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## Notes

I think the 2NR should be the Russia CP and the Spending DA (or possibly politics, although that might create some issues since the impact is based off of US/Russia Relations). You could also go for T-investment, since their plan text doesn’t mandate an investment in transportation infrastructure.

GW adv: Note that it operates on the assumption that GW is inevitable (we’ve already passed the brink) and should just adapt to it.

## Topicality

### 1NC Investment

#### (A.) Interp -“Investment” requires capital expenditure

Anderson 6

(Edward, Lecturer in Development Studies – University of East Anglia, et al., “The Role of Public Investment in Poverty Reduction: Theories, Evidence and Methods”, Overseas Development Institute Working Paper 263, March, http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/1786.pdf)

1.3 Definitions We define (net) public investment as public expenditure that adds to the public physical capital stock. This would include the building of roads, ports, schools, hospitals etc. This corresponds to the definition of public investment in national accounts data, namely, capital expenditure. It is not within the scope of this paper to include public expenditure on health and education, despite the fact that many regard such expenditure as investment. Methods for assessing the poverty impact of public expenditure on social sectors such as health and education have been well covered elsewhere in recent years (see for example, van de Walle and Nead, 1995; Sahn and Younger, 2000; and World Bank, 2002).

#### ( ) That means you have to be new infrastructure – repair and maintenance affs aren’t topical

Law Depot 8

(“Capital Expenditure”, 2-6, http://wiki.lawdepot.com/wiki/Capital\_Expenditure)

Definition of "Capital Expenditure" Capital expenditure is money spent to acquire or upgrade (improve) long term assets such as property, buildings and machinery. Capital expenditure does not include the cost to merely repair such assets.

B. Violation – the affirmative doesn’t mandate investment in infrastructure to create shipping lanes.

#### Vote negative for limits and ground – not requiring the affirmative to invest in infrastructure permits them to evade links to core DAs and allows the negative to defend minor-repair affirmatives for which no meaningful link uniqueness exists.

### 1/2NC Create

#### Create does not mean invest

Merriam-Webster (“create”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/create>)

1: to bring into existence <God created the heaven and the earth — Genesis 1:1(Authorized Version)> 2 a : to invest with a new form, office, or rank <was created a lieutenant> b : to produce or bring about by a course of action or behavior <her arrival created a terrible fuss> <create new jobs> 3 : cause, occasion <famine creates high food prices> 4 a : to produce through imaginative skill <create a painting> b : design <creates dresses>

Note: “invest with” is distinct from “invest in”

### Ext. “Investment” = Capital Expenditures (1/2)

#### ( ) Not all spending is investment. Only capital expenditure is topical and requires new projects

**Becker ‘8**

(Werner, Deutsche Bank Research, et al., “Improving the Quality of Public Finances – The Road Ahead”, 2-5, http://www.dbresearch.com/PROD/DBR\_INTERNET\_EN-PROD/PROD0000000000220498.PDF)

With regard to the effects of public spending on growth, a distinction is traditionally made between current government consumption expenditure (on, say, the compensation of government employees) and capital expenditure geared to the future (on infrastructural projects such as transport, utility supply and communications systems). Government consumption spending is frequently generalised as unproductive, whereas public capital expenditure is regularly labelled as growth-enhancing investment in the future. When assessing the growth effects of public spending, however, this simplistic approach needs reexamining. There are some kinds of public spending that, while reported as capital expenditure, do not count as productive investment in the economic sense. Empirical surveys show that substantial growth effects can normally be expected only from infrastructure investment. But over the past 25 years this has accounted for a mere quarter to a third of total government investment.13 Ultimately, the simple equation “more public investment equals more growth” has been undermined in Germany by the very broad interpretation of the debt rule in Article 115 of the Basic Law.14 Although the rule stipulates that net new borrowing by the Federal government must not exceed public investment expenditure, in many years the government has departed from this principle – most recently in each of the years from 2002 to 2006 –, taking as its justification the disturbance in macroeconomic equilibrium. Public spending and public debt rose, but in most cases growth remained anaemic. A problem here is the relatively broad definition of public investment.

#### ( ) This applies to transportation investment as well

Berechman 2

(Yossi, Professor of Public Policy – Tel Aviv University, Transport and Economic Development, p. 114)

4.1. Basic definitions In the present context, "transportation investment" is defined as a capacity improvement or addition to an existing network of roads, rail, waterways, huh terminals, tunnels, bridges, airports and harbors. The concept of "resultant economic growth" is further considered to mean the long-run increase in economic activity in a given geographical area, which can be ascribed to a specific transport investment and which confers welfare improvements to the area's residents. Additionally, as explained later, it is also required that the growth benefits will be in addition to the direct transportation benefits from the investment and not merely their capitalised value. Tin's latter condition is a fundamental one. fully discussed in section 5.2.

### Ext. “Investment” = Capital Expenditures (2/2)

#### ( ) Only capital expenditure is “investment”. Spending on current capabilities is maintenance revenue expenditure. Distinguishing clearly between the two is critical to precision and topic education

Mtetwa 10

(Munya, ACCA and IFA Qualified Accountant with Over Ten Years Financial Management and Accounting Experience, “Revenue and Capital Expenditure”, Accounting – Suite 101, 3-21, http://munya-mtetwa.suite101.com/revenue-and-capital-expenditure-a212507)

In accounting there are two main mandatory financial statements and these report the financial position and the financial performance of a company. These two financial statements are known as the balance sheet and the profit and loss account. The balance sheet is the home to all capital expenditures and all revenue expenses are recorded in the profit and loss account. Failure to distinguish the difference between revenue expenses and capital expenses can lead to a misleading picture of both the financial performance and financial position being reported or presented to the users of accounting information. In book-keeping and accounting there is a type of error known as the error of principle. This error occurs when capital expenditure is treated as revenue expenditure in the books of accounts and vice versa. When a firm deliberately misclassifies revenue expenditure as capital expenditure this may be viewed as creative accounting, which is morally and ethically wrong. Below these two concepts are explored further. Revenue Expenses Revenue expenditure is outlay or expenses incurred in the day to day running of a company. In most cases revenue expenditure involves the procurement of services and goods that will be used within a financial year. Revenue expenditure does not improve or increase the income generating abilities of a company; at best it leads to the maintenance of the current organisational revenue generating capacity. All expenses of a revenue nature are recorded in the profit and loss account as either operating expenses, marketing and selling expenses and administrative expenses. Revenue expenses play a role in determining the profit earned or a loss by a company. Revenue expenses are routine and recurring in nature and some examples of revenue expenditure include payments in staff wages and salaries, heating and lighting, depreciation, legal and professional fees, travel and subsistence, insurance, administrative expenses, most of marketing and public relations expenses, audit fees, office supplies, staff training costs, staff recruitment costs and minor or immaterial items of equipment. Capital Expenses Capital expenditure represents outlay on fixed assets. Capital expenditure can be outlay of resources on the investment of long-term income generating capability of the company. Investment in fixed assets will lead to an increase or improvement in the investing company’s revenue generating capacity. Capital expenditure can also be in the form of significant acquisitions or purchases of more expensive items of equipment that will last longer than a financial year.

### Ext. Capital Expenditure = New Assets (1/1)

#### ( ) The affirmative is an instance of maintenance expenditure – which is distinct from the creation of a new asset

**Transpower ‘10**

(Transpower New Zealand Limited Business Guidance, “Accounting Guidance Notes for Revenue and Capital Expenditure”, Issue 2, November, http://ebookbrowse.com/transpower-accounting-guidance-notes-for-revenue-and-capital-expenditure-issue2-pdf-d284331433)

7.3 Maintenance Expenditure (Revenue Expenditure) Maintenance expenditure is expenditure that satisfies one or more of the these criteria: (i) It restores an asset to its original expected operating capability or condition; (ii) It provides only minor or incidental improvement(s) to the features, functionality or EOL of the asset; (iii) It maintains an asset in good working condition. In other words, Maintenance Expenditure enables the asset to achieve its original expected operational life (EOL) through regular and/or preventive maintenance. 7.4 Capital Expenditure Capital expenditure is expenditure that satisfies one or more of these criteria: (i) It results in the creation of a new asset or assets2; (ii) It provides a to significant improvement an existing asset with respect to capability or EOL.

#### ( ) Plan’s revenue expenditure

Chennai 5

(Corporation of Chennai Tax-Free Bonds 2005, “Offer Document”, 3-31, http://www.bseindia.com/BSEdata/ipo\_downloads/Corporation%20of%20Chennai.pdf)

THE MAJOR TYPES OF REVENUE EXPENDITURE ARE 1. Salaries to the Corporation employees. 2. Terminal and Retirement benefits to the Corporation pensioners/family pensioners. 3. Operating expenses like, Power charges, Stores Consumption, Medicines, Fuel charges. 4. Repairs and maintenance like storm water drains and culverts, repair charges for vehicles, electrical installation, etc. 5. Programme expenses like Family Welfare Programme, Noon Meal, Tree Planting, etc. 6. Administration Expenses like telephone charges, audit fees, printing and stationeries, etc. 7. Interest on loan.

#### ( ) That excludes maintenance and repair

360 Capital 12

(“Investor Information”, http://www.360capital.com.au/investor-information/glossary-of-terms/)

Capital expenditure (Capex): Those items that are significant replacements or additions to properties, as distinguished from expense items that are considered to be recurring items. Capital expenditure does not include general maintenance and repair items. For example the replacement of an air conditioning unit at a property would be an item of capital expenditure. However, the replacement of its fan-belt would not.

### AT//Maintenance / Repairs (1/1)

#### ( ) Maintaining or repairing is distinct – that’s construction, not infrastructure investment

Roberts 10

(Ivan, Economist – Economic Analysis Department of the Reserve Bank of Australia, and Anthony Rush, Analyst – RBA, “Sources of Chinese Demand for Resource Commodities”, Reserve Bank of Australia – Research Discussion Paper, November, http://www.rba.gov.au/publications/rdp/2010/pdf/rdp2010-08.pdf)

Our definition of manufacturing is the same as that of Barnett and Brooks from 2004 onwards, since it is given as a complete category in the FAI by industry data. Prior to 2004, we define manufacturing as ‘secondary industry’ less ‘energy’ and ‘construction’. Barnett and Brooks define ‘infrastructure’ investment as the sum of FAI in electricity, gas & water; transport, storage & post; water conservancy & environmental management; education; health, social security & welfare; and public administration & social organisations. From 2004, we follow the definition of Barnett and Brooks, except that we omit public administration & social organisations and include culture, sport & entertainment. Given the higher level of aggregation in the pre-2004 data, before 2004 we define infrastructure as the sum of ‘industry: energy’, transport, storage & telecommunications; culture, education & health care; and ‘other’ (since infrastructure-related categories that did not exist prior to 2004 such as water conservancy & environmental management were included in this category). Including investment in the ‘construction’ industry itself would make little difference to the calculation as it is small (around 1 per cent of total FAI), but we omit it as it is not clear that it constitutes ‘infrastructure’ investment as such. Since a (discontinued) urban real estate investment category is available prior to the 2004 reclassification, we use this series to extend the real estate FAI series back to 1996.19

### AT//Short-Term Fixes (1/1)

#### ( ) The aff has to have a durability of more than a year – otherwise it isn’t investment

HECFE, 10

(9/30/10 Higher Education Funding Council for England, “What is meant by the term “infrastructure investment?,” <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2010/cl172010/faqoncif2/#gen5>)

By infrastructure investment we mean expenditure of sufficient scale that it would normally be eligible for capitalisation on the balance sheet. Infrastructure comprises items with a life of greater than 12 months and includes buildings, equipment, software development and campus infrastructure such as IT, roadways and utility services.

### 1NC Infrastructure

(If they change their plan text to mandate icebreakers)

#### ( A. ) Transportation infrastructure is highways, roads, bridges, intermodal transit, inland waterways, ports, aviation, and rail systems.

**Congress ‘11**

[The US House of Representatives – the 112th Congress of the United States. “HR 402 – National Infrastructure Development Bank Act of 2011” 1/24/11 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr402/text//Cal-JV>]

(25) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT- The term ‘transportation infrastructure project’ means any project for the construction, maintenance, or enhancement of highways, roads, bridges, transit and intermodal systems, inland waterways, commercial ports, airports, high speed rail and freight rail systems.

B. The affirmative invests in icebreakers, not actual transportation infrastructure.

#### Vote negative for limits and ground – other forms of infrastructure like the aff’s self-evidently explode the topic and require a different and unrelated set of negative arguments – rejecting the plan is necessary to preserve a manageable negative research burden and preserve competitive equity.

### Ext. “TI” Excludes Other Forms (General) (3/4)

#### ( ) Transportation infrastructure is defined as transit, highways, airports, railways, waterways and intermodal links

**Trimbath 2011**

(Susanne, Ph.D., former Senior Research Economist in Capital Market Studies at Milken Institute, Transportation Infrastructure: Paving the Way, STP Advisory Services, LLC, p. 9)

The strategy applied by the US Chamber of Commerce for the infrastructure performance index project presents a model for developing the way forward. A stakeholder-centric approach allows you to measure the right things, communicate to the people in a language they understand and get to ACTION faster. The process, detailed in the Technical Report last summer (US Chamber 2010), is basically this: 1. Clearly define “transportation infrastructure” as the underlying structures that support the delivery of inputs to places of production, goods and services to customers, and customers to marketplaces. The structures are: • Transit • Highways • Airports • Railways • Waterways (Ports) • Intermodal Links

#### ( ) Water supply and disposal, telecom, and power generation, transmission, and distribution aren’t topical

Snieska 9

(Vytautas, Professor – Kaunas University of Technology, and Ineta Simkunaite, Professor – Projectu Vadybos Centras, “Socio-Economic Impact of Infrastructure Investments”, Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics, 3, p. 17)

Authors of scientific literature suggest many definitions of infrastructure sector and its components, they widely interpret the features and functions of infrastructure while the issue of measurement is based mainly on the available data for different regions. Infrastructure is defined as a complex of capital goods which are not consumed directly; they provide services only in combination with labour and other inputs. This description allows to distinguish a wide range of components and to analyse their direct impact on development issues and emphasises the need of specification of infrastructure sector in order to measure its impact. In this article infrastructure is defined as the core physical structure consisting of: transportation infrastructure, water supply and disposal infrastructure, telecommunications infrastructure and power infrastructure, consisting of sub sectors that are defined by a set of physical variables: transportation infrastructure (length of roads, rail tracks, etc.), water supply and disposal infrastructure (resident population connected to wastewater collection and treatment systems), telecommunications infrastructure (number of telephone lines), power infrastructure (power plants, transmission and distribution lines).

#### **( ) Transportation infrastructure laundry list – it’s distinct from communication and utilities**

FCEDC, 09

( June 2009, Fond Du Lac County Economic Development Corporation, “ Economic Development Glossary,” <http://www.fcedc.com/sft386/ed101.pdf> )

Infrastructure: Encompasses existing transportation, communication and utility networks. Infrastructure gets people to their jobs and goods and services to their markets. Transportation infrastructure includes: roads; light transit rail networks, inter city, state passenger railways; airports; waterways and ports; bus services. Communication infrastructure includes: copper wire for telecommunications, installed by telecommunications companies; high bandwidth and fiber optic cable capable for carrying voice, data and video streams; satellite communications and microwave antenna; mobile phone networks; the Internet; local area networks (LAN). Utility infrastructure includes: electric power; water and sewage treatment; natural gas lines.

### Ext. “TI” Excludes Other Forms (General) (4/4)

#### ( ) Transportation infrastructure is distinct from other types of infrastructure

Neumann and Price ‘9

(James E. Neumann and Principle – Industrial Economics, and Jason C. Price, Senior Associate – Industrial Economics, RFF Report, June 2009, Adapting to Climate Change, http://www.rff.org/rff/documents/RFF-Rpt-Adaptation-NeumannPrice.pdf)

This paper assesses the threats and needs that multidimensional climate change imposes for public infrastructure, reviews the existing adaptive capacity that could be applied to respond to these threats and needs, and presents options for enhancing adaptive capacity through public sector investments in physical, planning, and human resources. The paper considers four types of infrastructure: transportation; energy generation and transmission; water, sewer, and telecommunications; and coastal defense. The main threats  presented by climate change to these assets include damage or destruction from extreme events, which climate change may exacerbate; coastal flooding and inundation from sea level rise; changes in patterns of water availability; effects of higher temperature on  operating costs, including effects in temperate areas and areas currently characterized by permafrost conditions; and demand‐induced effects.

#### ( ) It’s not an arbitrary distinction – the *literature agrees* that distinguishing between types of infrastructure is crucial

Neumann and Price ‘9

(James E. Neumann and Principle – Industrial Economics, and Jason C. Price, Senior Associate – Industrial Economics, RFF Report, June 2009, Adapting to Climate Change, http://www.rff.org/rff/documents/RFF-Rpt-Adaptation-NeumannPrice.pdf)

Throughout this paper, we organize our presentation by referring to four major categories of infrastructure: •transportation; •energy utility provision, including electric, natural gas, gasoline, and oil pipeline networks;  •nonenergy utility provision, including water, sewer, communication, and solid waste management networks; and • coastal and flood defense networks

### AT//Coastal Defense (1/1)

#### ( ) Coastal defense infrastructure is distinct from transportation

Neumann ‘9

(James E., Principle – Industrial Economics, and Jason C. Price, Senior Associate – Industrial Economics, “Adapting to Climate Change: The Public Policy Response Public Infrastructure”, June, http://www.rff.org/rff/documents/RFF-Rpt-Adaptation-NeumannPrice.pdf)

This paper assesses the threats and needs that multidimensional climate change imposes for public infrastructure, reviews the existing adaptive capacity that could be applied to respond to these threats and needs, and presents options for enhancing adaptive capacity through public sector investments in physical, planning, and human resources. The paper considers four types of infrastructure: transportation; energy generation and transmission; water, sewer, and telecommunications; and coastal defense. The main threats presented by climate change to these assets include damage or destruction from extreme events, which climate change may exacerbate; coastal flooding and inundation from sea level rise; changes in patterns of water availability; effects of higher temperature on operating costs, including effects in temperate areas and areas currently characterized by permafrost conditions; and demand‐induced effects.

### AT//Military Infrastructure (1/1)

#### ( ) “Transportation infrastructure” is strictly defined as facilities of transport --- this excludes security, law enforcement, and military support

**Musick ‘10**

(Nathan, Microeconomic and Financial Studies Division – United States Congressional Budget Office, Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure, p. 2)

Although different definitions of "infrastructure" exist, this report focuses on two types that claim a significant amount of federal resources: transportation and water. Those types of infrastructure share the economic characteristics of being relatively capital intensive and producing services under public management that facilitate private economic activity. They are typically the types examined by studies that attempt to calculate the payoff, in terms of benefits to the U.S. economy) of the public sector's funding of infrastructure. For the purposes of CBO's analysis, "transportation infrastructure" includes the systems and facilities that support the following types of activities: ■ Vehicular transportation: highways, roads, bridges, and tunnels; ■ Mass transit subways, buses, and commuter rail; ■ Rail transport primarily the intercity service provided by Amtrak;\* ■ Civil aviation: airport terminals, runways, and taxi-ways, and facilities and navigational equipment for air traffic control: and ■ Water transportation: waterways, ports, vessel\*, and navigational systems. The category "water infrastructure" includes facilities that provide the following: ■ Water resources: containment systems, such as dams, levees, reservoirs, and watersheds; and sources of fresh water such as lakes and rivers; and ■ Water utilities: supply systems for distributing potable water, and wastewater and sewage treatment systems and plants. Consistent with CBO'% previous reports on public spending for transportation and water infrastructure, this update excludes spending that is associated with such infrastructure but does not contribute directly to the provision of infrastructure facilities or certain strictly defined infrastructure services. Examples of excluded spending are federal outlays for homeland security (which are especially pertinent to aviation), law enforcement and military functions (such as those carried out by the Coast Guard), and cleanup operations (such as those conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers following Hurricane Katrina in 2005).

#### ( ) U.S. law defines “infrastructure” as only non-military

National Infrastructure Improvement Act 7

(National Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2007 – Passed by the Senate, http://uspolitics.about.com/od/legislation/l/bl\_s775.htm)

(4) INFRASTRUCTURE(A) IN GENERAL- The term `infrastructure' means a nonmilitary structure or facility and equipment associated with that structure or facility. (B) INCLUSIONS- The term `infrastructure' includes-(i) a surface transportation facility (such as a road, bridge, highway, public transportation facility, and freight and passenger rail), as the Commission, in consultation with the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission established by section 1909(b)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59; 119 Stat. 1471), determines to be appropriate; (ii) a mass transit facility; (iii) an airport or airway facility; (iv) a resource recovery facility; (v) a water supply and distribution system; (vi) a wastewater collection, treatment, and related facility; (vii) waterways, locks, and dams; (viii) a levee and any related flood-control facility; (ix) a dock or port; and (x) a solid waste disposal facility.

#### ( ) The topic excludes military structures

El Makhloufi 11

(A El Makhloufi ,Department of Economics at the University of Amsterdam, <http://www.sesric.org/imgs/news/image/541-full.pdf>, April 2011)

2. Infrastructure investment and economic growth: A review of the literature Existing literature concerned with the study of the relationship between infrastructure investment and economic growth show a wide variety of point of view concerning the definition of the concept 'infrastructure' (Lakshmanan, 1989). Although the literature is generally clear in the way in which specific public goods are categorized, the general tendency is the association of infrastructure to particular characteristics of physical features (e.g. large and costly installations) or public services (educational buildings, hospitals, information flows, water and power supply, etc.). Some authors define infrastructure in a broader way without making any distinction between physical and non-physical infrastructure (Hirschman, 1958 for example). Others restrict the definition of infrastructure to core infrastructure consisting of railways, airports, and utilities such as sewerage and water facilities, information flows and particular cases of externalities of public goods (Aschauer, 1990; Anderson, 1991). Gramlich (1994, p. 1177) for example, defines infrastructure capital from an economic point of view as "large capital intensive natural monopolies such as highways, other transportation facilities, water and sewer lines, and communications systems." More generally, most studies employ a narrow definition of public capital that includes the tangible capital stock owned by the public sector, excluding military structures and equipment and infrastructure capital based on private ownership. Other studies use a broad definition of public capital by including human capital investment (e.g., Garcia-Mila and McGuire 1992) or health and welfare facilities (e.g., Mera 1973). The latter components are hard to measure, which explains why most authors focus on narrowly defined public capital.

### Err Negative – 1st Line (1/1)

#### You should err neg on topicality and prefer Negative strategy to Affirmative ground – the Aff has structural advantages like infinite prep time to create their Affirmative, the ability to choose a strategic area of the topic for the 1AC, and the first and last speech which already give them an advantage – they should be held to the reciprocal burden of providing an acceptable amount of predictable negative ground.

### Competing Interpretations Good – 1st Line (1/1)

#### Competing interpretations are good:

#### ( ) Educational – debating about different interpretations equips debaters with the ability to engage in analytical debate based on *precise standards of evaluation*. Reasonability is arbitrary and jackknifes meaningful analysis of interpretations.

#### ( ) Reasonability is arbitrary – replaces interpretation’s clash with judge-evaluated reasonability, which is subjective. Subjective interpretations are the death of debate because there’s no OBJECTIVE standard for evaluation and the debaters CANNOT REASONABLY PREDICT how to frame their arguments

#### ( ) Our interp most predictable – allowing the neg to defend an interpretation shields them from unpredictable affirmatives. This improves the quality of debate by ensuring stable negative ground and minimizes judge intervention.

#### ( ) Destroys strategic ground – the combination of all reasonable interpretations will force the topic to be as large as possible. This forces the neg to assume a massive research burden, which collapses predictable ground. Ground isn’t meaningful unless it’s predictable because all of our strategies are researched with a set case list in mind.

#### ( ) Infinitely regressive – there’s no brightline for what is and what is not reasonable. Teams will always push these limits to catch the neg unprepared – we have evidentiary support

**Stone ‘23**

[Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit. Sussex Land & Live Stock Co v. Midwest Refining Co, 1923. Lexis]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.

### Fairness 1st (1/1)

#### ( ) Fairness has to come first – otherwise everyone would quit, destroying debate. It’s objectively true that despite educational merits, one of the BIGGEST reasons debaters are so dedicated to the activity is because anyone can win a given round.

#### ( ) Fairness creates equitable debate which is a pre-requisite for education. Their forms of education can be reproduced in other forums – debate is a game which necessities fair rules otherwise no one would play it.

#### ( ) Limits are good and necessary to preserve debate – otherwise people will quit

Rowland 84

(Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

### Limits Good (1/1)

#### Narrow interpretations are key to all negative strategy –

#### ( ) Case-specific strategies are educational core negative ground – vast literature exists for topic-specific trade-off disads, specific politics or court disad links, presidential power disads, etc. along with in-depth debates over agent, delegation, or other process counterplans. These are the only core ground because the topic is so broad – the only stable action is what relates to the plan. Core ground is key to fairness because it’s the only thing for which we can consistently prepare.

#### ( ) Their interpretation is an incentive for aff conditionality – they can re-clarify the plan to be done by an alternate actor, or the plan to take a different course of action in the 2AC to avoid our best offense and manipulate the plan to their advantage

#### ( ) Crucial to pre-round preparation – the plan text is the most mainstream form of disclosure and locus of negative strategy formulation before the round – anything else skews time allocation. Adequate pre-round preparation is key to fair debate and education.

### Ext. Limits Good (1/1)

#### ( ) Limits key to clash—minimize neg research burdens that facilitate generics

Hardy ‘10

(Aaron T. Hardy, Coach at Whitman College, “CONDITIONALITY, CHEATING COUNTERPLANS, AND CRITIQUES: TOPIC CONSTRUCTION AND THE RISE OF THE “NEGATIVE CASE””, Contemporary Argumentation & Debate, 2010, pg. 44-45, [http://www.cedadebate.org/cad/index.php/CAD/article/view File/271/243](http://www.cedadebate.org/cad/index.php/CAD/article/view%20File/271/243))

First, narrow topics are most likely to encourage substantive clash. One of the primary motivations for negative teams running away from engagement with the specifics of the affirmative is fear of “falling behind” in the necessary research effort. On a topic with 200 topical affirmative plan mechanisms, it is extremely unlikely that all but the most precocious of negative teams will be prepared to debate each one, and much more likely that they will turn instead to as generic of an approach as possible. Despite sentiments from some corners that the topic writing process is already too narrow and specialized, I would submit that the debate community has not yet truly experimented with what a radically narrower topic might entail. Even the smallest topics in recent memory have afforded the affirmative an incredible amount of flexibility, usually as a compromise to the “broad topics good” camp. A quick perusal of any of the archived case lists from the past decade reveals that even the narrowest topics the community has debated have entailed dozens (if not hundreds) of discrete affirmatives. Instead, envision as a potentially hyperbolic example, a topic with truly only five topical cases. With essentially no room for maneuver, it is easier to envision negative teams feeling empowered “stale” could be replaced with “nuanced,” even if debates superficially resemble each other as the year progresses.

#### ( ) Limits ensure predictability and don’t undermine affirmative flexibility

Kupferbreg ’87

(Debate Coach at University of Kentucky) 1987 (Eric, “Limits – The Essence of Topicality”, Latin American Politics: The Calculus of Instability, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Kupferberg1987LatAmer.htm) aml

If you are negative, two lines of argumentation should be advanced. First, it is necessary to explain that the affirmative interpretation unlimits the resolution. It should be explained that many cases normally thought to be outside of the resolution would become topical. Special emphasis should be placed on explaining why the affirmative definition would serve as a precedent to an undebatable topic. A premium should be placed on pointing out absurd examples that would be allowable under the broader interpretation (or, the sheer number of cases that would fall within the resolution). Second, it is the negatives responsibility to explain that their own interpretation would allow for an adequate number of cases. If the negative is able to list several fruitful case areas that would remain topical, then the negative position appears less abusive.

### Framers’ Intent Good (1/2)

#### ( ) Framer’s intent matters – it’s the basis of the topic

Hutchison 8

(Cameron, Assistant Professor of Law – University of Alberta, “Which Kraft of Statutory Interpretation”, Alberta Law Review, November, 46 Alberta L. Rev. 1, Lexis)

Second, it is not possible to interpret even a single word, much less an entire text, without knowing the purpose of the statute. [123](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=bef2ae73d8968e2a7ac2c41f4058a2c3&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAb&_md5=78aa7022ae9dd715e1437a81c40167d8&focBudTerms=canon+and+competing+interpretation+w%2F100+text%21&focBudSel=all" \l "n123#n123" \t "_self) To take Hart's "no vehicle in the park" example, if local patriots were to wheel a truck used in World War II on a pedestal, would this qualify as a core case? This example illustrates that meaning of language in a statute cannot be divorced from an inquiry into the purpose that a rule serves. When courts are offered competing interpretations, they must choose the one that is most sensible in connection with its legislative purpose, [124](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=bef2ae73d8968e2a7ac2c41f4058a2c3&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAb&_md5=78aa7022ae9dd715e1437a81c40167d8&focBudTerms=canon+and+competing+interpretation+w%2F100+text%21&focBudSel=all#n124#n124) and makes the statute "a coherent [and] workable whole." [125](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=bef2ae73d8968e2a7ac2c41f4058a2c3&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAb&_md5=78aa7022ae9dd715e1437a81c40167d8&focBudTerms=canon+and+competing+interpretation+w%2F100+text%21&focBudSel=all#n125#n125) Moreover, the purpose of a statute is not static, but through interpretation, courts engage in a process of redefining and clarifying the ends themselves. [126](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=bef2ae73d8968e2a7ac2c41f4058a2c3&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAb&_md5=78aa7022ae9dd715e1437a81c40167d8&focBudTerms=canon+and+competing+interpretation+w%2F100+text%21&focBudSel=all" \l "n126#n126" \t "_self) As Fuller puts it, courts must "be sufficiently capable of putting [themselves] in the position of those who drafted the rule to know what they thought 'ought to be.' It is in the light of this 'ought' that [they] must decide what the rule 'is.'" [127](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?y=&dom1=&dom2=&dom3=&dom4=&dom5=&crnPrh=&crnSah=&crnSch=&crnLgh=&crnSumm=&crnCt=&cc=&crnCh=&crnGc=&shepSummary=&crnFmt=&shepStateKey=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=XCITE&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=bef2ae73d8968e2a7ac2c41f4058a2c3&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAb&_md5=78aa7022ae9dd715e1437a81c40167d8&focBudTerms=canon+and+competing+interpretation+w%2F100+text%21&focBudSel=all" \l "n127#n127" \t "_self)

#### ( ) Legislative intent of the resolution outweighs limits

Clements 5

Judge Jean Harrison Clements, Court of Appeals of Virginia, October 25, 2005, Bryan David Auer v. Commonwealth of Virginia – Court of Appeals of Virginia, <http://www.courts.state.va.us/opinions/opncavtx/0851041.txt>

Consequently, the fact that the statute does not expressly enumerate a particular item implies that the item "falls outside of the definition." Highway & City Freight Drivers, 576 F.2d at 1289; see County of Amherst Bd. of Supervisors v. Brockman, 224 Va. 391, 397, 297 S.E.2d 805, 808 (1992) (holding that the courts "may not add to a statute language" that the legislature intended not be included therein). Because the word "include" is susceptible to more than one meaning and because it is not immediately clear from the word's context which meaning is meant to apply in Code 19.2-295.1, we conclude that the statute's provision that "[p]rior convictions shall include convictions . . . under the laws of any state, the District of Columbia, the United States or its territories" is ambiguous. See Brown v. Lukhard, 229 Va. 316, 321, 330 S.E.2d 84, 87 (1985) (noting that words are ambiguous if they admit to "being understood in more than one way" or lack "clearness and definiteness"). See generally Liverpool v. Baltimore Diamond Exch., Inc., 799 A.2d 1264, 1274 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. 2002) (recognizing that "the term 'includes,' by itself, is not free from ambiguity" because it "has various shades of meaning," ranging from enlargement and expansion to limitation and restriction); Frame v. Nehls, 550 N.W.2d 739, 742 (Mich. 1996) ("When used in the text of a statute, the word 'includes' can be used as a term of enlargement or of limitation, and the word in and of itself is not determinative of how it is intended to be used."). "Therefore, we are called upon to construe this statutory language in a manner that will ascertain and give effect to the General Assembly's intent." Herndon v. St. Mary's Hosp., Inc., 266 Va. 472, 475, 587 S.E.2d 567, 569 (2003). In seeking to resolve the ambiguity in the statutory language and discern the legislature's intent, we apply established principles of statutory interpretation. See Va. Dep't of Labor & Industry v. Westmoreland Coal Co., 233 Va. 97, 101-02, 353 S.E.2d 758, 762 (1987). Consistent with such principles, we interpret the statute so as "to promote the end for which it was enacted, if such an interpretation can reasonably be made from the language used." Mayhew v. Commonwealth, 20 Va. App. 484, 489, 458 S.E.2d 305, 307 (1995). Thus, the "statute must be construed with reference to its subject matter, the object sought to be attained, and the legislative purpose in enacting it; the provisions should receive a construction that will render it harmonious with that purpose rather than one which will defeat it." Esteban v. Commonwealth, 266 Va. 605, 609, 587 S.E.2d 523, 526 (2003). Furthermore, although "[i]t is a cardinal principle of law that penal statutes are to be construed strictly against the [Commonwealth]" and "cannot be extended by implication, or be made to include cases which are not within the letter and spirit of the statute," Wade v. Commonwealth, 202 Va. 117, 122, 116 S.E.2d 99, 103 (1960), "we will not apply 'an unreasonably restrictive interpretation of the statute' that would subvert the legislative intent expressed therein," Armstrong v. Commonwealth, 263 Va. 573, 581, 562 S.E.2d 139, 144 (2002) (quoting Ansell v. Commonwealth, 219 Va. 759, 761, 250 S.E.2d 760, 761 (1979)).

### Framers’ Intent Good (2/2)

#### ( ) It’s key to establish the baseline for literature

Weaver ‘7

(Aaron Weaver, Ph.D. Candidate in Politics and Society – Baylor University, “An Introduction to Original Intent”, Fall, http://www.thebigdaddyweave.com/BDWFiles/originalism.pdf)

During the Reagan presidency, Attorney General Edwin Meese, III was perhaps the most outspoken advocate of originalism. In 1985, Meese became the subject of deep controversy after calling for a “jurisprudence of original intent.” He accused the Supreme Court of straying from the original intention of the United States Constitution. Meese explained that the purpose of a jurisprudence of original intent was to: Explicate not simply what is old, but what is basic, what is true. It is a means of accommodating the political changes wrought by time within the safe framework of fundamental principles that are permanent – unchangeable. It is a jurisprudence that takes seriously the belief that the Constitution – our written Constitution – means something, something that can be and must be discerned and applied to our modern circumstances. The Framers’ object was not to keep the Constitution in tune with the times but rather to keep the times in tune with the Constitution. 7

### AT//Aff Flexibility (1/1)

#### ( ) Rules and boundaries facilitate innovation

Flood 10

(Scott, BS in Communication and Theatre Arts – St. Joseph’s College, School Board Member – Plainfield Community School Corporation, and Advertising Agent, “Business Innovation – Real Creativity Happens Inside the Box”, http://ezinearticles.com/?Business-Innovation---Real-Creativity-Happens-Inside-the-Box&id=4793692)

It seems that we can accomplish anything if we're brave enough to step out of that bad, bad box, and thinking "creatively" has come to be synonymous with ignoring rules and constraints or pretending they just don't exist. Nonsense. Real creativity is put to the test within the box. In fact, that's where it really shines. It might surprise you, but it's actually easier to think outside the box than within its confines. How can that be? It's simple. When you're working outside the box, you don't face rules, or boundaries, or assumptions. You create your own as you go along. If you want to throw convention aside, you can do it. If you want to throw proven practices out the window, have at it. You have the freedom to create your own world. Now, I'm not saying there's anything wrong with thinking outside the box. At times, it's absolutely essential - such as when you're facing the biggest oil spill in history in an environment in which all the known approaches are failing. But most of us don't have the luxury of being able to operate outside the box. We've been shoved into reality, facing a variety of limitations, from budgets, to supervisors' opinions and prejudices, to the nature of the marketplace. Even though the box may have been given a bad name, it's where most of us have to spend our time. And no matter how much we may fret about those limits, inside that box is where we need to prove ourselves. If you'll pardon the inevitable sports analogy, consider a baseball player who belts ball after ball over 450 feet. Unfortunately, he has a wee problem: he can't place those hits between the foul lines, so they're harmful strikes instead of game-winning home runs. To the out-of-the-box advocates, he's a mighty slugger who deserves admiration, but to his teammates and the fans, he's a loser who just can't get on base. He may not like the fact that he has to limit his hits to between the foul poles, but that's one of the realities of the game he chose to play. The same is true of ideas and approaches. The most dazzling and impressive tactic is essentially useless if it doesn't offer a practical, realistic way to address the need or application. Like the baseball player, we may not like the realities, but we have to operate within their limits. Often, I've seen people blame the box for their inability or unwillingness to create something workable. For example, back in my ad agency days, I remember fellow writers and designers complaining about the limitations of projects. If it was a half-page ad, they didn't feel they could truly be creative unless the space was expanded to a full page. If they were given a full page, they demanded a spread. Handed a spread, they'd fret because it wasn't a TV commercial. If the project became a TV commercial with a $25,000 budget, they'd grouse about not having a $50,000 budget. Yet the greatest artists of all time didn't complain about what they didn't have; they worked their magic using what they did. Monet captured the grace and beauty of France astonishingly well within the bounds of a canvas. Donatello exposed the breathtaking emotion that lurked within ordinary chunks of marble. And I doubt that Beethoven ever whined because there were only 88 keys on the piano. Similarly, I've watched the best of my peers do amazing things in less-than-favorable circumstances. There were brilliant commercials developed with minimal budgets and hand-held cameras. Black-and-white ads that outperformed their colorful competitors. Simple postcards that grabbed the attention of (and business from) jaded consumers. You see, real creativity isn't hampered or blocked by limits. It actually flowers in response to challenges. Even though it may be forced to remain inside the box, it leverages everything it can find in that box and makes the most of every bit of it. Real creativity is driven by a need to create. When Monet approached a blank canvas, it's safe to say that he didn't agonize over its size. He wanted to capture something he'd seen and share how it looked through his eyes. The size of the canvas was incidental to his talent and desire. Think about the Apollo 13 mission. NASA didn't have the luxury of flying supplies or extra tools to the crew. They couldn't rewrite the laws of physics. Plus, they faced a rapidly shrinking timeline, so their box kept getting smaller and less forgiving. And yet they arrived upon a solution that was creative; more important, that was successful. The next time someone tells you that the real solution involves stepping outside the box, challenge him or her to think and work harder. After all, the best solution may very well be lurking in a corner of that familiar box.

### AT//Breadth > Depth (1/1)

#### ( ) Studies prove that deep education on a few issues outweighs the decision to exclude some topics in their entirety

WP 9

(Washington Post, “Will Depth Replace Breadth in Schools?” http://voices.washingtonpost.com/class-struggle/2009/02/will\_depth\_replace\_breadth\_in.html)

The truth, of course, is that students need both. Teachers try to mix the two in ways that make sense to them and their students. But a surprising study — certain to be a hot topic in teacher lounges and education schools — is providing new data that suggest educators should spend much more time on a few issues and let some topics slide. Based on a sample of 8,310 undergraduates, the national study says that students who spend at least a month on just one topic in a high school science course get better grades in a freshman college course in that subject than students whose high school courses were more balanced. The study, appearing in the July issue of the journal Science Education, is “Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Science Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework.” The authors are Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington, Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and Robert H. Tai of the University of Virginia. This is more rich ore from a goldmine of a survey Sadler and Tai helped organize called “Factors Influencing College Science Success.” It involved 18,000 undergraduates, plus their professors, in 67 colleges in 31 states. The study weighs in on one side of a contentious issue that will be getting national attention this September when the College Board’s Advanced Placement program unveils its major overhaul of its college-level science exams for high school students. AP is following a direction taken by its smaller counterpart, the International Baccalaureate program. IB teachers already are allowed to focus on topics of their choice. Their students can deal with just a few topics on exams, because they have a wide choice of questions. AP’s exact approach is not clear yet, but College Board officials said they too will embrace depth. They have been getting much praise for this from the National Science Foundation, which funded the new study. Sadler and Tai have previously hinted at where this was going. In 2001 they reported that students who did not use a textbook in high school physics—an indication that their teachers disdained hitting every topic — achieved higher college grades than those who used a textbook. Some educators, pundits, parents and students will object, I suspect, to sidelining their favorite subjects and spending more time on what they consider trivial or dangerous topics. Some will fret over the possibility that teachers might abandon breadth altogether and wallow in their specialties. Even non-science courses could be affected. Imagine a U.S. history course that is nothing but lives of generals, or a required English course that assigns only Jane Austen. “Depth Versus Breadth” analyzes undergraduate answers to detailed questions about their high school study of physics, chemistry and biology, and the grades they received in freshman college science courses. The college grades of students who had studied at least one topic for at least a month in a high school science course were compared to those of students who did not experience such depth. The study acknowledges that the pro-breadth forces have been in retreat. Several national commissions have called for more depth in science teaching and other subjects. A 2005 study of 46 countries found that those whose schools had the best science test scores covered far fewer topics than U.S. schools.

### AT//Literature Checks Abuse (1/1)

#### Literature does not check abuse:

#### ( ) There’s no limit – Literature exists about everything and the resolution serves to limit teams’ research burdens down to specific subsets of that literature. Their argument’s ONLY LIMIT is “that for which literature exists” – which could be anything.

#### ( ) Predictability is the filter through which you should evaluate literature – means that in THIS INSTANCE, lit does not check abuse because we had no way of knowing to research literature about their aff.

#### ( ) Determining the meaning of the resolution is key --There is extensive literature about baseball, and we could have an outstanding debate about that topic, but that’s not the resolution. Determining what the resolution means is a prerequisite to debating about its merits – their argument justifies debating last year’s Mars affirmative because “everyone has a space backfile".

### AT//Clash Checks Abuse (1/1)

#### Clash doesn’t check abuse

#### ( ) Clash is inevitable – we can always go for Consult NATO or the Heidegger critique – both are arguments that we have and they probably have answers to. That doesn’t prove their model of debate is fair.

#### ( ) No link – their argument presupposes that the clash allowed by their affirmative is GOOD clash; the negative is at a MASSIVE strategic disadvantage when their only 2NR options are T and the K.

#### ( ) Don’t punish us for having ev -- Preparation is about more than just having some cards – otherwise the “disband America” aff would be topical because every team carries “hegemony good” evidence. Their vision of the topic explodes the negative’s preparation burden making it impossible for us to effectively research in-depth positions drawn from the topic literature. If we win that our interpretation is superior then we internal link turn their clash arguments because our vision of the topic would better enable the negative to meet their burden of rejoinder.

### AT//Disclosure Checks Abuse (1/1)

#### Disclosure doesn’t check:

#### ( ) Destroys strategic ground -- There would be as many affirmatives as there are teams and there would be no predictable negative ground. The reason we have a resolution is to provide the negative with a core set of arguments that dispute the desirability for change – their argument would force the neg to have a case neg to every affirmative on the wiki even if it isn’t close to topical.

#### ( ) Doesn’t prove they’re topical – literature exists about everything, but we shouldn’t have to prepare for arguments outside the resolution. Determining what the topic means is a prerequisite to debating its desirability.

#### ( ) Devastates small schools – it’s not reasonable to expect small schools with only a few debaters and a coach to keep up with the hundreds of affirmatives that would exist under their interpretation. The impact is participation in debate, which proves all our fairness arguments and internal-link turns all your ground/limits/education claims.

### AT//Not a Voting Issue (1/1)

#### ( ) Jurisdiction -- Before determining whether or not the plan is desirable one must determine whether or not the plan is within the bounds of one’s jurisdictional authority – if the affirmative is not an example of the resolution, then they have not provided a justification for voting affirmative.

#### ( ) Relevant education – we expect to use debate rounds as a vehicle to learn about the resolution. Affirmatives reading untopical plans prevents this by taking the discussion away from the topic. Predictable education is the ONLY MEANINGFUL form of education because we need to engage in BASELINE LEARNING before the round in order to master the topic.

#### ( ) Fairness – if the aff isn’t confined to the resolution, affirmatives would have NO INCENTIVE to read topical affirmatives. Rather, they would eliminate all negative ground with plan texts like “do not kill innocent children”. This destroys competitive equity, explodes affirmative side bias, and collapses predictable ground. We have evidentiary support

Speice and Lyle ‘3

[Patrick (Wake Forest Debater) and Jim (Director of Debate @ Clarion). “Traditional Policy Debate: Now More than Ever”. The Debater’s Research Guide, 2003. groups.wfu.edu/debate ]

The plan is a necessary convention in debate because it is a specific statement of topical advocacy that the affirmative is bound to defend, and all negative ground comes from attacks on the plan and it’s justifications. If the affirmative team argues for the judge to vote for them based on statements not related to the plan, it is likely that these portions of the 1AC will not be topical. Allowing teams to advocate non-topical statements as a reason to vote for them makes it impossible for the negative to debate. The affirmative could simply defend a statement such a “racism is bad” or “2 + 2 = 4.” Such non-falsifiable statements make going negative immensely unattractive, as the affirmative would win virtually every debate. Teams that run such affirmatives, or that justify such affirmatives by divorcing the judge’s decision from a topical plan-focus, skew the debate in such a way that it becomes a “rigged game” in favor of the affirmative.

#### ( ) The punishment paradigm is best – if they broke the rules, you should vote negative to deter future bad practices

Sigel **85**

(Doug Sigel, Northwestern debate, Wake Forest University, 1985, Punishment: Does It Fit the Crime? The Debaters’ Research Guide, groups.wfu.edu/debate)

The punishment paradigm boils down to the argument that abusive debate practices should be punished with a loss. If a team employs strategies which are unfair to their opponents or which harm the debate process, the penalty should be a loss--even if they win the substantive policy issues in the debate. For example, a negative team who runs conditional counterplans would lose a debate in which the punishment paradigm was successfully argued even if they were able to refute all other affirmative arguments--like competition, topicality, and disadvantages--against those policies. In short, the punishment approach makes the legitimacy of the debate practices of both teams a prior issue to the substantive policy concerns that normally form the basis for judges' decisions. There are three major justifications for punishment. First, voting against bad debate practices deters their future use. Second, the unfair burdens created by tactics like conditional counterplans and incomprehensible delivery requires the judge to restore competitive equity by punishing the team employing those tactics in a round. Third, the judge is an educator and should teach proper academic conduct by nullifying all arguments made by students who abuse the debate process. These three justifications are the most common reasons advanced for punishment but there are probably others.

### AT//Reasonability (1/1)

#### ( ) If we win our interpretation establishes a superior topic, then theirs should be considered unreasonable

Mancuso ‘82

(Steve Manusco, Debater for University of Kentucky, Wake Forest University, 1982, Topicality: In Search of Reason. The Debaters’ Research Guide, groups.wfu.edu/debate)

In recognition of the many possible definitions of a word, the debate community has adopted (original mother and father unknown) the convention that the affirmative definition only needs to be "reasonable." This burden traditionally stands opposed to the notion that the affirmative must have the best definition of a word, or even necessarily a better definition than the negative. While the initial theoretical underpinnings for such a convention are far from clear, it must certainly be justified on the grounds that it promotes the objective of quality debating. Such a convention recognizes that a definition is not right or wrong, but merely acceptable or unacceptable in a given situation. In situations where broad interpretations of a topic are desirable, a broader-than usual definition may be reasonable, and where a narrow interpretation is desirable, narrow definitions may be reasonable. Such a simplified view of reasonability is not justified in the face of the recent uses and abuses of such a convention. The relevant question is: What does it mean to be reasonable? Again, courts and legislators may have their own definitions of "reasonable," but they may not be at all useful for the functioning of the term in debate. To state that a court has been unable to define the word "reasonable" only means that in that particular context it was difficult, not that such a finding should be accepted as proof that we cannot come up with a workable concept of reasonability for our purposes. Of course, someone who has listened to a few debates concerning "reasonability" may find great sympathy with such a court the concept has taken on very diverse forms, to say the least, in its varied uses. On one extreme, teams have argued that as long as they were not "absurd" in defining their terms, they were reasonable, and some teams have argued that because their definition exists they are some how reasonable. On the other end of the definitional continuum, some interpretations of reasonability have been very restrictive. Some teams have argued that only the best definition is reasonable--that it shows little reason to accept an inferior definition. Clearly there has been quite a bit of disagreement as to what is entailed by a "reasonable" definition. Some debate critics have responded to this dispute by throwing up their arms and calling for the abandonment of the concept of reasonability as a topicality convention altogether. While it is very easy to respect and have empathy with such sentiment, it seems prudent to attempt a less radical solution by constructing a more useful and practical convention of reasonability without ""piffing" the concept in its entirety. I would suggest two steps in construction of a workable reasonability convention. First, we must agree upon what makes a definition acceptable. Keeping in mind the goal of high quality debating, two criteria necessary for an acceptable definition should be (1) Does it tend toward focusing debates on timely and relevant policy advocacy? and (2) does it allow the negative sufficient ability to be prepared in both analysis and research? A definition which failed to meet either of these goals would not seem to be an acceptable approach to interpretation. Secondly, the actual debate over topicality should center on the question of whether or not the affirmative interpretation actually did meet both of these criteria. In this sense, the "threshold" for when a definition became "reasonable" would be raised well above the currently less rigorous approaches, yet not overly restrict the affirmative initial and presumptive right to define its terms. The burden would be on the affirmative to explain, wren challenged, the implications of its definition, thus reviving the concept of an affirmative burden on topicality, without making the burden prohibitively heavy by making them refute any conceivable negative alternative definition. In an effort to supplement the convention of "reasonability," "standards" of definition have been offered which the affirmative should meet in order to be considered reasonable. These standards could potentially be used to discern whether or not the affirmative approach met the above two criteria.

.

Increasing investment is the core of the topic – the aff can’t be reasonable without mandating that they actually invest. As their plan text is written, there are tons of non-topical ways they could create shipping lanes (repairing existing icebreakers, borrowing them, etc.).

## Shipping Lanes

### 1NC F/L

#### Recovery is on track- unemployment decreasing and spending rising

Rushe 6/26/12

Dominic Rushe is the US business correspondent for the Guardian, OECD: US economy is improving but recovery is far from complete- Report suggests economy has 'gained momentum' but says long-term unemployment and income equality must be solved, The Guardian, Tuesday 26 June 2012 11.21 EDT

The US recovery remains on track but "fissures" have begun to appear in the world's largest economy as it struggles with record long-term unemployment and income inequality, according to a report by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. The international economist group is more bullish on the economy than Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke, who recently downgraded his forecasts for the US economy. And the report may prove useful ammunition for the Obama administration as the economy emerges as the key battleground of the 2012 election. The OECD offered support to president Barack Obama's plans to cut tax breaks for America's wealthiest, a plan known as the 'Buffett rule' after its championing by billionaire investor Warren Buffett. Growth in the US will remain moderate this year but the OECD report concludes that America's economic recovery has "gained momentum". Consumer and business spending have risen and unemployment, though still high at 8.2%, has fallen nearly two percentage points from its peak in 2009.

Just because shipping lanes help the economy doesn’t mean econ collapse without them – their ev is from 05, their econ collapse scenario is empirically denied.

And, their shipping lanes k2 the econ ev relies on the assumption that all shipping ceases, which would obviously not happen absent the plan; at worst, shipping would remain inefficient.

#### Studies in multiple fields prove that economic growth will inevitably collapse due to diminishing returns from complexity and environmental stress – Infinite growth is LITERALLY IMPOSSIBLE – allowing breakdowns in complexity is the only option

Mackenzie 8(Deborah, BBC Correspondant. Quotes Joe Tainter Phd - professor in the Department of Environment and Society at Utah State University and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies, and professor of anthropology at the University of New Mexico. And cites Yaneer Bar-Yam, head of the New England Complex Systems Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Charles Perrow of Yale University, a leading authority on industrial accidents and disasters. 4/5/2008 “Are WE doomed?” Ebsco)

DOOMSDAY. The end of civilisation. Literature and film abound with tales of plague, famine and wars which ravage the planet, leaving a few survivors scratching out a primitive existence amid the ruins. Every civilisation in history has collapsed, after all. Why should ours be any different? Doomsday scenarios typically feature a knockout blow: a massive asteroid, all-out nuclear war or a catastrophic pandemic . Yet there is another chilling possibility: what if the very nature of civilisation means that ours, like all the others, is destined to collapse sooner or later? A few researchers have been making such claims for years. Disturbingly, recent insights from fields such as complexity theory suggest that they are right. It appears that once a society develops beyond a certain level of complexity it becomes increasingly fragile. Eventually, it reaches a point at which even a relatively minor disturbance can bring everything crashing down. Some say we have already reached this point, and that it is time to start thinking about how we might manage collapse. Others insist it is not yet too late, and that we can - we must - act now to keep disaster at bay. History is not on our side. Think of Sumeria, of ancient Egypt and of the Maya. In his 2005 best-seller , Jared Diamond of the University of California, Los Angeles, blamed environmental mismanagement for the fall of the Mayan civilisation and others, and warned that we might be heading the same way unless we choose to stop destroying our environmental support systems. Lester Brown of the Earth Policy Institute in Washington DC agrees. He has that governments must pay more attention to vital environmental resources. "It's not about saving the planet. It's about saving civilisation," he says. Others think our problems run deeper. From the moment our ancestors started to settle down and build cities, we have had to find solutions to the problems that success brings. "For the past 10,000 years, problem solving has produced increasing complexity in human societies," says Joseph Tainter, an archaeologist at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies . If crops fail because rain is patchy, build irrigation canals. When they silt up, organise dredging crews. When the bigger crop yields lead to a bigger population, build more canals. When there are too many for ad hoc repairs, install a management bureaucracy, and tax people to pay for it. When they complain, invent tax inspectors and a system to record the sums paid. That much the Sumerians knew. Diminishing returns There is, however, a price to be paid. Every extra layer of organisation imposes a cost in terms of energy, the common currency of all human efforts, from building canals to educating scribes. And increasing complexity, Tainter realised, produces diminishing returns. The extra food produced by each extra hour of labour - or joule of energy invested per farmed hectare - diminishes as that investment mounts. We see the same thing today in a declining number of patents per dollar invested in research as that research investment mounts. This law of diminishing returns appears everywhere, Tainter says. To keep growing, societies must keep solving problems as they arise. Yet each problem solved means more complexity. Success generates a larger population, more kinds of specialists, more resources to manage, more information to juggle - and, ultimately, less bang for your buck. Eventually, says Tainter, the point is reached when all the energy and resources available to a society are required just to maintain its existing level of complexity. Then when the climate changes or barbarians invade, overstretched institutions break down and civil order collapses. What emerges is a less complex society, which is organised on a smaller scale or has been taken over by another group. Tainter sees diminishing returns as the underlying reason for the collapse of all ancient civilisations, from the early Chinese dynasties to the Greek city state of Mycenae. These civilisations relied on the solar energy that could be harvested from food, fodder and wood, and from wind. When this had been stretched to its limit, things fell apart. Western industrial civilisation has become bigger and more complex than any before it by exploiting new sources of energy, notably coal and oil, but these are limited. There are increasing signs of diminishing returns: the energy required to get is mounting and although global is still increasing, constant innovation is needed to cope with environmental degradation and evolving - the yield boosts per unit of investment in innovation are shrinking. "Since problems are inevitable," Tainter warns, "this process is in part ineluctable." Is Tainter right? An analysis of complex systems has led Yaneer Bar-Yam, head of the New England Complex Systems Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to the same conclusion that Tainter reached from studying history. Social organisations become steadily more complex as they are required to deal both with environmental problems and with challenges from neighbouring societies that are also becoming more complex, Bar-Yam says. This eventually leads to a fundamental shift in the way the society is organised. "To run a hierarchy, managers cannot be less complex than the system they are managing," Bar-Yam says. As complexity increases, societies add ever more layers of management but, ultimately in a hierarchy, one individual has to try and get their head around the whole thing, and this starts to become impossible. At that point, hierarchies give way to networks in which decision-making is distributed. We are at this point. This shift to decentralised networks has led to a widespread belief that modern society is more resilient than the old hierarchical systems. "I don't foresee a collapse in society because of increased complexity," says futurologist and industry consultant Ray Hammond. "Our strength is in our highly distributed decision making." This, he says, makes modern western societies more resilient than those like the old Soviet Union, in which decision making was centralised. Things are not that simple, says Thomas Homer-Dixon, a political scientist at the University of Toronto, Canada, and author of the 2006 book The Upside of Down . "Initially, increasing connectedness and diversity helps: if one village has a crop failure, it can get food from another village that didn't The very nature of civilisation may make its demise inevitable, says Debora MacKenzie New Scientist April 5, 2008 As connections increase, though, networked systems become increasingly tightly coupled. This means the impacts of failures can propagate: the more closely those two villages come to depend on each other, the more both will suffer if either has a problem. "Complexity leads to higher vulnerability in some ways," says Bar-Yam. "This is not widely understood." The reason is that as networks become ever tighter, they start to transmit shocks rather than absorb them. "The intricate networks that tightly connect us together - and move people, materials, information, money and energy - amplify and transmit any shock," says Homer-Dixon. "A financial crisis, a terrorist attack or a disease outbreak has almost instant destabilising effects, from one side of the world to the other." For instance, in 2003 large areas of North America and Europe suffered when apparently insignificant nodes of their respective electricity grids failed. And this year China suffered a similar blackout after heavy snow hit power lines. Tightly coupled networks like these create the potential for propagating failure across many critical industries, says Charles Perrow of Yale University, a leading authority on industrial accidents and disasters. Credit crunch Perrow says interconnectedness in the global production system has now reached the point where "a breakdown anywhere increasingly means a breakdown everywhere". This is especially true of the world's financial systems, where the coupling is very tight. "Now we have a debt crisis with the biggest player, the US. The consequences could be enormous." "A networked society behaves like a multicellular organism," says Bar-Yam, "random damage is like lopping a chunk off a sheep." Whether or not the sheep survives depends on which chunk is lost. And while we are pretty sure which chunks a sheep needs, it isn't clear - it may not even be predictable - which chunks of our densely networked civilisation are critical, until it's too late. "When we do the analysis, almost any part is critical if you lose enough of it," says Bar-Yam. "Now that we can ask questions of such systems in more sophisticated ways, we are discovering that they can be very vulnerable. That means civilisation is very vulnerable." So what can we do? "The key issue is really whether we respond successfully in the face of the new vulnerabilities we have," Bar-Yam says. That means making sure our "global sheep" does not get injured in the first place - something that may be hard to guarantee as the climate shifts and the world's fuel and mineral resources dwindle. Scientists in other fields are also warning that complex systems are prone to collapse. Similar ideas have emerged from the study of natural cycles in ecosystems, based on the work of ecologist Buzz Holling, now at the University of Florida, Gainesville. Some ecosystems become steadily more complex over time: as a patch of new forest grows and matures, specialist species may replace more generalist species, biomass builds up and the trees, beetles and bacteria form an increasingly rigid and ever more tightly coupled system. "It becomes an extremely efficient system for remaining constant in the face of the normal range of conditions," says Homer-Dixon. But unusual conditions - an insect outbreak, fire or drought - can trigger dramatic changes as the impact cascades through the system. The end result may be the collapse of the old ecosystem and its replacement by a newer, simpler one. Globalisation is resulting in the same tight coupling and fine-tuning of our systems to a narrow range of conditions, he says. Redundancy is being systematically eliminated as companies maximise profits. Some products are produced by only one factory worldwide. Financially, it makes sense, as mass production maximises efficiency. Unfortunately, it also minimises resilience. "We need to be more selective about increasing the connectivity and speed of our critical systems," says Homer-Dixon. "Sometimes the costs outweigh the benefits." Is there an alternative? Could we heed these warnings and start carefully climbing back down the complexity ladder? Tainter knows of only one civilisation that managed to decline but not fall. "After the Byzantine empire lost most of its territory to the Arabs, they simplified their entire society. Cities mostly disappeared, literacy and numeracy declined, their economy became less monetised, and they switched from professional army to peasant militia." Pulling off the same trick will be harder for our more advanced society. Nevertheless, Homer-Dixon thinks we should be taking action now. "First, we need to encourage distributed and decentralised production of vital goods like energy and food," he says. "Second, we need to remember that slack isn't always waste. A manufacturing company with a large inventory may lose some money on warehousing, but it can keep running even if its suppliers are temporarily out of action." The electricity industry in the US has already started identifying hubs in the grid with no redundancy available and is putting some back in, Homer-Dixon points out. Governments could encourage other sectors to follow suit. The trouble is that in a world of fierce competition, private companies will always increase efficiency unless governments subsidise inefficiency in the public interest. Homer-Dixon doubts we can stave off collapse completely. He points to what he calls "tectonic" stresses that will shove our rigid, tightly coupled system outside the range of conditions it is becoming ever more finely tuned to. These include population growth, the growing divide between the world's rich and poor, financial instability, weapons proliferation, disappearing forests and fisheries, and climate change. In imposing new complex solutions we will run into the problem of diminishing returns - just as we are running out of cheap and plentiful energy. "This is the fundamental challenge humankind faces. We need to allow for the healthy breakdown in natural function in our societies in a way that doesn't produce catastrophic collapse, but instead leads to healthy renewal," Homer-Dixon says. This is what happens in forests, which are a patchy mix of old growth and newer areas created by disease or fire. If the ecosystem in one patch collapses, it is recolonised and renewed by younger forest elsewhere. We must allow partial breakdown here and there, followed by renewal, he says, rather than trying so hard to avert breakdown by increasing complexity that any resulting crisis is actually worse. Lester Brown thinks we are fast running out of time. "The world can no longer afford to waste a day. We need a Great Mobilisation, as we had in wartime," he says. "There has been tremendous progress in just the past few years. For the first time, I am starting to see how an alternative economy might emerge. But it's now a race between tipping points - which will come first, a switch to sustainable technology, or collapse?" Tainter is not convinced that even new technology will save civilisation in the long run. "I sometimes think of this as a 'faith-based' approach to the future," he says. Even a society reinvigorated by cheap new energy sources will eventually face the problem of diminishing returns once more. Innovation itself might be subject to diminishing returns, or perhaps absolute limits. Studies of the way by Luis Bettencourt of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, support this idea. His team's work suggests that an ever-faster rate of innovation is required to keep cities growing and prevent stagnation or collapse, and in the long run this cannot be sustainable.

#### Growth Risks Human Survival - A Steady-State Economy is the Only Chance

Attarian ’03

(John Attarian, Social Contract Journal Staff Writer, Spring 2003, Herman Daly's Ecological Economics - An Introductory Note, http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1303/article\_1138.shtml)

Daly maintains that the economy is a subset of an ecosystem which is finite, non-growing, and materially closed (i.e., no matter enters or leaves it) and that it uses the environment as a source for material inputs and as a sink for wastes. Unfortunately, he argues, the economy has become so large relative to the ecosystem that human activity is undermining the ecosystem's ability to support human life. Resource finitude and the entropy law make perpetual economic growth impossible. Accordingly, we must abandon growth (quantitative enlargement) in favor of development (qualitative improvement), and of a "steady-state economy" which can be sustained long-term (though not forever), in which population and capital stocks are constant, and throughput (the flow of low-entropy matter and energy which is taken from the environment and transformed into high-entropy wastes) is minimized.

#### Economic growth is the root cause of emissions

Rosales 8

(JON ROSALES Department of Environmental Studies, St. Lawrence University, Economic Growth, Climate Change, Biodiversity Loss: Distributive Justice for the Global North and South, June 2008, http://s3.amazonaws.com/files.posterous.com/forestpolicy/eDT7wRWCEQSEHeQ5LLs3zInpcaF1Z3S95N7s0Zy6YApP92BwU5HO1rL6R07Q/Rosales\_2008.\_Growth\_vs\_Biodiv.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJFZAE65UYRT34AOQ&Expires=1342790692&Signature=pYzFramyxntf9DPVkc3uKIoRlps%3D)

The atmospheric space for safe levels of GHG emissions and the ecological space for socially beneficial economic growth have been outstripped. Long-term ecological and economic carrying capacities have been overshot, development options are cut off, and economic growth is no longer an option for all people on the planet. If the north does not abide by its ethical obligations to accept responsibility and to act first, as expressed in principles such as the polluter pays, ability to pay, and common but differentiated responsibilities, the south’s participation in global environmental protection is less likely. Similarly, if countries act according to national interests alone, the economic growth impasse cannot be resolved. The most effective resolution is to provide room for development for the south while capping economic growth. With increased knowledge of ecological thresholds, and in the context of an ethical framework, per capita GHG emissions can be used to determine levels of responsibility and, by association, to identify under- and overgrown economies. In other words, per capita emissions can be adjusted as a scientifically sound metric and used to determine whether economic growth is an appropriate goal for particular countries. Climate-change negotiations that developed the Kyoto Protocol were fantastic efforts to guard economic growth, especially for the high-polluting economies of the north. Many government delegations recognized the threat an unstable climate poses to economic growth, particularly for agriculture and coastal human settlements. They rallied to develop a treaty that addresses climate change, albeit insufficiently, yet develops new sectors for economic growth such as GHG credits, technology exchange, and financial trade. In addition, those countries that resisted the protocol most fervently—the United States and until recently Australia—did so on grounds that it would dampen economic growth even with the development of these new sectors. Ironically, guarding economic growth is often the key consideration in climate-change negotiations even though economic growth is the main driver of climate change. This imperative may be changing. Negotiations by the UNFCCC are increasingly focusing on science-based decision making (IISD 2007), and scientists are increasingly exposing the impact of economic growth on the environment (Canadell et al. 2007; IPCC 2007b). In addition the Working Group III of the IPCC is building on the ethical foundations of the UN and the UNFCCC and increasingly working on the ethical dimensions of climate change (see Fisher et al. 2007). Efforts to mitigate climate change that began at the Earth Summit in 1992, and earlier with the establishment of the IPCC in 1988, are moving political leaders toward the realization that economic growth is the main driver of climate change and biodiversity loss. The politics of scarcity may yet be tempered by the politics of science and equity.

### 2NC Econ High ext

Ext. 1NC Rushe 12 – The economy is experiencing recovery now, as proven by the OECD’s report that concludes that consumer spending is up while unemployment rates are falling.

#### No double-dip coming- Europe’s progress, leading indicators and lower gas prices buffer the economy

Koesterich 6/22/12

Russ is a frequent contributor to financial news media and can regularly be seen on CNBC, Fox Business News and Bloomberg TV. He is the author of two books. Russ is also regularly quoted in print media including the Wall Street Journal, USA Today, MSNBC.com, and MarketWatch. Russ earned a BA in history from Brandeis University, a JD from Boston College and an MBA in capital markets from Columbia University, Don't Expect A Double Dip ... This Year,

<http://seekingalpha.com/article/678771-don-t-expect-a-double-dip-this-year>

For the third summer in a row, the US economy is slowing and Europe is teetering on the brink of an abyss. While renewed fears of a US double dip are reasonable, I believe the United States will not see a recession in 2012 for the following four reasons: 1.) Europe is struggling, but it’s slowly stumbling toward a solution. It’s true that Europe is likely to continue to be a chronic source of stress for the global economy. That said, we have seen some tentative signs of progress in recent weeks. The results of the second Greek election mitigated the risk of a near-term Greek default or exit. And while Spain has yet to articulate a definitive plan to recapitalize its banking system, at least it has acknowledged there’s a problem. 2.) Apparent US weakness can partly be attributed to statistical quirks. The weakness of recent US economic data can be attributed to other factors besides an economic slowdown. Take May’s disappointing non-farm payroll report, for instance. The collapse of the construction industry likely is wreaking havoc with how the jobs data is adjusted for seasonal variations, meaning that winter was probably not as strong as the data indicated, nor spring as weak as the headline numbers suggested. 3.) Leading indicators remain stable. While most economic measures continue to be sluggish, leading economic indicators are still signaling positive growth. Our favorite metric, the Chicago Fed National Activity Index, is stuck at zero, close to its average level over the past few years. This is certainly not indicative of a robust economy, but it’s still consistent with US growth in the 2% range or even slightly better. Other leading indicators also confirm a continuation of the expansion. Lost in din of last month’s non-farm payroll report debacle was the May ISM manufacturing report. While weak, it was by no means a disaster. In particular, the new orders component, which tends to lead economic activity, rose to its best level since the spring of 2011. 4.) Gasoline prices are down. Finally, oil prices have come down. While the consumer still faces a number of headwinds, cheaper gasoline prices are providing some relief for stretched middle-income consumers.

#### Tax Collections show the economy isn’t slowing

Adler 7/18/12

<http://www.businessinsider.com/federal-tax-revenues-economy-not-slowing-2012-7> Lee Adler is the editor and publisher of The Wall Street Examiner Jul. 18, 2012, 9:10 AM One Crucial Indicator Shows The US Economy Isn't Slowing At All

The mainstream consensus has lately been that the economy is slowing. Based on my tracking of federal revenues in real time, I suspect that that view is incorrect. Instead the recent data reflects only normal oscillations within the ongoing slow growth trend. Total federal tax collections, including withholding taxes, are available to us with just a one day lag in the US Treasury’s Daily Treasury Statements, which makes them an excellent analytical resource. Withholding is mostly for compensation, and thus it is a good measure of the economy’s strength. However, it is extremely volatile day to day so I rely more on a monthly moving average of the 10 day total collections, comparing that with the prior year. Smoothing sacrifices a bit of timeliness to get a clearer picture of the trend without losing too much of the edge that the daily data provides. Unfortunately, I have found even the 10 day total data too noisy for meaningful comparison so I’ve had to resort to additional smoothing. As a result the smoothed data is a little slow, so I also look at raw month to date data after mid month.

### 2NC Collapse Inev ext

Extend 1NC Macenzie 8 – economic collapse is inevitable due to the increasing complexity of our civilization, which is destroying our environment. The more we problem solve (and hurt the environment) the more complex society becomes, meaning that it requires more (financial) energy to take care of, leading to an inevitable collapse. [the law of diminishing returns].

#### Coming Resource depletion makes collapse inevitable

Alier et al 09 (Joan Martinez Alier ICTA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Francois Schneider, Associate Researcher at ICTA, Autonomous University of Barcelona. Francine Mestrum University of Ghent, Stefan Giljum Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI), Socially Sustainable Economic Degrowth Editors: Leida Rijnhout and Thomas Schauer Proceedings of a workshop in the European Parliament on April 16, 2009 upon invitation by Bart Staes MEP and The Greens / European Free Alliance, http://www.clubofrome.at/archive/pdf/degrowth\_brussels.pdf)

Due to growth of world population, continued high levels of consumption in the developed world combined with the rapid industrialisation of countries such as China and India, worldwide demand on natural resources and related pressures on the environment are steadily increasing. Renewable resources, and the ecological services they provide, are at great risk of degradation and collapse (see, for example, the latest “Global Environmental Outlook” by UNEP, 2007). The depletion of these ecological assets is serious, as human society is embedded within the biosphere and depends on ecosystems for a steady supply of the basic requirements for life: food, water, energy, fibres, waste sinks, and other services. At the same time, extraction of many non-renewable resources is already reaching or near a peak; some authors even describe today’s situation as “peak everything” (Heinberg, 2007). In 1980, around 40 billion tons of raw materials and energy carriers were extracted. In 2005 this number has risen to around 58 billion tons. Global extraction of natural resources for production and consumption of products and services thus increased by 45% in the past 25 years (Behrens et al., 2007). In the same time period the performance of the global economy increased by 110%. Relative de-coupling of economic growth and resource use could thereby be achieved; however, the relative gains were overcompensated by the overall growth of the economic system. Scenarios illustrate that the global resource extraction could reach 100 billion tons in 2030, if no policy measures are implemented aiming at an absolute reduction of resource use (see Figure 1**)**. In the light of these dramatic scenarios on increased use of raw materials and energy, the question arises, whether such growth will be possible or whether the world economy will face ecological limits to growth. In principal, two types of limits to growth regarding resource use and resource availability can be distinguished. First, non-renewable resources, in particular fossil fuels and metal ores, are finite. As the most recent „World Energy Outlook“ of the International Energy Agency points out, an energy revolution is necessary, in order to change human’s use of energy towards environmental, economic and social sustainability (IEA, 2008). Several scenarios exist for “peak-oil”, i.e. the reaching of the level of maximum global oil extraction. All scenarios illustrate that peak oil will be reached between 2015 and 2050. If no affordable alternatives to oil can be developed in time, these developments will have severe negative economic impacts, for example in the construction and transport industries, as well as in the chemical or pharmaceutical sectors. Apart from oil, peak extractions have already been reached or will be reached in the very near future for a number of metal ores such as zinc, silver, platinum or tantalum. This suggests severe impacts on industries such as the electronic industries, which depend on these rare metals for producing for example LCD screens and other electronic devices. Also the development of environmental technologies can be influenced by resource scarcity. One example is the new generation of solar cells, which requires indium and gallium, also highly scarce, for producing semiconducting materials. Resource scarcity thus also limits the potentials of these new technologies to contribute to a cleaner energy system. It might therefore prove difficult to substitute a large share of current energy use by new technologies at the current level of energy consumption. An absolute reduction (or de-growth) of natural resources could help increasing the importance of these new technologies.

#### Economic collapse is inevitable if growth is maintained

Alier et al 09 (Joan Martinez Alier ICTA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Francois Schneider, Associate Researcher at ICTA, Autonomous University of Barcelona. Francine Mestrum University of Ghent, Stefan Giljum Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI), Socially Sustainable Economic Degrowth Editors: Leida Rijnhout and Thomas Schauer Proceedings of a workshop in the European Parliament on April 16, 2009 upon invitation by Bart Staes MEP and The Greens / European Free Alliance, http://www.clubofrome.at/archive/pdf/degrowth\_brussels.pdf)

1.8 If we do not [bring] global economic activity into line with the capacity of our ecosystems, and [redistribute] wealth and income globally so that they meet our societal needs, the result will be a process of involuntary and uncontrolled economic decline or collapse, with potentially serious social impacts, especially for the most disadvantaged. (...) 2. We therefore call for a paradigm shift from the general and unlimited pursuit of economic growth to a concept of “right-sizing” the global and national economies. (...) 3. The paradigm shift involves degrowth in wealthy parts of the world. (...) 3.3 The objectives of degrowth are to meet basic human needs and ensure a high quality of life, while reducing the ecological impact of the global economy to a sustainable level, equitably distributed between nations. This will not be achieved by involuntary economic contraction. Sci., 23(3), 369-376

#### Physical limits prevent infinite growth

Brown et al. 11 (James H. Brown, James H. Brown (jhbrown@unm.edu) is a distinguished professor at the University of New Mexico and external faculty of the Santa Fe Institute. William R. Burnside, William C. Dunn, Jordan G. Okie, and Wenyun Zuo are PhD candidates in the Department of Biology at the University of New Mexico. Ana D. Davidson is a postdoctoral researcher at the National University of Mexico and adjunct professor of biology at the University of New Mexico. John P. DeLong is a postdoctoral associate at Yale University in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. Marcus J. Hamilton is an archaeological anthropologist at the University of New Mexico and the Santa Fe Institute. Norman Mercado-Silva is a research specialist with the School of Natural Resources and the Environment, Arizona Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, at the University of Arizona, in Tucson. Jeffrey C. Nekola is an ecologist at the University of New Mexico. William H. Woodruff is a scientist at Los Alamos National Laboratory and external faculty at the Santa Fe Institute. Jan 2011, Energetic Limits to Economic Growth, <http://www.aibs.org/bioscience-press-releases/resources/Davidson.pdf>)

We are by no means the first to write about the limits to economic growth and the fundamental energetic constraints that stem directly from the laws of thermodynamics and the principles of ecology. Beginning with Malthus (1798), both ecologists and economists have called attention to the essential dependence of economies on natural resources and have pointed out that near-exponential growth of the human population and economy cannot be sustained indefinitely in a world of finite resources (e.g., Soddy 1922, Odum 1971, Daly 1977, Georgescu-Roegen 1977, Cleveland et al. 1984, Costanza and Daly 1992, Hall et al. 2001, Arrow et al. 2004, Stern 2004, Nel and van Zyl 2010). Some ecological economists and systems ecologists have made Figure 4. Current and projected global energy consumption based on alternative scenarios of population growth (2006, 2025, and 2050) and standard of living (equivalent to contemporary Uganda, China, and United States). Dashed line is total global terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP), 75 terawatts (Haberl et al. 2007). Data sources and calculation methods can be found in supplemental online materials (www.jstor.org/ stable/10.1525/bio.2011.61.1.7). Figure 5. Sources of energy currently consumed by the global human economy. Total annual consumption is approximately 15.9 terawatts (TW; 1 terawatt = 10 12 watts), of which about 85% comes from fossil fuels, 6% from nuclear energy, and the remaining 9% from solar, hydro, wind, and other renewable sources (BP 2009, REN21 2009).Articles www.biosciencemag.org January 2011 / Vol. 61 No. 1 • BioScience 25 Articles similar theoretical arguments for energetic constraints on economic systems (e.g., Odum 1971, Hall et al. 1986). However, these perspectives have not been incorporated into mainstream economic theory, practice, or pedagogy (e.g., Barro and Sala-i-Martin 2003, Mankiw 2006), and they have been downplayed in consensus statements by influential ecologists (e.g., Lubchenco et al. 1991, Palmer et al. 2004, ESA 2009) and sustainability scientists (e.g., NRC 1999, Kates et al. 2001, ICS 2002, Kates and Parris 2003, Parris and Kates 2003, Clark 2007). Our explicitly macroecological and metabolic approach uses new data and analyses to provide quantitative, mechanistic, and practically relevant insights into energetic limits on economic growth. We hope the evidence and interpretations presented here will call the attention of scientists, policymakers, world leaders, and the public to the central but largely underappreciated role of energetic limits to economic growth.

#### Economic collapse inevitable- debt

Smith ’11

(Ron Smith, Baltimore Sun Staff Writer, September 15 2011, “Ron Smith: The only question now is how and when the global economy will collapse”, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-09-15/news/bs-ed-smith-debt-20110915\_1\_debt-ceiling-global-economy-political-elite)

Predicting how the future will play out is a fool's game, but I make the above prediction with great confidence. If you haven't yet grasped it, government [debt](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-09-15/news/bs-ed-smith-debt-20110915_1_debt-ceiling-global-economy-political-elite) in the U.S., Europe and Japan has grown to such heights that it is literally unrepayable. Description: http://articles.baltimoresun.com/images/pixel.gif Description: http://articles.baltimoresun.com/images/pixel.gif People play with the figures all the time, but we can be confident that the actual federal debt alone is nearly $17 trillion. The current system is kaput, and the [financial](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-09-15/news/bs-ed-smith-debt-20110915_1_debt-ceiling-global-economy-political-elite) and political elite are aware of this, but they prefer financial sleight-of-hand to revolution, which is certainly understandable. However, as we shall see pretty quickly, the game is over, and the only question now is how the collapse of the global economy will take place. All of the political theater over raising the debt ceiling limit can't conceal the fact that the economy in question was built on perpetual debt, created out of thin air. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke is wedded to the fantastical notion that creating vast new debt won't affect [interest rates](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-09-15/news/bs-ed-smith-debt-20110915_1_debt-ceiling-global-economy-political-elite). He's promised to keep them at their current levels for two more years, but will the markets allow that to happen? Even should the answer be yes, it does nothing to help Joe and Jill Sixpack as massive unemployment will persist and living standards will continue to fall. All the presidential exhortations to "pass this [jobs] bill now" are hollow words. Job creation is a byproduct of a growing economy, not the cause of one. The wagon cannot pull the horses. The debt ceiling fuss was carried out under the fictive notion that our elected representatives were desperately trying to save our bacon. The way it was represented in the major media was as a clash of disparate political beliefs, with tea party Congress critters cast as the penurious villains gumming up the finely tuned machine of governance. So-called mainstream Republicans were certainly willing to do their usual surrender to the Democrats, but elections have consequences, and the 2010 election of dozens of GOP representatives resulted in a sizable bloc willing to buck the system that had gotten us into this mess in the first place. In the end, though, what was delivered was just another delay of game's end. The nation's elites want the system that has allowed them to loot the economy to continue as long as possible. After all, the financial oligarchy that bought the people that ostensibly represent all of us is still flying high, though I'm certain the members of it are well aware that time is short and they'd better grab all they can before the final whistle blows. Perhaps the biggest story of the week was the release of the Census Bureau's annual snapshot of living standards, which showed that median household [earnings](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-09-15/news/bs-ed-smith-debt-20110915_1_debt-ceiling-global-economy-political-elite) have fallen to 1996 levels and that poverty levels are up to more than 15 percent of the population. This is despite 2010 showing a growth of 3 percent in the GDP.

#### Economic collapse inevitable – no economic freedom, debt, inflation

Greenlee ’12

(Jeff Greenlee, Freedom Fighter Journal Staff Writer, March 13 2012, “ECONOMIC COLLAPSE INEVITABLE DUE TO AMERICAN RULING CLASS”, http://ronbosoldier.blogspot.com/2012/03/economic-collapse-inevitable-due-to.html)

In the three years and two months that have now defined the Obama presidency, the United States of America is not the same country with unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness guaranteed by the Constitution. ObamaCare, the government takeover of major corporations (Chrysler and General Motors), executive power run amok with 42 unaccountable czars and over three-fourths not confirmed by the Senate, the horrific Dodd-Frank bill that takes over the financial sector, and the Federal Reserve-Gone-Wild and its secret unaccountable shenanigans now threatening to collapse the entire system are but a few examples of the extreme partisanship now ruling our country against its laws and against the will of the majority of people. Nearly all the legislation was passed on strict party lines. The dramatic abuse of lawless power which inspired Tea Parties and a Republican landslide to take back the House in the midterm 2010 elections has been neutered to a whimper as the Obama administration has usurped power and made Congress nearly meaningless. What we are witnessing is a rare bit of sincerity from the neo-Marxist, proto-dictator actually doing what he said five days before the 2008 election when he told us he was going to "fundamentally transform" the United States of America. This is one campaign promise we did not want to see happen, even if half of us didn't know it at the time. The Wall Street Journal assessed Obama's worldview and disdain for free markets: Economic freedom is morally superior to socialism not only because freedom is an intrinsic good, but also because the free market is the most effective means of harmonizing individual self-interest with collective good. A market economy rewards neither self-indulgence nor self-sacrifice but the production of goods and services that other people value. Libertarians believe in freedom, self-reliance, and limited government. As long as you are following the laws of the land, not harming anyone else, and respecting others' property and rights, you should be free to make your own choices. They understand what happens when those fundamentals are breached -- rights get abused, freedoms get destroyed, and governments get too much power. Unfortunately, when that happens, governments collapse under their own weight. It will happen very soon in the United States, because we have crossed the point of no return. The massive debt of the United States is now unstoppable. We need to voluntarily cut the federal budget by 50% immediately, or the monetary system will explode. You cannot borrow your way out of debt any more than you can drink your way sober, and we now borrow 43 cents out of every dollar the federal government spends. Since no politicians in Washington, D.C. have the will to stop it, or even slow it down, the Federal Reserve will take the easy way out and devalue the currency. There is no other way. Sooner or later we will be bringing in wheelbarrows full of dollars to buy our groceries. When Greece collapses, the dominoes will start falling.

### 2NC Hurts Enviro ext

Extend 1NC Attarian ’03 – the economy’s become so big in relation to the ecosystem that infinite growth is a) impossible and b) dangerous to pursue because of the threat it poses to the maintenance of human life. We must transition to a steady-state economy.

#### Growth causes a laundry list of environmental destruction

Daly ’10

(Herman Daly, An ecological economist and professor at the School of Public Policy of University of Maryland, College Park in the United States, August 15, 2010, “Opportunity Cost of Growth”, http://steadystate.org/opportunity-cost-of-growth/)

However, increasing takeover of the ecosystem is the necessary consequence of the physical growth of the macroeconomy. This displacement is really a transformation of ecosystem into economy in physical terms. Trees are physically transformed into tables and chairs; soil, rain, and sunlight are physically transformed into crops and food and then into people; petroleum is physically transformed into motive force, plastics, and carbon dioxide. Thanks to the law of conservation of matter-energy, the more matter-energy appropriated by the economy, the less remains to build the structures and power the services of the ecosystem that sustains the economy. Thanks to the entropy law, the more dissipative structures (human bodies and artifacts) in the economy, the greater the rates of depletion and pollution of the remaining ecosystem required to maintain the growing populations of these structures against the eroding force of entropy. These are basic facts about how the world works. They could plausibly be ignored by economists only as long as the macroeconomy was tiny relative to the ecosystem, and the encroachment of the former into the latter did not constitute a noticeable opportunity cost. But now we live in a full world, no longer in an empty world – that is, in a finite ecosystem filled up largely by the economy. Remaining ecosystem services and natural capital are now scarce and their further reduction constitutes a significant opportunity cost of growth. The new economic question is: Are the extra benefits of physically transforming more of the ecosystem into the economy worth the extra opportunity cost of the ecosystem services lost in the transformation? Has the macroeconomy reached, or surpassed, its optimal physical scale relative to its containing and sustaining ecosystem? Is the economy now too big for the ecosystem from the point of view of maximum human welfare? Or from the point of view of all living species and the functioning of the biosphere as we know it? If these questions about the opportunity costs of growth sound too abstract, think of the following concrete examples: wholesale extinction of species, climate change, peak oil, water scarcity, topsoil loss, deforestation, risks from more powerful technologies, a huge military to maintain access to world resources, and an increase in the risk of wars over resources, etc.

#### Sustained growth leads to catastrophe

Cairns 09

(John Cairns, Jr. Department of Biological Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Tribal to Global: Can Humankind Make the Transition in Time?, Asian J. Exp. Sci., Vol. 23, No. 3, 2009, <http://www.johncairns.net/Papers/Tribal%20to%20Global.pdf>)

Anyone with even a modest understanding of exponential growth should be aware that a continual growth rate of merely 1% per year of human population will have catastrophic consequences on a finite planet —shockingly, no robust, global discussion is occurring on this issue. As a result, no significant efforts are being made to eliminate this problem. If present trends continue, rapid climate change will add additional catastrophic consequences. Global discussion has begun at least on climate change, although effective countermeasures have not yet been implemented. Persuasive evidence indicates that the global human population has already exceeded Earth’s carrying capacity (i.e., ecological overshoot). Approximately onehalf of Earth’s human population is either starving or malnourished, is lacking adequate370 medical care, is poorly housed, and is lacking safe drinking water, while approximately 1% of the global human population enjoys unprecedented wealth. Does humankind wish to have even more people at a subsistence level or would a much smaller human population enjoying a quality life within the planet’s carrying capacity be a superior objective? Some aid from developed countries to developing countries has not produced desirable results, and some subsidies within both developed and developing countries have produced perverse results. The biospheric life support system, which has maintained a climate favorable to the genus Homo for approximately two million years, has already been severely, possibly irreversibly, damaged by present human numbers and lifestyles. In addition, many species, which collectively comprise the planet’s life support system, have been driven to extinction. One species, Homo sapiens, has been too “successful,” and this high energy/ technological success threatens civilization.

### 2NC GW ext

Extend 1NC Rosales 8 – economic growth drives climate change because it allows humans to expand the carrying capacity and sustains states that release emissions.

#### Economic crisis is the best way to cut emissions – empirics prove

Alier et al 09

(Joan Martinez Alier ICTA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Francois Schneider, Associate Researcher at ICTA, Autonomous University of Barcelona. Francine Mestrum University of Ghent, Stefan Giljum Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI), Socially Sustainable Economic Degrowth Editors: Leida Rijnhout and Thomas Schauer Proceedings of a workshop in the European Parliament on April 16, 2009 upon invitation by Bart Staes MEP and The Greens / European Free Alliance, http://www.clubofrome.at/archive/pdf/degrowth\_brussels.pdf)

The world peak in carbon dioxide emissions has been reached because of the economic crisis. Emissions are now (finally?) going down. This might become a unique historical chance. In May 2008, it was announced that carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere was at a record level of 387 parts per million (ppm) according to the measurements at the Mauna Loa observatory in Hawaii. This meant an increase of 30 per cent above the level of 300 ppm that Svante Arrhenius used in his article of 1895, when he pointed out that burning coal would increase the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and would increase temperatures. Between 1970 and 2000, the concentration had increased by 1.5 ppm per year, since 2001 and until 2007 growth in concentration reached 2.1 ppm. In early 2008, the world was still travelling at all speed towards 450 ppm to be reached in about thirty years. The great increase in the prices of oil, gas, and other commodities until July 2008, and the economic crisis in the second half of 2008 and in 2009, stopped economic growth and changed the trend in carbon dioxide emissions. From the point of view of climate change, the economic crisis should certainly be welcome.

#### Recession proves degrowth is the best way to cut emissions and environmental degradation

Schneider et al 10

(François Schneider is an industrial ecologist and degrowth researcher. He worked on the development of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodology at the INSA engineering school in Lyon and at the CML in Holland. Giorgos Kallis, Joan Martinez-Alier Crisis or opportunity? Economic degrowth for social equity and ecological sustainability. Introduction to this special issue, Spainhttp://degrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Schneider\_Crisis-or-opportunity.pdf)

The Paris Conference took place when the economic crisis of 2008–09 was yet about to start (although our contributors were asked to revise their articles and reﬂect on the implications of the crisis). As Kallis, Martinez-Alier and Norgaard [43] argue, the crisis is a result of unsustainable growth. Irresponsible borrowing and the cultivation of fake expectations in the housing market were not accidents, but a systemic failure of a system struggling to keep up with growth rates that could not be sustained by its biophysical base (the ‘‘real’’ economy). Furthermore, the crisis marks a failure of ‘‘economicism’’, the doctrine of mainstream, neo-classical economics which refuses to accept any material reality beyond the beliefs of investors and consumers. The collapse of the ﬁctitious economy had real impacts. Because of the economic crisis, and despite growth in India, China, Indonesia, the world trend towards increased emissions of carbon dioxide (3 per cent growth in emissions per year up to 2007) has been stopped, and there has been a reduction of three per cent[44]. This is too little compared with the IPCC recommended reduction of over 60 per cent but it shows that more than the Kyoto commitment and more than technological changes, it is economic degrowth that achieves greenhouse gas emission reductions. Similarly, because of the decrease in external demand for exports, the rate of deforestation in the Brazil Amazon has decreased to ‘‘only’’ 7000 sq. km. in the year 2008 [45]. Economic degrowth can be good for the environment. It helped to reach goals that 20 years of talking about sustainable development did not achieve. Nevertheless, scientists and politicians have not been considering degrowth as an option. The IPCC projections [46] (or the Stern report [47]) never considered that the peak of carbon dioxide emissions could be reached in 2007. Will this be just one peak in cordillera of peaks leading to climate disaster? The consequences of economic degrowth have been absolute reductions of emissions and extractions, and perhaps to some extent avoidance of outsourcing/delocalization of environmental impacts. In a context of economic degrowth, increased efﬁciency in resource use is not accompanied by a rebound effect [48]. The rate of substitution of renewable energies (wind, photovoltaic) for other energies may increase more easily when the overall use of energy is stable or declines. It is likely that the reduction of natural resource extraction and CO2 emissions is larger than the degrowth rate of the economy because in times of economic shrinking it seems (at least in the present crisis) that material and energy intensive industries are heavily affected, leading to an actual decoupling. For instance, the cement output has decreased faster than the overall economy in many countries; in Spain in the ﬁrst four months of 2009, cement demand dropped by about 45% [49]. If well targeted ‘‘green Keynesianism’’ rather than ‘‘public works Keynesianism’’ and ‘‘car subsidy Keynesianism’’ had been applied, the dematerialization of the economy could have advanced further in the economic crisis of 2008–09.

#### Growth causes global warming

Science Daily ’12

(Science Daily, 5/1/12, Global Warming: New Research Blames Economic Growth, http://www.opednews.com/populum/linkframe.php?linkid=149763)

It's a message no one wants to hear: To slow down global warming, we'll either have to put the brakes on economic growth or transform the way the world's economies work. That's the implication of an innovative University of Michigan study examining the most likely causes of global warming. The study, conducted by José Tapia Granados and Edward Ionides of U-M and Óscar Carpintero of the University of Valladolid in Spain, was published online in the peer-reviewed journal *Environmental Science and Policy.* It is the first analysis to use measurable levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide to assess fluctuations in the gas, rather than estimates of CO2 emissions, which are less accurate. "If 'business as usual' conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2," said Tapia Granados, who is a researcher at the U-M Institute for Social Research. For the study, the researchers assessed the impact of four factors on short-run, year-to-year changes in atmospheric concentrations of CO2, widely considered the most important greenhouse gas. Those factors included two natural phenomena believed to affect CO2levels -- volcanic eruptions and the El Niño Southern oscillation -- and also world population and the world economy, as measured by worldwide gross domestic product. Tapia Granados and colleagues found no observable relation between short-term growth of world population and CO2concentrations, and they show that incidents of volcanic activity coincide with global recessions, which may confound any slight volcanic effects on CO2. With El Niño outside of human control, economic activity is the sole modifiable factor. In years of above-trend world GDP, from 1958 to 2010, the researchers found greater increases in CO2 concentrations. For every $10 trillion in U.S. dollars that the world GDP deviates from trend, CO2 levels deviate from trend about half a part per million, they found. Preindustrial concentrations are estimated to be 200-300 parts per million. To break the economic habits contributing to a rise in atmospheric CO2 levels and global warming, Tapia Granados says that societies around the world would need to make enormous changes. "Since the mid 1970s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth," Tapia Granados said. "One solution that has promise is a carbon tax levied on any activity producing CO2in order to create incentives to reduce emissions. The money would be returned to individuals so the tax would not burden the population at large. "What our study makes clear is that climate change will soon have a serious impact on the world, and the time is growing short to take corrective action."

#### Growth can’t solve emission output- only preventing growth solves

Simms, policy director of nef (the new economics foundation), 2/1/12 (Andrew, “Clinging to economic growth suffocates the imagination”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/feb/01/limits-to-economic-growth)

For one thing, the model used by the MIT scientists didn't make precise "predictions", but projected what was likely to happen if certain trends continued, allowing for "adjustable assumptions" of resource use. Their real finding was not that collapse was likely to occur by a particular year, but that population and the global economy would contract rapidly after peaking. The only circumstances under which some kind of stabilisation, rather than collapse, was achieved, was constraining population and the scale of the economy. Models and reality are not the same thing. But – strikingly given the relatively crude computer modelling available at the time – the MIT projections have proved remarkably accurate. Today they can be checked against decades of actual data. Population, industrial output, pollution and food consumption all track the lines in the model. 1There is a popular view that economic growth can be saved by efficiency measures, recycling and technological substitution, such as nuclear and renewable energy replacing fossil fuels. Yet the model allowed even for these variables, and crashed under the pressure of growth just the same. I took part in a debate last week with Michael Jacobs who was an environmental adviser to Gordon Brown's Treasury. My job was to respond to a lecture he gave at University College London called The Green Moment? The Crises of Capitalism and the Response of Progressive Politics. Jacobs's critique, which several on the left share, is that pointing out the non-viability of economic growth (at least at the global aggregate level and where rich countries are concerned) is a mistaken article of faith in the green movement. His argument is that, firstly, opposing growth is bad politics, it's bad spin for the green movement that "puts people off". Secondly he argues that low growth is compatible, even in rich countries, with environmental constraints. The first point is immaterial if the limits are scientifically real. It is an inconvenient reality that cannot be spun away. The second point is a claim that must be backed with evidence, it cannot simply be asserted. And while I have yet to see any figures to illustrate how growth in rich countries can, in perpetuity, be compatible with environmental limits, several assessments point to the opposite conclusion. The Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research at Manchester University found that to prevent dangerous global warming, economic growth in rich countries would not be possible. With colleagues at the New Economics Foundation, I came to a similar conclusion. Jacobs quotes, admiringly, the work of Tim Jackson on "prosperity without growth" with the former government advisory body the Sustainable Development Commission. Yet Jackson's work too, as the name suggests, foresees a future without growth. Work by the Stockholm Resilience Centre on environmental "planetary boundaries" shows several have already been transgressed, requiring large absolute reductions of consumption in rich countries. One thing is sure: advocates of growth need to be able to show not only that environmental impact can be cancelled out by efficiency and resource substitution, but that deep, absolute reductions in resource use can be achieved simultaneously, and that such gains can be made year, after year, after year, ad infinitum. A key insight by the original MIT group was the problem of time lag. Environmental problems became obvious and were acted on too late. Damage became locked in. This is the moment we are now living through. Nasa climate scientist James Hansen recently pointed out that if the rich world had started reducing emissions as recently as 2007, the annual reductions necessary would have been 3%. Wait until next year and the figure rises to 6%, wait further until 2020 and the annual target leaps to a staggering 15% reduction per year.

## Naval Power

### 1NC F/L

#### US and Russia are cooperating in the Arctic now

Stars and Stripes 12 (Seth Robson, “US uses Russian icebreaker to get fuel supplies to Antarctica”, 2/12/12, <http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/japan/us-uses-russian-icebreaker-to-get-fuel-supplies-to-antarctica-1.168398>)

McMURDO STATION, Antarctica — The U.S. is relying on a Russian icebreaker to deliver supplies to its main base in Antarctica thanks to continued problems with its own shrinking fleet of the cold-water vessels. Late last month, the Russian icebreaker Vladimir Ignatyuk cut a channel through Antarctic sea ice so that a Military Sealift Command tanker — the Maersk Peary — could deliver millions of gallons of fuel to McMurdo Station. A second MSC ship, the Green Wave, also is bound for McMurdo and will need the Russian icebreaker’s help to deliver supplies and equipment that will sustain the station through the harsh Antarctic winter. The job of cutting supply channels through the ice has traditionally fallen to the U.S. Navy and Coast Guard. However, the military’s inaction on updating its fleet has led to an increased reliance on foreign vessels. The U.S. has only one operational icebreaker, the Coast Guard Cutter Healy, which has been busy escorting a Russian-flagged tanker through the iced-over waters in the Bering Sea to supply Nome, Alaska. The Coast Guard owns two other icebreakers, but the Polar Sea is being decommissioned, and the Polar Star is being refitted at a cost of $62.8 million, according to Lt. Eric Quigley, a capabilities manager with the Coast Guard. The shortage of U.S. icebreakers, which cost $1 billion each to build, contrasts with a large Russian fleet that comprises more than two dozen of the massive ships, including several nuclear-powered vessels. Russian icebreakers are in high demand to escort commercial shipping along the Northern Sea Route that follows Russia’s northern coast through Arctic waters between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, according to Cmdr. Steve Wittrock, a Coast Guard budget officer. The route is open for only two months each year, and moving sea ice means ships risk being trapped. However, the route is far shorter than traditional sea lanes connecting Europe and Asia, he said

#### The U.S. military will need more than icebreakers to maintain dominance in the Arctic

The Guardian 11(Suzanne Golberg – U.S. environment correspondent, “Prepare for Arctic struggle as climate changes, US navy warned”, 3/10/11, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/mar/10/arctic-struggle-climate-change>)

"The US military as a whole has lost most of its competence in cold-weather operations for Arctic weather," the report, National Security Implications of Climate Change for US Naval Forces, warned. "In the immediate term, the navy should begin Arctic training and the marine corps should also establish a cold weather training programme." The report warned that America was currently unprepared to defend its interests in the Arctic. Current submarine sytems would be challenged to operate in the Arctic, the report warned. In addition, the coastguard has just three ice breakers, and these are old and obsolete. It went on to call on the navy to develop an Arctic observer and research service, with remote sensing equipment such as satellites and drones. "Even the most moderate predicted trends in climate change will present new national security challenges for the US navy, marine corps, and coastguard," said Frank Bowman, a retired US navy admiral and co-chair of the committee that produced the report. "Naval forces need to monitor more closely and start preparing now for projected challenges climate change will present in the future," Bowman said.

#### Borgerson’s wrong; scenarios for conflict in the arctic are the result of misinterpreted signals

ISN 11 (International Relations and Security Network, “Colliding Geopolitics and the Arctic”, 12/8/11, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Security-Watch/Articles/Detail/?ots783=4888caa0-b3db-1461-98b9-e20e7b9c13d4&lng=en&id=134823>)

Borgerson’s highly geopolitical tale is illustrative of a common narrative about the Arctic. It invariably stresses climate change, increasing competition for resources, and the potential for conflict. Last week’s discussion of critical geopolitics , however, should remind us that this narrative is far from the only one that can tell us about the Arctic today. Today’s second article, “Have you heard the one about the disappearing ice? Recasting Arctic Geopolitics,” challenges this conventional narrative. Far from accepting it as an inevitable reflection of global warming or climate change, it argues that the prospect of military conflict in the Arctic is largely a manufactured one. According to the authors, this orthodox construction of Arctic geopolitics has two main elements, neither of which are legitimate – 1) the construction of Arctic space in general as open, indeterminate and therefore dangerous, and 2) the political construction of Arctic space in the neo-realist terms of structural anarchy and territorial competition associated with a ‘great game.’ Together these two groups of representational choices conspire to misread Arctic geography – and the recent events of Arctic history. In particular, they contribute to an almost complete misunderstanding of the 2007 Russian Polar expedition as a geopolitically motivated Arctic resource grab, instead of a routine scientific endeavor that was only retroactively (and self-consciously) exploited by Moscow. To begin with, the authors argue, the Arctic is represented as a region of new ‘openness’, which signifies indeterminacy, which then signifies danger. “Melting ice,” they write, “is correlated with enhanced accessibility,” and this new accessibility is correlated with the use of the Arctic for hostile purposes. In addition to hostility from traditional states, the authors take Borgerson to task for warning us about Arctic-based illegal immigration and terrorism, to include a scenario in which a future Arctic oil infrastructure becomes a target for terrorist attacks that could undermine North American energy security. “Arctic openness,” argue Dittmer et al “is central to the performance of Arctic geopolitics, enabling sabre-rattling by the five Arctic Ocean coastal states.” All of this, they remind us, ignores the reality in much of the Arctic – e.g., that the movement of goods and persons remains prohibitively expensive for most actors and that actual military combat there is almost unimaginable (as Russian strategic analyst Pavel Baev pointed out at the time). The second representational move that has become characteristic of orthodox geopolitical portrayals of the Arctic is the idea of it – in general, but in the case of Arctic governance regimes in particular – as weak, frail and vulnerable. In conjunction with the idea of ‘openness,’ this promotes a geopolitics of the Arctic understood as a territorial scramble under conditions of international ‘anarchy’—very much a proverbial ‘great game’. For Dittmer et al, Borgerson’s article is typical of accounts that exaggerate the ‘anarchic’ character of the Arctic by misrepresenting (and underestimating) the strength of international institutions and agreements in the region. In addition to seriously mischaracterizing the workings of UNCLOS, Borgerson, as already noted, describes the Arctic Council as ‘emasculated’ by its inability to address military issues and therefore unable to set ‘ground rules’ for the region. Yet this implicitly assumes that the region has a militarized future rather than providing evidence of the greater likelihood of that future. Indeed, the authors argue, empirical indications that such a future is likely are few and generally ambiguous. The Arctic Council, they suggest, is a vehicle for greater cooperation, peace and security in the Arctic, and not a liability that threatens its future. This skewed representational climate is most typified by its misreading of the Russian ‘flag-planting’ expedition of 2007. According to Pavel Baev, Moscow was barely even aware of the expedition in advance. Its depiction, therefore, as the opening move in an Arctic ‘great game’ was little more than bald political opportunism by “Putin’s spin masters” who immediately realized how well it might suit “the ‘Putin project’ of consolidating Russian State authority on the basis of a supposedly threatening international environment.” Nevertheless, the expedition was widely interpreted in the West as “prima facie evidence of Russian realpolitik” in trying to annex the Arctic. Instead of attributing the above expedition to “some sovereign geopolitical master-logic,” argue Dittmer et al, Arctic geographies should instead provide “a more complex picture that highlights how the expedition was improvised, with its supposed geopolitical meaning and significance emerging afterwards.” Borgerson and his fellow travelers, in other words, draw a dubious straight line from the “realistically irreversible” melting of polar ice to an inevitable military-political conflict for the region’s resources. There are, argue Dittmer and co, alternatives to this type of lockstep geopolitical determinism.

#### The U.S. shouldn’t jump to ‘overdoing’ military presence in the arctic

Atlantic Council 09 (James Joyner – PhD in political science and former management analyst at the Defense Information Systems Agency, “Arctic Thaw Brings NATO Security Risks”, 1/29/09, <http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/arctic-thaw-brings-nato-security-risks>)

An Arctic thaw will open up sea routes and competition for lucrative energy reserves in a multinational scramble sure to pose new security threats, NATO's chief said Thursday. NATO commanders and lawmakers meeting in Iceland's capital said a military presence in the region will eventually be needed as standoffs between powerful nations unfold. "I would be the last one to expect military conflict — but there will be a military presence," NATO Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer told delegates. "It should be a military presence that is not overdone, and there is a need for political cooperation and economic cooperation." The NATO chief said negotiations involving Russia, NATO and other nations are the key to preventing a future conflict. De Hoop Scheffer is expected to meet Russian Deputy Prime Minister Sergei Ivanov next week to discuss such issues.

#### A multilat approach solves better

Borgerson 08 (Dr. Scott - Senior fellow at the Institute for Global Maritime Studies, “Arctic Meltdown”, Foreign Affairs, 3/1/08, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63222/scott-g-borgerson/arctic-meltdown>)

This bilateral arrangement could eventually be expanded to include other Arctic countries, especially Russia. The United States and Russia, as an extension of the proposed Arctic seaway management corporation, could develop traffic-separation schemes through the Bering Strait and further invest in the responsible development of safe shipping along the Northern Sea Route. Eventually, a pan-Arctic corporation could coordinate the safe, secure, and efficient movement of vessels across the Arctic. Japan, which is vitally dependent on the Strait of Malacca for the overwhelming majority of its energy supplies, would be a natural investor in such a project since it has an interest in limiting the risk of a disruption in its oil supply.

### 2NC Coop W/Russia

Extend 1NC Stars and Stripes 12 – Russia has assisted the U.S. in escorting icebreakers. This proves Arctic tensions between the U.S. and Russia are lower than the aff implies.

#### Russia’s icebreakers have helped us for years

Seattle Times 07 (Sandi Doughton, “Aging fleet slows U.S. in Arctic "chess game"”, 9/20/07, http://www.fertikola.com/articles/The%20Seattle%20Times\_%20Aging%20fleet%20slows%20U.S.%20in%20Arctic%20\_chess%20game\_.pdf)

The Coast Guard calls the old icebreakers "operationally challenged." Borgerson puts it more bluntly. "They're geriatric. Moribund," he said. "It's just like a car. You can't drive a car for 300,000 miles ... and expect it's going to be in great condition." The National Science Foundation, the icebreakers' main "client," took control of their budgets a few years ago. In 2006, the foundation temporarily hired a Russian icebreaker to open the route to McMurdo Station in Antarctica.

### 2NC No Conflict

#### Arctic conflict is unlikely – not a source of major tension

CNN Money 12 (Steve Hargreaves -, “U.S. missing out on Arctic land grab”, 7/18/12, <http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/18/news/economy/Arctic-land-grab/index.htm>)

Canada and Russia claim the passages are part of their inland waterways, subject to the rules, restrictions, surveillance and possible imposition of hefty transit fees by the host country. Russian President Vladimir Putin has said the Northern Sea Route could one day rival the Suez Canal in terms of ship traffic. The Suez generates $5 billion a year in revenue for Egypt. Much has been made of these Arctic disputes, as well as what appears to be a military build-up in the region. In 2008, shortly after planting a Russian flag on the bottom of the ocean at the North Pole, Russia conducted long-rage strategic bomber flights over the Arctic -- the first such exercises since the end of the Cold War, according to the CRS report. Meanwhile Canada has constructed a cold-weather training base in its Arctic territory, and ordered the construction of six ice-capable ships to patrol the Northwest Passage. Yet despite these moves, most analyst say a military confrontation in the region is unlikely. Four of the five Arctic states with competing claims are NATO members. And if the United States and Russia were able to survive 40-plus years of Cold War antagonism, it's unlikely they'd go to war over shipping fees or drilling rights.

## Arctic Science

There’s no internal link between crop yields and disease.

### 1NC F/L

#### Climate change research in the Antarctic happening now

Stars and Stripes 12 (Seth Robson, “Antarctic research could change lives around the world”, 2/5/12, http://www.stripes.com/news/antarctic-research-could-change-lives-around-the-world-1.167784)

MCMURDO STATION, Antarctica — Climate change research that the U.S. military is supporting in Antarctica will likely impact the lives of billions and might even affect servicemembers’ careers. About 125 U.S. military personnel are on the ice this summer providing logistical support to scientists investigating subjects as diverse as astronomy, physics, biology, geology, oceanography and glaciology. In terms of global impact, few fields of research are as important as efforts to understand climate change and what’s learned about the phenomenon in Antarctica will help policy makers determine U.S. energy and foreign policy for decades. If pundits are right, and conflicts arise over resources made scarce by a warming earth, the research could have a bearing on future deployments. National Science Foundation representative in Antarctica George Blaisdell said: “The vast majority of research that goes on down here is answering components of the questions: Is climate change happening? How is it happening and on what kind of timetable?” Antarctica has a central role to play in the climate of the planet, said Chuck Kennicutt, president of the multi-national Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research. “It is a very exciting time for research in the polar regions,” he said. “It is things people read about in newspapers every day.” Ninety percent of the world’s fresh water is bound up in Antarctic ice sheets, Kennicutt said. “The polar ice is the planet’s thermostat,” he said. “There is a lot of interest in trying to understand if the ice sheets are stable and whether they are increasing or decreasing in mass and how that will play out over the next century.” One of the biggest research programs going on in Antarctica is a study of the Pine Island Glacier, which drains a major part of West Antarctica and is moving at 10 feet a day. Glaciers in other part of the world move a few inches per year, Blaisdell said. Members of the 109th Airlift Wing have been flying long missions to the isolated glacier in support of the research, which has been slowed by poor weather this season, he said. Scientists are drilling miles beneath the Antarctic ice sheets to obtain samples of ancient ice that they can examine to find out about past climate change, according to Jeff Severinghaus, 52, a professor from the Scripps Institute of Oceanography in San Diego, who has been helping collect ice core samples in West Antarctica this season. “The ice down there is 62,000 years old,” he said. “A lot of snow falls each year there so the yearly layers at that depth are 2 cm thick and we can see climate events that happen each year. What we are hoping to learn from this ice core is how the natural system will respond in coming centuries to human caused global warming.”

#### Adaptation strats are being developed and implemented now

Stutz 09 (Bruce, former editor-in-chief of *Natural History*, “Adaptation Emerges as Key

Part of Any Climate Change Plan”, 5/26/09, http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2156)

In the world’s sub-tropics, most models predict that wet regions will become wetter and dry regions drier, but there’s little agreement on how these trends will affect regional annual rainfall patterns and growing seasons. And it’s these that determine crop productivity. Farmers have always had to adapt to changing weather patterns. Climate change will exacerbate the uncertainties, both in the short and longterm. The key to coping will be to make farming as resilient as possible. Researchers in Ethiopia, for example, found that many farmers had already recognized that temperature and precipitation changes were affecting their crops and altering the growing season. Once they were given access to technical support, credit, and information about future climate change, these farmers adjusted their agricultural practices. They changed crop varieties, adopted soil and water conservation measures, and changed planting and harvesting periods. For researchers at the Rockefeller Foundation, future “simultaneous changes in temperature, precipitation, CO2 fertilization, and pest/pathogen dynamics” will require breeding new crop varieties, especially for those crops that feed most of the world’s poor. The reserve of genetic material now in seed banks may not be enough from which to develop new drought-, temperature-, or flood-resistant crops, and the foundation is urging new efforts to increase the world’s genetic reserves of seed crops. Adaptation strategies are already underway to cope with changes in the world’s fresh water resources. In April, the European Union issued a dire warning about declining water resources. Temperatures in the Alps — “the water tower of Europe” — have increased 1.5°C (2.7°F) over the last 100 years, twice the global average. The glaciers are vanishing. At the same time, warming temperatures and drought have left southern Europe dry, with creeping desertification in Spain and Portugal. The EU is focusing on adaptation strategies aimed mainly at reducing demand through water conservation, introducing new methods of efficient irrigation, and reforming water pricing.

#### Warming not real - 30,000 scientists signed a petition saying warming is flat-out nonexistent - their data is skewed

**Bell 12** (Larry Bell, Prof at Univ of Houston, Sasakawa International Center for Space Architecture, 7/17/2012, "That Scientific Global Warming Consensus...Not!," Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2012/07/17/that-scientific-global-warming-consensus-not/2/)

Since 1998, more than 31,000 American scientists from diverse climate-related disciplines, including more than 9,000 with Ph.D.s, have signed a public petition announcing their belief that “…there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.” Included are atmospheric physicists, botanists, geologists, oceanographers, and meteorologists. So where did that famous “consensus” claim that “98% of all scientists believe in global warming” come from? It originated from an endlessly reported 2009 American Geophysical Union (AGU) survey consisting of an intentionally brief two-minute, two question online survey sent to 10,257 earth scientists by two researchers at the University of Illinois. Of the about 3.000 who responded, 82% answered “yes” to the second question, which like the first, most people I know would also have agreed with. Then of those, only a small subset, just 77 who had been successful in getting more than half of their papers recently accepted by peer-reviewed climate science journals, were considered in their survey statistic. That “98% all scientists” referred to a laughably puny number of 75 of those 77 who answered “yes”. That anything-but-scientific survey asked two questions. The first: “When compared with pre-1800s levels, do you think that mean global temperatures have generally risen, fallen, or remained relatively constant?” Few would be expected to dispute this…the planet began thawing out of the “Little Ice Age” in the middle 19th century, predating the Industrial Revolution. (That was the coldest period since the last real Ice Age ended roughly 10,000 years ago.) The second question asked: “Do you think human activity is a significant contributing factor in changing mean global temperatures?” So what constitutes “significant”? Does “changing” include both cooling and warming… and for both “better” and “worse”? And which contributions…does this include land use changes, such as agriculture and deforestation?

#### No good scientific link between climate change and disease

Sherwood, Keith, and Craig Idso et al 2011 (Craig, PhD in geography @Arizona State, M.S. in Agronomy from U Nebraska) The Effects of Climate Change on Infectious Diseases http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N40/EDIT.php

In an Opinion article published in a recent issue of Trends in Ecology and Evolution, Rhor et al. (2011) state that "the notion that climate change will generally increase human and wildlife diseases has garnered considerable public attention, but remains controversial and seems inconsistent with the expectation that climate change will also cause parasite extinctions." Therefore, they decided to review the subject in some detail to see what the bulk of the scientific studies that have addressed the topic have concluded on this contentious matter. In describing the nature of their review, the eight scientists say they highlighted frontiers in climate change-infectious disease research by "reviewing knowledge gaps that make this controversy difficult to resolve." And in doing so, they came to the conclusion that "understanding climate change-disease interactions is a formidable problem because of its interdisciplinary nature and the complexities of hosts, parasites and their interactions with the multiple factors that can co-vary with climate change." As a result of this enlightenment, they go on to state that "effective forecasting of climate-change impacts on disease will require filling the many gaps in data, theory and scale," adding that their findings suggest that "forecasts of climate-change impacts on disease can be improved by more interdisciplinary collaborations, better linking of data and models, addressing confounding variables and context dependencies, and applying metabolic theory to host-parasite systems with consideration of community-level interactions and functional traits." In terms of the implications of their findings, the eight U.S. researchers -- who hail from the University of South Florida, Princeton University, the University of Colorado, the University of California at Santa Cruz, Cornell University and the Pennsylvania State University -- write that "although there should be genuine concern regarding future disease risk for humans and wildlife, we discourage alarmist claims and encourage rigor, open-mindedness and broad thinking regarding this crucial and interdisciplinary global issue." We agree. For far too long, we have heard only one catastrophic scare story after another in regard to how humanity will suffer from climate-change-induced impacts on various vector-borne diseases and other maladies, nearly all of which have been based on studies lacking the "rigor, open-mindedness and broad thinking" that Rhor et al. state is essential for evaluating all of the many interrelated aspects of the subject. We can only hope their plea will be taken to heart by all researchers working in this most important field of endeavor.

#### Cuts in crop yields due to warming are negligible

Gillis (Environmental specialist staff writer for the New York Times) 2011 (Justin, “Global Warming Reduces Expected Yields of Harvests in Some Countries, Study Says,” May 5, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/06/science/earth/06warming.html>) //CL

Some countries saw small gains from the temperature increases, however. And in all countries, the extra carbon dioxide that humans are pumping into the air acted as a fertilizer that encouraged plant growth, offsetting some of the losses from rising temperatures caused by that same greenhouse gas. Consequently, the study’s authors found that when the gains in some countries were weighed against the losses in others, the overall global effect of climate change has been small so far: losses of a few percentage points for wheat and corn from what they would have been without climate change. The overall impact on production of rice and soybeans was negligible, with gains in some regions entirely offsetting losses in others.

#### Warming promotes peace – history and multiple studies prove

Liang Chen et al Karin A.F. Zonnevelda, b, Gerard J.M. Versteegh Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universität Bremen October 2011, Short term climate variability during “Roman Classical Period” in the eastern Mediterranean http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277379111003039

To date, there have been a lot of studies devoted to understand the relationship between climate change and ancient civilization. Most of these investigations suggest that cooling and drying climate might have played a significant role in the collapse of cultures as it might have caused crop failure and the enhancement of the occurrence of cultural conflicts caused by adverse environmentalconditions (e.g. [Hodell et al., 1995], [Binford et al., 1997], [Haug et al., 2003] and [Yancheva et al., 2007]). Our study shows that the investigated part of the Roman Period might have been warmer than the 20th century, and it is interesting to note that our study interval is more or less the same as the “Pax Romana” (27 BC to 180 AD), which denotes a long period of relative peace (Gibbon and Saunders, 2001). We speculate that the booming period “Pax Romana” might be related to this relatively warm and stable situation. Interestingly, wars between Roman and neighboring cultures became more frequent along with the subsequent Roman decline after 200 AD, shortly after our records show a declining temperature trend. It would therefore be extremely interesting to dedicate more studies to this time interval to be able to pinpoint the relationship between climate and civilization.

#### Climate change does not cause mass extinction – empirically proven

Sherwood, Keith, and Craig Idso et al 2011 (Craig, PhD in geography @Arizona State, M.S. in Agronomy from U Nebraska) Thoughts on Species' Abilities to Survive Rapid Climate Change http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N47/EDIT.php

In an Opinion article published in Global Change Biology, Hof et al. (2011) note that recent and projected climate change is assumed to be exceptional because of its supposedly unprecedented velocity; and they say that this view has fuelled the prediction that CO2-induced global warming "will have unprecedented effects on earth's biodiversity," primarily by driving many species to extinction, because of the widespread belief that earth's plants and animals are unable to migrate poleward in latitude or upward in altitude fast enough to avoid that deadly consequence, as well as the assumption that current climate change simply outpaces evolutionary adaptation. But are these assumptions correct? The four biological researchers address this important question in stages. First, they present evidence demonstrating that "recent geophysical studies challenge the view that the speed of current and projected climate change is unprecedented." In one such study, for example, they report that Steffensen et al. (2008) showed that temperatures in Greenland warmed by up to 4°C/year near the end of the last glacial period. And they state that this change and other rapid climate changes during the Quaternary (the last 2.5 million years) did not cause a noticeable level of broad-scale, continent-wide extinctions of species. Instead, they state that these rapid changes appeared to "primarily affect a few specific groups, mainly large mammals (Koch and Barnosky, 2006) and European trees (Svenning, 2003)," with the result that "few taxa became extinct during the Quaternary (Botkin et al., 2007)." So how were the bulk of earth's species able to survive what many today believe to be unsurvivable? Hof et al. speculate that "species may have used strategies other than shifting their geographical distributions or changing their genetic make-up." They note, for example, that "intraspecific variation in physiological, phenological, behavioral or morphological traits may have allowed species to cope with rapid climatic changes within their ranges (Davis and Shaw, 2001; Nussey et al., 2005; Skelly et al., 2007)," based on "preexisting genetic variation within and among different populations, which is an important prerequisite for adaptive responses," noting that "both intraspecific phenotypic variability and individual phenotypic plasticity may allow for rapid adaptation without actual microevolutionary changes." So do these observations imply that all is well with the planet's many and varied life forms? Not necessarily, because, as Hof et al. continue, "habitat destruction and fragmentation, not climate change per se, are usually identified as the most severe threat to biodiversity (Pimm and Raven, 2000; Stuart et al., 2004; Schipper et al., 2008)." And since Hof et al. conclude that "species are probably more resilient to climatic changes than anticipated in most model assessments of the effect of contemporary climate change on biodiversity," these several observations suggest to us that addressing habitat destruction and fragmentation, rather than climate change, should take center stage when it comes to striving to protect earth's biosphere, since the former more direct and obvious effects of mankind are more destructive, more imminent and more easily addressed than are the less direct, less obvious, less destructive, less imminent, and less easily addressed effects of the burning of fossil fuels.

### 2NC Not Real ext

#### Climate change is completely natural and the world is cooling – historical cycle, satellite data, ocean oscillation, and sunspots prove

Ferrara 12 (Peter Ferrara, Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute, General Counsel for the American Civil Rights Union, and Senior Fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, he served in the White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, and as Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under President George H.W. Bush, he is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, 5/31/12, “Sorry Global Warming Alarmists, The Earth Is Cooling” www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2012/05/31/sorry-global-warming-alarmists-the-earth-is-cooling/2/)

Check out the 20th century temperature record, and you will find that its up and down pattern does not follow the industrial revolution’s upward march of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2), which is the supposed central culprit for man caused global warming (and has been much, much higher in the past). It follows instead the up and down pattern of naturally caused climate cycles. For example, temperatures dropped steadily from the late 1940s to the late 1970s. The popular press was even talking about a coming ice age. Ice ages have cyclically occurred roughly every 10,000 years, with a new one actually due around now. In the late 1970s, the natural cycles turned warm and temperatures rose until the late 1990s, a trend that political and economic interests have tried to milk mercilessly to their advantage. The incorruptible satellite measured global atmospheric temperatures show less warming during this period than the heavily manipulated land surface temperatures. Central to these natural cycles is the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO). Every 25 to 30 years the oceans undergo a natural cycle where the colder water below churns to replace the warmer water at the surface, and that affects global temperatures by the fractions of a degree we have seen. The PDO was cold from the late 1940s to the late 1970s, and it was warm from the late 1970s to the late 1990s, similar to the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO). In 2000, the UN’s IPCC predicted that global temperatures would rise by 1 degree Celsius by 2010. Was that based on climate science, or political science to scare the public into accepting costly anti-industrial regulations and taxes? Don Easterbrook, Professor Emeritus of Geology at Western Washington University, knew the answer. He publicly predicted in 2000 that global temperatures would decline by 2010. He made that prediction because he knew the PDO had turned cold in 1999, something the political scientists at the UN’s IPCC did not know or did not think significant. Well, the results are in, and the winner is….Don Easterbrook. Easterbrook also spoke at the Heartland conference, with a presentation entitled “Are Forecasts of a 20-Year Cooling Trend Credible?” Watch that online and you will see how scientists are supposed to talk: cool, rational, logical analysis of the data, and full explanation of it. All I ever see from the global warming alarmists, by contrast, is political public relations, personal attacks, ad hominem arguments, and name calling, combined with admissions that they can’t defend their views in public debate. Easterbrook shows that by 2010 the 2000 prediction of the IPCC was wrong by well over a degree, and the gap was widening. That’s a big miss for a forecast just 10 years away, when the same folks expect us to take seriously their predictions for 100 years in the future. Howard Hayden, Professor of Physics Emeritus at the University of Connecticut showed in his presentation at the conference that based on the historical record a doubling of CO2 could be expected to produce a 2 degree C temperature increase. Such a doubling would take most of this century, and the temperature impact of increased concentrations of CO2 declines logarithmically. You can see Hayden’s presentation online as well. Because PDO cycles last 25 to 30 years, Easterbrook expects the cooling trend to continue for another 2 decades or so. Easterbrook, in fact, documents 40 such alternating periods of warming and cooling over the past 500 years, with similar data going back 15,000 years. He further expects the flipping of the ADO to add to the current downward trend. But that is not all. We are also currently experiencing a surprisingly long period with very low sunspot activity. That is associated in the earth’s history with even lower, colder temperatures. The pattern was seen during a period known as the Dalton Minimum from 1790 to 1830, which saw temperature readings decline by 2 degrees in a 20 year period, and the noted Year Without A Summer in 1816 (which may have had other contributing short term causes). Even worse was the period known as the Maunder Minimum from 1645 to 1715, which saw only about 50 sunspots during one 30 year period within the cycle, compared to a typical 40,000 to 50,000 sunspots during such periods in modern times. The Maunder Minimum coincided with the coldest part of the Little Ice Age, which the earth suffered from about 1350 to 1850. The Maunder Minimum saw sharply reduced agricultural output, and widespread human suffering, disease and premature death. Such impacts of the sun on the earth’s climate were discussed at the conference by astrophysicist and geoscientist Willie Soon, Nir J. Shaviv, of the Racah Institute of Physics in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Sebastian Luning, co-author with leading German environmentalist Fritz Vahrenholt of The Cold Sun. Easterbrook suggests that the outstanding question is only how cold this present cold cycle will get. Will it be modest like the cooling from the late 1940s to late 1970s? Or will the paucity of sunspots drive us all the way down to the Dalton Minimum, or even the Maunder Minimum? He says it is impossible to know now. But based on experience, he will probably know before the UN and its politicized IPCC.

#### Warming is not anthropogenic or a big deal – history, satellites, and IPCC’s falsified data prove

Arrak 11 (Arno Arrak, author of the book “What Warming?” and was a nuclear chemist on NASA's Apollo program, 12/1/11, “Arctic Warming Is Not Greenhouse Warming” Energy & Environment, Vol. 22, No. 8, Ebsco)

Present Arctic warming started at the turn of the twentieth century. Its probable cause is a change in the North Atlantic current system that directed warm water from the Gulf Stream into the Arctic Ocean. Prior to that there had been only slow cooling for two thousand years according to Kaufman et al. A foraminiferal core taken near Svalbard by Spielhagen et al. also shows the same long term cooling. Rapid warming of Greenland glaciers, polar bears in trouble, permafrost melting, the Northwest Passage becoming navigable etc. have been used as proofs that greenhouse warming is real. Since it is now clear that Arctic warming is not greenhouse warming these observations cannot be used as proof of greenhouse warming. It is therefore incumbent upon us to look at what other proofs remain of the existence of greenhouse warming. Most axiomatic is the claim that we are now living through a greenhouse warming period that started with a global temperature rise in the late seventies. After all, Hansen said so in his testimony to the Senate. But satellites which have been measuring global temperature for the last 31 years cannot even see this so-called late twentieth century warming. What global warming they do see is a short spurt that began with the super El Nino of 1998, raised temperature by a third of a degree in four years, and then stopped. Its origin was oceanic. And this satellite record is in accord with the observations of Ferenc Miskolczi on IR absorption by the atmosphere. A third of a degree may not sound like much but it is half of what is allotted to the entire twentieth century. It, and not the greenhouse effect, was responsible for the very warm first decade of our century. But there are ground-based temperature curves that do show warming in the eighties and nineties. These are simply cooked, as in falsified. It was done by systematically raising up the cool La Nina temperatures and leaving the warm El Nino peaks in place. This fake warming was then used to justify the establishment of the IPCC in 1988. According to satellites there has been no warming in the twentyfirst century either but thanks to the IPCC we still get major governmental efforts to “mitigate” a non-existent warming. The global warming extremists today are not just in charge of government policy but have also infiltrated and taken over control of our scientific organizations. Those who should be our scientific leaders, such as the Royal Society and the National Academies of Science, have all knuckled under to extremist propaganda and now support the global warming movement. As a scientist I repudiate such a mass dereliction of their mission to advance science. Last time the scientific elite espoused such wrong ideas was in the eighteenth century when phlogiston was king. They renamed it caloric to make it more palatable but it still would not fly and both imaginary concepts ended up in the dust bin of history. That is where the global warming doctrine belongs.

#### Their impacts are all empirically denied ---- past temperatures were substantially warmer than the present

**Idsos 7** (Sherwood, Research Physicist @ US Water Conservation laboratory, and Craig, President of Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global change and PhD in Geography, “Carbon Dioxide and Global Change: Separating Scientific Fact from Personal Opinion”, 6-6, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/hansen/HansenTestimonyCritique.pdf)

In an attempt to depict earth's current temperature as being extremely high and, therefore, extremely dangerous, Hansen focuses almost exclusively on a single point of the earth's surface in the Western Equatorial Pacific, for which he and others (Hansen et al., 2006) compared modern sea surface temperatures (SSTs) with paleo-SSTs that were derived by Medina-Elizade and Lea (2005) from the Mg/Ca ratios of shells of the surface-dwelling planktonic foraminifer Globigerinoides rubber that they obtained from an ocean sediment core. In doing so, they concluded that “this critical ocean region, and probably the planet as a whole [our italics], is approximately as warm now as at the Holocene maximum and within ~1°C of the maximum temperature of the past million years [our italics].” Is there any compelling reason to believe these claims of Hansen et al. about the entire planet? In a word, no, because there are a multitude of other single-point measurements that suggest something vastly different. Even in their own paper, Hansen et al. present data from the Indian Ocean that indicate, as best we can determine from their graph, that SSTs there were about 0.75°C warmer than they are currently some 125,000 years ago during the prior interglacial. Likewise, based on data obtained from the Vostok ice core in Antarctica, another of their graphs suggests that temperatures at that location some 125,000 years ago were about 1.8°C warmer than they are now; while data from two sites in the Eastern Equatorial Pacific indicate it was approximately 2.3 to 4.0°C warmer compared to the present at about that time. In fact, Petit et al.’s (1999) study of the Vostok ice core demonstrates that large periods of all four of the interglacials that preceded the Holocene were more than 2°C warmer than the peak warmth of the current interglacial. But we don’t have to go nearly so far back in time to demonstrate the non-uniqueness of current temperatures. Of the five SST records that Hansen et al. display, three of them indicate the mid-Holocene was also warmer than it is today. Indeed, it has been known for many years that the central portion of the current interglacial was much warmer than its latter stages have been. To cite just a few examples of pertinent work conducted in the 1970s and 80s – based on temperature reconstructions derived from studies of latitudinal displacements of terrestrial vegetation (Bernabo and Webb, 1977; Wijmstra, 1978; Davis et al., 1980; Ritchie et al., 1983; Overpeck, 1985) and vertical displacements of alpine plants (Kearney and Luckman, 1983) and mountain glaciers (Hope et al., 1976; Porter and Orombelli, 1985) – we note it was concluded by Webb et al. (1987) and the many COHMAP Members (1988) that mean annual temperatures in the Midwestern United States were about 2°C greater than those of the past few decades (Bartlein et al., 1984; Webb, 1985), that summer temperatures in Europe were 2°C warmer (Huntley and Prentice, 1988) – as they also were in New Guinea (Hope et al., 1976) – and that temperatures in the Alps were as much as 4°C warmer (Porter and Orombelli, 1985; Huntley and Prentice, 1988). Likewise, temperatures in the Russian Far East are reported to have been from 2°C (Velitchko and Klimanov, 1990) to as much as 4-6°C (Korotky et al., 1988) higher than they were in the 1970s and 80s; while the mean annual temperature of the Kuroshio Current between 22 and 35°N was 6°C warmer (Taira, 1975). Also, the southern boundary of the Pacific boreal region was positioned some 700 to 800 km north of its present location (Lutaenko, 1993). But we needn’t go back to even the mid-Holocene to encounter warmer-than-present temperatures, as the Medieval Warm Period, centered on about AD 1100, had lots of them. In fact, every single week since 1 Feb 2006, we have featured on our website (www.co2science.org) a different peer-reviewed scientific journal article that testifies to the existence of this several-centuries-long period of notable warmth, in a feature we call our Medieval Warm Period Record of the Week. Also, whenever it has been possible to make either a quantitative or qualitative comparison between the peak temperature of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and the peak temperature of the Current Warm Period (CWP), we have included those results in the appropriate quantitative or qualitative frequency distributions we have posted within this feature; and a quick perusal of these ever-growing databases (reproduced below as of 23 May 2007) indicates that, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the peak warmth of the Medieval Warm Period was significantly greater than the peak warmth of the Current Warm Period.

#### NASA has already collected satellite data that proves their feedback theory is wrong and warming is not a problem - heat can escape the atmosphere

Taylor 11 (James M. Taylor, senior fellow for environment policy at The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, 5/27/11, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism” http://news.yahoo.com/nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-global-warming-alarmism-192334971.html)

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth's atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-reviewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA's Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA's Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. "The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show," Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. "There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans." In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is "not much"). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA's ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted.

### 2NC Adapt Now ext

#### At-risk areas are planning now

Stutz 09 (Bruce, former editor-in-chief of *Natural History*, “Adaptation Emerges as Key

Part of Any Climate Change Plan”, 5/26/09, http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2156)

While scientists still debate predictions of sea level rise over the century due to climate change — with many studies predicting an increase of one to two meters — there is no doubt that rising seas have already begun affecting low-lying coastal regions. How humans adapt will depend not only upon regional geography, but regional development. The world’s large river deltas — the Mississippi, Nile, Rhine and Ganges — have been altered by development and agriculture, their tidal wetlands diminished and, with that, their resistance to flooding and erosion weakened, especially during storm surges. That is why in the Ganges-Brahmaputra delta in Bangladesh, efforts are underway to restore lost mangroves to keep storm surges from flooding agricultural land and human settlements, and to keep delta land from washing away. At the same time, Bangladesh is trying to restore its upland forests to prevent downstream erosion. Islands, too, will hope to adapt to rising seas by creating or restoring natural buffer zones. Things will be different, however, where coastal nature has already been lost to population growth and development. By 2030, some 60 percent of the world’s population will live in coastal cities that may be increasingly subject to flooding from storm surges. Complex and expensive solutions will be needed to protect not only homes and people, but sanitation, communication, and transportation infrastructures. New York City, where the land is only 5 to 16 feet above sea level, has engaged a consortium of city agencies and researchers from Columbia University’s Earth Institute to develop adaptation plans to deal with sea level rises that could easily reach 1 ½ feet by 2080, as well as with increased tidal and storm surges. City planners are modeling the risks and working with New York citizens' groups and city agencies to develop a coordinated approach to protecting vulnerable roads, tunnels, water supplies, transit, sewers, and water treatment plants. One firm has proposed a concrete tidal barrier that would stretch across the neck of lower New York Bay, similar to one that the Russian government has already commissioned to protect St. Petersburg from rising levels of the Baltic Sea.

#### More evidence [aware – taking steps to remedy]

Stutz 09 (Bruce, former editor-in-chief of *Natural History*, “Adaptation Emerges as Key

Part of Any Climate Change Plan”, 5/26/09, http://e360.yale.edu/content/feature.msp?id=2156)

River flooding can also contaminate water supplies. Gambia, for example, has undertaken a program along the Gambia River coastal floodplain to increase the number of improved pit latrines in school, health and community centers; to purchase fogging machines and sprayers for insect control; and to stockpile drugs and vaccines to deal with disease outbreaks. In Samoa, authorities are developing a program in which doctors and meteorologists work together to predict outbreaks of disease — such as mosquito-transmitted dengue fever — that may worsen as temperatures rise.

### 2NC Disease ext

#### Burnout - powerful diseases kill their hosts off too quickly to spread

Carlson 6(Shawn Carlson, PhD MacArthur Fellow, The Citizen Scientist, **2006,** “**Dealing with Doctor Doom,” http://www.sas.org/tcs/weeklyIssues\_2006/2006-04-07/editorial-p/index.html)**

The data stand utterly against this idea. Plagues have run rampant through human populations throughout time. Millions have died. Huge fractions of some populations have been wiped out. But the net death rate has never come close to the fractions that Pianka envisions. Virulent diseases that kill quickly tend to burn themselves out. Natural selection creates less lethal varieties because an organism can't spread if it kills its host before it can propagate. The flu pandemic of 1918 (the influenza virus is championed by Pianka) may have killed 50 million people, but that was only about 5 percent of those infected. Moreover, every year sees medical advancements—screening techniques improve, as do our methods of creating new vaccines and treating illness of all kinds. Not only that, a desperate situation would be met by desperate measures, including the implementation of martial law, the halting of all air and ground traffic except for emergency vehicles and so on, to stop contagion.

#### No disease

Kenny 12 (Charles Kenny, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, a Schwartz fellow at the New America Foundation, 4/9/12, "Not Too Hot to Handle," Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/09/not\_too\_hot\_to\_handle)

And what about the impact on global health? Suggestions that malaria has already spread as a result of climate change and that malaria deaths will expand dramatically as a result of warming in the future don't fit the evidence of declining deaths and reduced malarial spread over the last century. The authors of a recent study published in the journal Nature conclude that the forecasted future effects of rising temperatures on malaria "are at least one order of magnitude smaller than the changes observed since about 1900 and about two orders of magnitude smaller than those that can be achieved by the effective scale-up of key control measures." In other words, climate change is and will likely remain a small factor in the toll of malaria deaths into the foreseeable future.

#### 1. Human diversity, medicine and evolutionary limits check.

Gladwell 95 [Malcolm, New York bureau chief of The Washington Post, New Republic, July 17]

This is what is wrong with the Andromeda Strain argument. Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adopt a specific strategy, but every strategy carries a corresponding cost, and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly, but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all but halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable, remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability, its essential rigidity, is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. aids is almost invariably lethal because its attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flu, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms. If there are any conclusions to be drawn about disease, they are actually the opposite of what is imagined in books such as The Hot Zone and The Coming Plague. It is true that the effect of the dramatic demographic and social changes in the world over the past few decades is to create new opportunities for disease. But they are likely to create not homogeneous patterns of disease, as humans experienced in the past, so much as heterogeneous patterns of disease. People are traveling more and living in different combinations. Gene pools that were once distinct are mixing through intermarriage. Adults who once would have died in middle age are now living into their 80s. Children with particular genetic configurations who once died at birth or in infancy are now living longer lives. If you talk to demographers, they will tell you that what they anticipate is increasing clusters of new and odd diseases moving into these new genetic and demographic niches. Rare diseases will be showing up in greater numbers. Entirely unknown diseases will emerge for the first time. But the same diversity that created them within those population subgroups will keep them there. Laurie Garrett's book is mistitled. We are not facing "the coming plague." We are facing "the coming outbreaks."

#### Self-interest means no extinction.

MacPhee and Marx 98 [Ross, American Museum of Natural History and Preston, Aaron, Diamond AIDS Research Facility, http://www.amnh.org/science/biodiversity/extinction/Day1/disease/Bit1.html]

It is well known that lethal diseases can have a profound effect on species' population size and structure. However, it is generally accepted that the principal populational effects of disease are acute--that is, short-term. In other words, although a species many suffer substantial loss from the effects of a given highly infectious disease at a given time, the facts indicate that natural populations tend to bounce back after the period of high losses. Thus, **disease as a primary cause of extinction seems implausible**. However, this is the normal case, where the disease-provoking pathogen and its host have had a long relationship. Ordinarily, it is not in the pathogens interest to rapidly kill off large numbers of individuals in its host species, because that might imperil its own survival. Disease theorists long ago expressed the idea that pathogens tend to evolve toward a "benign" state of affairs with their hosts, which means in practice that they continue to infect, but tend not to kill (or at least not rapidly). A very good reason for suspecting this to be an accurate view of pathogen-host relationships is that individuals with few or no genetic defenses against a particular pathogen will be maintained within the host population, thus ensuring the pathogen's ultimate survival.

## Oil Spills

#### Shell is taking precautions to avoid a spill

Alaska Dispatch 12 (Alex DeMarban, “Alaska starts to prepare for the worst, an Arctic oil spill”, <http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/alaska-starts-prepare-worst-arctic-oil-spill>, 7/25/12)

The project shouldn't be seen as a sign that Shell hasn't done enough to prevent and prepare for a spill, said Folley. Federal regulators have given Shell's oil-spill response plans a thumbs-up, and Shell officials have said they're confident there will be no spill. If there is, Shell has built or hired multiple response vessels big and small to mop up a release at the wellhead in federal waters or near Alaska's coast. Also, Shell has pre-staged spill-response equipment in the Inupiat village of Wainwright, about 70 miles southeast of Shell's Chukchi Sea prospect, and at Prudhoe Bay, about 70 miles southwest of Shell's Beaufort Sea prospect.

#### The Coast Guard has the capabilities to oversee Shell drilling

Businessweek 12 (Carol Wolf and Kasia Klimasinska, “As the Arctic Opens for Oil, the Coast Guard Scrambles”, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-07-26/as-the-arctic-opens-for-oil-the-coast-guard-scrambles>, 7/26/12)

To oversee the Shell drilling, the Coast Guard plans to send two helicopters and two cutters to the Arctic, including one of its three flagship National Security Cutters, which can navigate the high seas, serve as a sophisticated communications center, and operate its own helicopter pad. The Coast Guard opened a temporary base in Barrow, Alaska, on July 16. It will practice oil spill responses and other maneuvers to test equipment and personnel readiness, says Vice Admiral Peter Neffenger, deputy commandant for operations. “Our goal is to have a presence up there that can adequately address the activity for this summer and then to think about what it means for the future,” says Neffenger. Shell is deploying 33 vessels and 600 workers for its Arctic venture, says Steve Phelps, Shell’s manager of exploration for Alaska. “We know the region is very remote and very dangerous,” Phelps says. “We realize if we need it, we have to bring it.”

#### Traumatic oil spills aren’t inevitable. U.S. oil drilling in the arctic is heavily regulated and companies will not be able to drill until the Coast Guard is confident a spill could be effectively cleaned up.

National Geographic 12 (Joe Eaton, “Shell Scales Back 2012 Arctic Drilling Goals”, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/shell-2012-arctic-drilling-goals/>, 7/27/12)

Faced with iced-in Arctic waters and failure to secure U.S. Coast Guard approval of its oil-spill barge, Royal Dutch Shell\* is ratcheting down its plan to drill as many as five exploratory wells this summer in the seas north of Alaska. The company planned to sink the wells in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas during a brief window between July and October, when the waters were expected to be clear of severe ice. But Pete Slaiby, Shell’s vice president for Alaska operations, said it’s unlikely the company will be able to meet that goal due to regulatory challenges and stubborn ice. “We are still hopeful that we will get some wells drilled,” Slaiby said. “Considering what we’ve been through . . . I think doing any kind of drilling will be a success.” With global oil demand expected to rise in the long term, and conventional production in decline, international and national fuel companies have turned increasingly to more challenging exploration and production. The Arctic has become a prized frontier, holding 13 percent of the world’s untapped oil and 30 percent of undiscovered natural gas, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. Russia and Norway also have been forging into Arctic seas for oil, but no development has been more closely watched than Shell’s plan for drilling off Alaska’s coast. Yet Shell’s diminished Arctic expectations show that even before rigs enter this unchartered territory in search for oil, the challenges for drilling are formidable.

#### Robust peer reviewed evidence indicates ecosystems are resilient

McDermott 09 (Matthew McDermott, “Good news: most ecosystems can recover in one lifetime from human induced or natural disturbance” 2009, www.treehugger.com/files/2009/05/most-ecosystems-can-recover-from-disturbance-in-one-lifetime.php)

There's a reason the phrase "let nature take its course" exists: New research done at the Yale University School of Forestry & Environmental Science reinforces the idea that ecosystems are quiet resilient and can rebound from pollution and environmental degradation. Published in the journal PLoS ONE, the study shows that most damaged ecosystems worldwide can recover within a single lifetime, if the source of pollution is removed and restoration work done: Forests Take Longest of Ecosystems Studied The analysis found that on average forest ecosystems can recover in 42 years, while in takes only about 10 years for the ocean bottom to recover. If an area has seen multiple, interactive disturbances, it can take on average 56 years for recovery. In general, most ecosystems take longer to recover from human-induced disturbances than from natural events, such as hurricanes. To reach these recovery averages, the researchers looked at data from peer-reviewed studies over the past 100 years on the rate of ecosystem recovery once the source of pollution was removed. Interestingly, the researchers found that it appears that the rate at which an ecosystem recovers may be independent of its degraded condition: Aquatic systems may recover more quickly than, say, a forest, because the species and organisms that live in that ecosystem turn over more rapidly than in the forest.

### 2NC Shell

#### Shell has the capabilities to clean up an oil spill

The Cordona Times 12 (Diane Jeantet, “SHELL'S OIL SPILL RESPONSE PLAN: WHAT'S DIFFERENT?”, <http://www.thecordovatimes.com/article/1230shells-oil-spill-response-plan-whats>, 7/27/12)

While Shell is waiting for its last piece of equipment to arrive on site to start its first exploratory drilling in the Arctic Ocean, and the US Coast Guard is about to test and practice the oil spill response system, questions regarding the efficiency of current oil spill recovery remain unanswered. In addition to the United States’ forces gathering in the Arctic for oil spill response (Coast Guard, Navy and the North Command, which covers Alaskan, Canadian and Mexican waters), Shell also bears a significant part of the responsibility. In the event of an oil spill the giant Dutch oil company is specifically responsible for the first response capabilities and is thus bringing its own boats, booms and skimmers; and has contracted with Alaska Clean Seas, to which Shell Offshore Inc. is a current member, to bring in additional equipment. Last March, the U.S. federal Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement approved Shell’s contingency plan detailing the company’s oil spill emergency response procedures in both the Beaufort and Chukchi seas. By doing so, the Obama administration judged that Shell’s strategy and resources fitted the harsh conditions of the Arctic - ice covered and remote seas, short summer season, low temperatures, and limited sunlight.

### 2NC Ecosystems Resil

#### No collapse – adaptation and functional redundancy.

Doremus, Berkeley Law, 2K [Holly, Law Professor – Cal Berkeley, 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, L/N]

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. **Nor is human extinction probable any time soon.** Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 [\*47] One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by **multiple species.** This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse. n217

## Solvency

#### The plan will take 10 years and the U.S. needs 4 icebreakers

Bloomberg 12 (Carol Wolf and Kasia Klimasinska, “Shell-Led Arctic Push Finds U.S. Shy in Icebreakers: Energy”, 7/18/12, Businessweek, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-07-18/shell-led-arctic-push-finds-u-dot-s-dot-shy-in-icebreakers-energy#p2>)

Papp said the Coast Guard eventually would need three heavy-duty and three medium-duty icebreakers for the Arctic. It now has one medium-duty icebreaker and two heavy-duty ones dating from the 1970s, neither of which is currently operable. The service plans to repair one of them. That means the U.S. would need to build four icebreakers -- two heavy-duty and two medium-duty -- with an estimated total cost of $3.2 billion, according to a Congressional Research Service report in April. Neither Congress nor the administration of President Barack Obama has proposed spending that kind of money on icebreakers. The Obama fiscal 2013 budget has called for $8 million to study building one. The Coast Guard’s five-year plan has called for $852 million for its actual construction in subsequent years, although Congress has yet to address the funding. It can take as long as 10 years to build an icebreaker.

#### 2013 timeframe means aff can’t solve

Atlantic Council 09 (James Joyner – PhD in political science and former management analyst at the Defense Information Systems Agency, “Arctic Thaw Brings NATO Security Risks”, 1/29/09, <http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/arctic-thaw-brings-nato-security-risks>)

Some scientists predict that Arctic waters could be ice-free in summers by 2013, decades earlier than previously thought. De Hoop Scheffer said trans-Arctic routes are likely to become an alternative to passage through the Suez or Panama canals for commercial shipping. "The end of the Cold War resulted in a marked reduction in military activity in the High North — Iceland would like it to stay that way," Iceland's outgoing Prime Minister Geir Haarde told the conference. Haarde tendered his resignation Monday amid the country's economic crisis and said the one-day conference was among his final duties before he steps down on Saturday.

#### The U.S. needs to cooperate with Canada in order to sustain a presence in the Arctic

SIPRI 12 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Kristopher Berg - researcher with the SIPRI Armed Conflict and Conflict Management Programme, “The Arctic Policies of Canada and the United States: Domestic Motives and International Context”, pg. 19, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, July 2012, http://www.scribd.com/doc/99895997/The-Arctic-policies-of-Canada-and-the-United-States-domestic-motives-and-international-context)

While the USA has not particularly distinguished itself in the inter- national cooperation over the Arctic—although it seems that this is now changing—Canada has repeatedly made clear that it is seeking a leadership role. The lingering disagreements between the two countries may, however undermine their ability to pursue their interests in the region. The future of the Arctic will require close cooperation between Canada and the USA, not least if human activity in the area increases as it becomes more accessible. Increased traffic in the Northwest Passage will present a challenge to both Canadian and US capacity to operate in the region, not least if responsibilities in the area are unclear. The two countries’ inability to agree on key issues such as the legal status of the Northwest Passage and the maritime boundary in the Beaufort Sea is affecting not only their domestic abilities but also their abilities to exercise international leadership in the region. In terms of boundary issues, for example, Norway and Russia, rather than Canada and the USA, have set a positive example and created a model for future delimitations.

#### The United States does not have territorial rights of the Northwest Passage - can’t solve

SIPRI 12 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Kristopher Berg - researcher with the SIPRI Armed Conflict and Conflict Management Programme, “The Arctic Policies of Canada and the United States: Domestic Motives and International Context”, pgs. 3-4, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, July 2012, http://www.scribd.com/doc/99895997/The-Arctic-policies-of-Canada-and-the-United-States-domestic-motives-and-international-context)

For both Canada and the USA the issue of sovereignty is closely related to the prospect of new resource discoveries in the Arctic region, and the extended continental shelf and boundary issues that may affect their access to these resources. The USA recognizes that several disputed areas in the Arctic may contain resources critical to its energy security, including in the Beaufort Sea, where Canada and the USA disagree on the maritime bound- ary. Canada regards this and other disputes as ‘discrete boundary issues’ that neither pose defence challenges nor have an impact on its ability to cooperate with other Arctic states. Another point of disagreement between Canada and the USA is the Northwest Passage, which the USA views as an international strait through which any ship has the right of free passage. Numerous US Government agencies acknowledge the status of both the Northwest Passage and the Northern Sea Route as having implications for strategic straits anywhere in the world. Canada, in contrast, claims that it ‘controls all maritime navigation in its waters’ which, according to its own definition, includes the Northwest Passage.10

#### The U.S. doesn’t have rights to the resources outside of its economic zone

Borgerson 08 (Dr. Scott - Senior fellow at the Institute for Global Maritime Studies, “Arctic Meltdown”, Foreign Affairs, 3/1/08, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63222/scott-g-borgerson/arctic-meltdown>)

While the other Arctic powers are racing to carve up the region, the United States has remained largely on the sidelines. The U.S. Senate has not ratified the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the leading international treaty on maritime rights, even though President George W. Bush, environmental nongovernmental organizations, the U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard service chiefs, and leading voices in the private sector support the convention. As a result, the United States cannot formally assert any rights to the untold resources off Alaska’s northern coast beyond its exclusive economic zone — such zones extend for only 200 nautical miles from each Arctic state’s shore — nor can it join the UN commission that adjudicates such claims. Worse, Washington has forfeited its ability to assert sovereignty in the Arctic by allowing its icebreaker fleet to atrophy. The United States today funds a navy as large as the next 17 in the world combined, yet it has just one seaworthy oceangoing icebreaker — a vessel that was built more than a decade ago and that is not optimally configured for Arctic missions. Russia, by comparison, has a fleet of 18 icebreakers. And even China operates one icebreaker, despite its lack of Arctic waters. Through its own neglect, the world’s sole superpower — a country that borders the Bering Strait and possesses over 1,000 miles of Arctic coastline — has been left out in the cold..

### 2NC Coop w/Canada

#### It’s in the U.S.’ best interest to cooperate w/Canada

Borgerson 08 (Dr. Scott - Senior fellow at the Institute for Global Maritime Studies, “Arctic Meltdown”, Foreign Affairs, 3/1/08, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63222/scott-g-borgerson/arctic-meltdown>)

The United States should also strike a deal with Canada, leading to a joint management effort along the same lines as the 1817 Rush-Bagot Agreement, which demilitarized the Great Lakes and led to the creation (albeit more than a century later) of the nonprofit St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to manage this critical, and sometimes ice-covered, binational waterway. In the same spirit, the United States and Canada could combine their resources to help police thousands of miles of Arctic coastline. Washington and Ottawa now work collaboratively on other sea and land borders and together built the impressive North American Aerospace Defense Command, or NORAD, system. They are perfectly capable of doing the same on the Arctic frontier, and it is in both countries’ national interests to do so. There is no reason that economic development and environmental stewardship cannot go hand in hand. To this end, Canada could take the lead in establishing an analogous public-private Arctic seaway management corporation with a mandate to provide for the safe and secure transit of vessels in North American Arctic waters while protecting the area’s sensitive environment. Shipping tolls levied by this bilateral management regime could pay for desperately needed charts (much of the existing survey information about the Northwest Passage dates to nineteenth-century British exploration), as well as for search-and-rescue capabilities, traffic-management operations, vessel tracking, and similar services that would guard life and property. Such a jointly managed Arctic seaway system could establish facilities for the disposal of solid and liquid waste, identify harbors of refuge for ships in danger, and enforce a more rigorous code for ship design in order to ensure that vessels traveling through the Northwest Passage have thicker hulls, more powerful engines, and special navigation equipment. The captains and crews of these vessels could also be required to have additional training and, if the conditions warrant, to take aboard an agency-approved “ice pilot” to help them navigate safely.

### 2NC 2 Not enough

#### The Coast Guard would need 3 heavy and 3 medium icebreakers minimum

O’Rourke 12 (Ronald – specialist in naval affairs, “Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues

for Congress”, pgs. 33-4, 6/15/12, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41153.pdf)

In July 2011, the Coast Guard provided to Congress a study on the Coast Guard’s missions and capabilities for operations in high-latitude (i.e., polar) areas. The study, commonly known as the High Latitude Study and dated July 2010 on its cover, concluded the following: The Coast Guard requires three heavy and three medium icebreakers to fulfill its statutory missions. These icebreakers are necessary to (1) satisfy Arctic winter and transition season demands and (2) provide sufficient capacity to also execute summer missions. Single-crewed icebreakers have sufficient capacity for all current and expected statutory missions. Multiple crewing provides no advantage because the number of icebreakers required is driven by winter and shoulder season requirements. Future use of multiple or augmented crews could provide additional capacity needed to absorb mission growth. • The Coast Guard requires six heavy and four medium icebreakers to fulfill its statutory missions and maintain the continuous presence requirements of the Naval Operations Concept. Consistent with current practice, these icebreakers are single-crewed and homeported in Seattle Washington. • Applying crewing and home porting alternatives reduces the overall requirement to four heavy and two medium icebreakers. This assessment of non-material solutions shows that the reduced number of icebreakers can be achieved by having all vessels operate with multiple crews and two of the heavy icebreakers homeporting in the Southern Hemisphere.

### 2NC No Jurisdiction

#### U.S. territorial waters only extend 12 miles from the coast

UN 82 (“United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea”, 1982, Section 2, Article 3, http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention\_agreements/texts/unclos/part2.htm”

Every State has the right to establish the breadth of its territorial sea up to a limit not exceeding 12 nautical miles, measured from baselines determined in accordance with this Convention.

#### Canada’s doing its best to keep the U.S. out of the Northwest Passage

Borgerson 08 (Dr. Scott - Senior fellow at the Institute for Global Maritime Studies, “Arctic Meltdown”, Foreign Affairs, 3/1/08, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63222/scott-g-borgerson/arctic-meltdown>)

There are also battles over sea-lanes. Canada has just launched a satellite surveillance system designed to search for ships trespassing in its waters. Even though the Northern Sea Route will likely open before the Northwest Passage, the desire to stop ships from passing through the Canadian archipelago — especially those from the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S. Navy — is the cause of much saber rattling north of the border. “Use it or lose it,” Canadian Prime Minister Harper frequently declares in reference to Canada’s Arctic sovereignty — an argument that plays well with Canadians, who are increasingly critical of their southern neighbor. So far, the delicate 1988 “agreement to disagree” between the United States and Canada over the final disposition of these waters has remained intact, but the United States should not underestimate Canadian passions on this issue.

## CPs

### Russia Do the Plan

Russia should create shipping lanes through United States territorial waters off the coast of Alaska and the Northern Sea Route.

#### Russia has control over the Northern Sea Route

The Moscow Times 12 (Michael Byers - Canada research chair in global politics and international law at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, “Canada Can Help Russia With Northern Sea Route”, 6/8/12, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mobile/article/460127.html)

The Arctic Ocean's coastline belongs mostly to Russia and Canada, the two largest countries in the world. Each country owns territory on either side of a series of contested, and increasingly ice-free, Arctic straits. Russia considers the narrowest parts of the Northern Sea Route to be "internal waters." Canada takes the same view of the Northwest Passage. Internal waters are not territorial waters, and foreign ships have no right to access them without permission from the coastal state. Russia and Canada face a single, common source of opposition to their claims — namely, the United States, which insists that both the Northern Sea Route and the Northwest Passage are "international straits." The United States thus accepts that Russia and Canada "own" the Northern Sea Route and Northwest Passage, while asserting that foreign vessels have a right of "transit passage" through the straits that exceeds the right of "innocent passage" in regular territorial waters. A right of transit passage entitles foreign ships to pass through a strait without coastal state permission. It also means that foreign submarines can sail submerged, something that they are not allowed to do in regular territorial waters.

#### Russia has the requisite icebreakers

Bloomberg 12 (Carol Wolf and Kasia Klimasinska, “Shell-Led Arctic Push Finds U.S. Shy in Icebreakers: Energy”, 7/18/12, Businessweek, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-07-18/shell-led-arctic-push-finds-u-dot-s-dot-shy-in-icebreakers-energy#p2>)

Russia has 25 icebreakers, which are being used “to assert sovereign control over the Arctic region and its valuable resources,” according to the Congressional Research Service report. Finland and Sweden have seven icebreakers each and Canada has six, the report says. China has one icebreaker and another under construction.

### 2NC O/V

The CP solves the entire case and avoid the Spending DA because it doesn’t spend any of the USFG’s money. None of the aff’s advantages have a USFG-key warrant – the only internal link is the creation of shipping lanes, which the CP solves. In fact, the CP solves better because Russia already has the icebreakers necessary to do the plan, whereas the U.S. does not. And continuing to rely on Russia for icebreaker assistance solves their U..S/Russia Arctic conflict scenario.

### 2NC General Solvency

#### **Russia wants to do the plan**

The Moscow Times 12 (Michael Byers - Canada research chair in global politics and international law at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, “Canada Can Help Russia With Northern Sea Route”, 6/8/12, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mobile/article/460127.html)

The Kremlin is intent on turning the Northern Sea Route into a commercially viable alternative to the Strait of Malacca and the Suez Canal. In September 2011, then-Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said: "The shortest route between Europe's largest markets and the Asia-Pacific region lies across the Arctic. This route is almost a third shorter than the traditional southern one. I want to stress the importance of the Northern Sea Route as an international transport artery that will rival traditional trade lanes in service fees, security and quality. States and private companies that choose the Arctic trade routes will undoubtedly reap economic advantages."

#### Russia’s building the best icebreakers now

Russia Times 12 (“Russia to build the world's biggest icebreaker”, 7/3/12, <http://rt.com/business/news/russia-icebreaker-arctic-ice-293/>)

The world's biggest atomic icebreaker will cost Russia an estimated $1.1 billion, with construction to start in 2013. The mega-ton ship will be capable of breaking 4 meters thick ice to help explore the Arctic shelf. Atomflot – a sister company of Rosatom – will build the ice breaking ship, and hopes to have it ready to sail in 2015. “This icebreaker will clear the way for other vessels in Russia’s Arctic as well as tag them along the Yenisei and Ob rivers”, Atomflot told Izvestya newspaper. The new Icebreaker will be granted the highest ice class – 9, meaning the ship will be able to break ice thicker than 4 meters in the Arctic area all year round. It will also be capable of swiftly passing through the 2.5 meters thick ice fields. “The estimated cost will include construction work, building a shipyard etc. But the most expensive part of the icebreaker is the Rhythm-200 reactor and various pieces of know–how” Aleksey Kravchenko from OSK ship Building Corporation told Izvestya. “By the time we get to the series we will be able to lower the cost by 30 percent” he added. Russia is the only country in the world that is currently building atomic icebreakers and specialists say it needs them to keep control over the Arctic basin. “Icebreakers are used to transport huge tankers to the oil and gas shelf in the Arctic region. The new type of icebreakers, capable of breaking 3 meter thick ice, could be used commercially all year round” said Kravchenko. The new Icebreaker-9 (170 meters long, 34 meters wide) will supersede “50 year Victory”, the current biggest icebreaker – it’s 159 meters long and 30 meters wide. Specialists say that the new type of Icebreakers will be universal because they can be used both in the Arctic area and on rivers. And that is what’s unique about them. “We had nothing like this before and we really need such icebreakers”, Yuri Sinelnikov, from the Baltic shipbuilding plant in St Petersburg told Izvestya. Russia currently has 5 icebreakers cruising the Arctic. They were built between 1985 and 2007. By 2016 it plans to replace the older types with the new Icebreaker -9.

#### It’s advantageous for Russia, too - increasing the efficiency of the NSR will increase Russia’s competitiveness

Konovalov 12 (Alexei, Candidate of Sciences, head of the World’s Ocean Center at the State Research

Institution “Council for the Study of the Productive Forces” (SOPS), Ministry of Economic Development of

the Russian Federation and Russian Academy of Sciences, and the Section for Public–Private Partnership

Issues at the Science-Expert Council of the Government’s Marine Board, “The issues and prospects of an expanded arctic transportation network”, pg. 1, <http://www.institutenorth.org/assets/images/uploads/articles/The_issues_and_prospects_of_an_expanded_arctic_transportation_network.pdf>)

It is common knowledge that the Arctic abounds in natural resources. However, Russia’s Arctic zone contains tremendous oil, gas and other strategic mineral deposits, the most attractive export items. Apart from an immensely rich natural-resource base, Russia’s location facilitating the active use of Arctic territories has paramount importance for the subsequent sustained development of Russia and its Arctic zone. The underused potential generated by spatial factors implies Russia’s unique transportation and logistics capabilities. Russia can become a competitive transit state with developed service option. Russia’s Arctic zone has an opportunity to alter its foreign-trade specialization in the next 10-12 years, to discard its narrow specialization prioritizing hydrocarbons extraction, reduce the commodity bias of its economy and eliminate many disproportions in its development. The realization of Russia’s transportation potential through a system of international transport corridors passing through Russian territory and waters but remaining under Russia’s jurisdiction, as well as its incorporation into the global network, may be-come a very promising prospect. Today, a unique opportunity for the cost-effective use of the high-latitude Northern Transport Corridor, Russia’s national trans-Arctic route that combines the Northern Sea Route (NSR) with river and railway lines is opening up. Murmansk and Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, the route’s remotest trans-port hubs, are called on to load consignments aboard ice-resistant vessels, to facilitate the maintenance of the icebreaker fleet and to support transit by means of feeder routes. Moreover, it is becoming increasingly more efficient to establish reduced-scheduled routes for transpolar traffic, including air routes, because these projects link the Earth’s Eastern and Western Hemispheres via the shortest routes, and to build a transcontinental route which tunnels under the Bering Strait. The Northern Sea Route possesses some obvious competitive advantages. Suffice it to compare the length of the standard Yokohama–Hamburg run between the southern and northern routes. The NSR is free from high-seas terrorism and piracy. Regardless of the technical difficulties of Arctic navigation, the NSR is the shortest geographical trajectory linking Europe with the rapidly developing Asia-Pacific region and North America’s west coast. This route can handle transit consignments and Russian exports now being delivered to South East Asia via the Suez Canal.

### 2NC Oil Solvency

#### The CP creates shipping lanes, which increases recovery time in the event of a spill

O’Rourke 12 (Ronald – specialist in naval affairs, “Changes in the Arctic: Background and Issues

for Congress”, pgs. 26-7, 6/15/12, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41153.pdf)

Response time is a critical factor for oil spill recovery. With each hour, spilled oil becomes more difficult to track, contain, and recover, particularly in icy conditions, where oil can migrate under or mix with surrounding ice. 96 Most response techniques call for quick action, which may pose logistical challenges in areas without prior staging equipment or trained response professionals. Many stakeholders are concerned about a “response gap” for oil spills in the Arctic region. 97 A response gap is a period of time in which oil spill response activities would be unsafe or infeasible. The response gap for the northern Arctic latitudes is likely to be extremely high compared to other regions. 98According to the former Commander of the 17th Coast Guard District (Alaska), “we are not prepared for a major oil spill [over 100,000 gallons] in the Arctic environment. The Coast Guard has no offshore response capability in Northern or Western Alaska.” 99 The transportation infrastructure along Alaska’s northern coast poses challenges for oil spill responders. The Coast Guard has no designated air stations north of Kodiak, AK, which is almost 1,000 miles from the northernmost point of land along the Alaskan coast in Point Barrow, AK. 100 Although some of communities have airstrips capable of landing cargo planes, no roads connect these communities. 101 Vessel infrastructure is also limited. The nearest major port is in the Aleutian Islands, approximately 1,300 miles from Point Barrow. A 2010 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report identified further logistical obstacles that would hinder an oil spill response in the region, including “inadequate” ocean and weather information for the Arctic and technological problems with communications. 102

### 2NC IF Good

#### International Fiat Good

1. Doesn’t unlimit – it’s a domestic topic, very few affs can be solved by international actors & one USFG key warrant checks every international CP
2. It’s reciprocal – perms check any of their de-limiting args.
3. Nothing says the judge is a US policymaker – assumptions that he/she is are ethnocentric
4. Key to neg ground
5. Lit checks – we have a solvency advocate
6. Real world – the CP is something that Russia actually would/probably will do
7. Rej the arg, not the team - not a voter

### 2NC Perm: DB

1. Links to the NB – the USFG still spends money on building icebreakers.
2. No NB to the perm – the U.S. still can’t solve because of jurisdictional issues and the amount of time it would take to build the amount of icebreakers necessary to solve
3. Even if the aff could solve, double solvency is dumb – if we prove the CP is better, no reason to vote on a perm that definitely links to a NB.
4. Makes their scenario for Arctic conflict more probable because the U.S. would actively be establishing a forward presence in the Arctic
5. A2 Cooperation: Cooperation is intrinsic – neither the plan nor the CP mandate cooperation with Russia. Intrinsicness is a voting issue - it kills all DAs b/c the aff could say the USFG could always do something else to remedy the DA impact and allowing them to spike out of anything bad their plan causes kills political education, which is uniquely important for policy makers. And perm: do both doesn’t mean the US and Russia cooperate – it just means that the U.S. does the plan and Russia does the plan (independent of one another)

### 2NC Perm: Do the CP

The perm severs U.S. creation of shipping lanes, which their CP text mandates. (The CP’s competitive)

Severance is a voting issue – makes the aff a moving target and allows them to spike out of disadvantages to the plan, which kills neg. ground.

The perm links to the net benefit because the USFG still has to spend billions on icebreakers to clear shipping lanes.

### 2NC PICs Good

1. Makes the aff defend the entire plan – allows for more in depth debate
2. Key to neg ground and flex
3. Education- it’s the most real world.
4. Vital to search for best policy option – if the USFG isn’t the best actor, why should the judge be forced to vote aff?
5. Reject the arg not the team
6. Net benefits check abuse

### 2NC No Jurisdiction

#### Russia has access to U.S. territorial waters

NOAA 88 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, “Maritime Zones and Boundaries”, <http://www.gc.noaa.gov/gcil_maritime.html#internal>)

Internal Waters Internal waters are the waters (for example, bays and rivers) on the landward side of the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured. Each coastal State has full sovereignty over its internal waters as if they were part of its land territory. The right of innocent passage does not apply in internal waters. Territorial Sea Each coastal State may claim a territorial sea that extends seaward up to 12 nautical miles (nm) from its baselines. The coastal State exercises sovereignty over its territorial sea, the air space above it, and the seabed and subsoil beneath it. Foreign flag ships enjoy the right of innocent passage while transiting the territorial sea subject to laws and regulations adopted by the coastal State that are in conformity with the Law of the Sea Convention and other rules of international law relating to such passage. The U.S. claimed a 12 nm territorial sea in 1988 (Presidential Proclamation No. 5928, December 27, 1988).

## DAs

### Spending

#### A. Fiscal discipline now – political pressure will lead to debt compromise

Washington Post 7/18

Washington Post 7/18/12, <http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2012/jul/18/coalition-aims-to-head-off-debt-disaster/>

WASHINGTON — A coalition of business leaders, budget experts and former politicians launched a $25 million campaign yesterday to build political support for a far-reaching plan to raise taxes, cut popular retirement programs and tame the national debt. With anxiety rising over a major budget mess looming in January, the campaign — dubbed "Fix the Debt" — is founded on the notion that the moment is finally at hand when policymakers will be forced to compromise on an ambitious debt-reduction strategy. After nearly three years of bipartisan negotiations, the broad outlines of that strategy are clear, the group's leaders said during a news conference at the National Press Club: Raise more money through a simplified tax code and spend less on Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, the primary drivers of future borrowing. "Everyone knows in their hearts and their minds what has to be done," said Democratic former Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell, who is chairing the group with former New Hampshire Sen. Judd Gregg, a Republican. The goal of the campaign is to "create a safe environment where it's not only good policy, but good politics as well." The campaign was founded by former Clinton White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles and former Republican Sen. Alan Simpson of Wyoming. The two men led an independent fiscal commission that in 2010 produced a $4 trillion debt-reduction framework that has won praise from politicians across the political spectrum. But the Bowles-Simpson plan never won the explicit backing of President Barack Obama or GOP leaders and therefore never gained real traction in Congress. The campaign plans to launch a social media drive to persuade lawmakers to approve a plan similar to the Bowles-Simpson framework by July 4, 2013 — replacing $600 billion in abrupt tax hikes and sharp spending cuts that are otherwise set to take effect in January.

#### B. New icebreakers will cost billions

O’Rourke 12 (Ronald – specialist in Naval Affairs, “Coast Guard Polar Icebreaker Modernization:

Background and Issues for Congress”, Congressional Research Service, 6/14/12, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/RL34391.pdf)

The Coast Guard estimated in February 2008 that new replacement ships for the Polar Star and Polar Sea might cost between $800 million and $925 million per ship in 2008 dollars to procure. 31 The Coast Guard said that this estimate is based on a ship with integrated electric drive, three propellers, and a combined diesel and gas (electric) propulsion plant. The icebreaking capability would be equivalent to the POLAR Class Icebreakers [i.e., Polar Star and Polar Sea] and research facilities and accommodations equivalent to HEALY. This cost includes all shipyard and government project costs. Total time to procure a new icebreaker [including mission analysis, studies, design, contract award, and construction] is eight to ten years. 32The Coast Guard further stated that this notional new ship would be designed for a 30-year service life. The High Latitude Study provided to Congress in July 2011 states that the above figure of $800 million to $925 million in 2008 dollars equates to $900 million to $1,041 million in 2012 dollars. The study provides the following estimates, in 2012 dollars, of the acquisition costs for new polar icebreakers: • $856 million for 1 ship; • $1,663 million for 2 ships—an average of about $832 million each; • $2,439 million for 3 ships—an average of $813 million each; • $3,207 million for 4 ships—an average of about $802 million each; • $3,961 million for 5 ships—an average of about $792 million each; and • $4,704 million for 6 ships—an average of $784 million each. The study refers to the above estimates as “rough order-of-magnitude costs” that “were developed as part of the Coast Guard’s independent Polar Platform Business Case Analysis.” 33

#### C. Loss of fiscal discipline causes a downgrade

Mark Gongloff, Wall Street Journal, 08/2/’11, [Moody’s Affirms US AAA Rating, <http://blogs.wsj.com/marketbeat/2011/08/02/moodys-affirms-us-aaa-rating/>] VN

Moody’s just came out and said, great job, USA, you get to keep your AAA rating. For now. This follows Fitch, which earlier said more or less that they were still reviewing the US rating, a process that could take through August. They didn’t promise they’d keep a AAA rating at the end of the process, but called the debt deal “a step in the right direction.” Now the big shoe dangling is S&P, which is really on the hook, having sounded the loudest warning about a downgrade. The size of the debt deal doesn’t seem to hit the $4 trillion mark S&P has said would be necessary to keep a AAA rating. My prediction? They’ll issue a similar placeholder statement soonish. Meanwhile, let’s hear what Moody’s has to say: Moody’s Investors Service has confirmed the Aaa government bond rating of the United States following the raising of the statutory debt limit on August 2. The rating outlook is now negative. Moody’s placed the rating on review for possible downgrade on July 13 due to the small but rising probability of a default on the government’s debt obligations because of a failure to increase the debt limit. The initial increase of the debt limit by $900 billion and the commitment to raise it by a further $1.2-1.5 trillion by yearend have virtually eliminated the risk of such a default, prompting the confirmation of the rating at Aaa. In confirming the Aaa rating, Moody’s also recognized that today’s agreement is a first step toward achieving the long-term fiscal consolidation needed to maintain the US government debt metrics within Aaa parameters over the long run. The legislation calls for $917 billion in specific spending cuts over the next decade and established a congressional committee charged with making recommendations for achieving a further $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction over the same time period. In the absence of the committee reaching an agreement, automatic spending cuts of $1.2 trillion would become effective. In assigning a negative outlook to the rating, **Moody’s indicated, however, that there would be a risk of downgrade if** (1) **there is a weakening in fiscal discipline in the coming year**; (2) further fiscal consolidation measures are not adopted in 2013; (3) the economic outlook deteriorates significantly; or (4) there is an appreciable rise in the US government’s funding costs over and above what is currently expected.

#### D. Further downgrades would create a debt spiral, crippling the economy

Rowley 12 Charles Rowley, Professor Emeritus of Economics at George Mason University, 10/15/12, “Renewed threats to U.S. credit rating,” Charles Rowley’s blog, http://charlesrowley.wordpress.com/2012/06/15/renewed-threats-to-u-s-credit-rating/

If Moody’s downgrades and if S & P further downgrades U.S. credit ratings, this would move the United States out of the exclusive club of AAA-rated nations, and throw into question the privileged status of U.S. Treasury securities as a safe haven for global investors. Any significant flight from Treasuries would raise Treasury bond rates, with crippling consequences for the economy. A 1-percentage point increase in rates would raise Treasury debt payments by $1 trillion over the next decade, wiping out the benefits of all the budget cuts enacted by Congress last year. The dynamics of such a process may prove to be devastating, moving the U.S. federal government onto a path of sovereign downgrades that accelerates an already worsening fiscal situation. Greece here we come.

#### E. Economic collapse causes global nuclear war.

Merlini, Senior Fellow – Brookings, 11

[Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs (IAI) in Rome. He served as IAI president from 1979 to 2001. Until 2009, he also occupied the position of executive vice chairman of the Council for the United States and Italy, which he co-founded in 1983. His areas of expertise include transatlantic relations, European integration and nuclear non-proliferation, with particular focus on nuclear science and technology. A Post-Secular World? DOI: 10.1080/00396338.2011.571015 Article Requests: Order Reprints : Request Permissions Published in: journal Survival, Volume 53, Issue 2 April 2011 , pages 117 - 130 Publication Frequency: 6 issues per year Download PDF Download PDF (~357 KB) View Related Articles To cite this Article: Merlini, Cesare 'A Post-Secular World?', Survival, 53:2, 117 – 130]

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

### 2NC Generic Links

#### New infrastructure spending kills fiscal discipline – it undercuts the spirit of “shared sacrifice”

O’Hanlon 10

Michael O’Hanlon, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, 12/22/10, “THE DEFENSE BUDGET AND AMERICAN POWER,” http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/events/2010/1222\_defense\_budget/20101222\_defense\_budget.pdf

So the minute that someone says, well, defense is the top constitutional obligation of the federal government and therefore it should be protected regardless, and we should make our deficit reduction out of other accounts. If we start a conversation in those terms, then a big constituency is going to come up and say let's protect Social Security, or let's protect college loans for students because that's our future after all. Or let's protect science research or **infrastructural development**, and you get the idea pretty soon you've lost the spirit of shared sacrifice that I think is essential if we're going to have any hope of reducing the deficit in the coming years. So that's the basic motivation. We're not probably going to reduce the deficit effectively, and therefore strengthen our long-term economy and the foundation for our long-term military power, if we don't establish a spirit of shared sacrifice.

#### Infrastructure is costly and inefficient

The Economist, 2/12/2012, “America’s Subterranean Malaise”, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2012/02/infrastructure?fsrc=scn%2Ftw%2Fte%2Fbl%2Famericanssubterraneanmalaise>

SALON‘s Will Doig had a nice piece last week riffing off a common theme: why does it take so long and cost so much for America to complete infrastructure projects when China seems to complete them in mere months for a fraction of the cost? On Dec. 31, the Chinese capital opened a new subway line and greatly expanded two others. This year it plans to open four more. A total of eight new lines are under construction. The city started expanding the system in the run-up to the 2008 Olympics, and has kept pushing forward ever since. In 2001 it had 33 miles of track. Today it has 231.Meanwhile, when you hear the completion dates for big U.S. transit projects you often have to calculate your age to figure out if you’ll still be alive. Los Angeles’s Westside subway extension is set to be finished in 2036. Just five years ago, New York’s Second Avenue Subway was supposed to be done by 2020, a goal that seems laughable now. The sub-headline of Mr Doig’s story promises suggestions for dealing with this problem, but the actual article focuses more on explaining why infrastructure projects take so much longer in America than they do in China. Bureaucracy, lack of money, politics and potential interference with existing infrastructure are the most convincing explanations he offers, although mismanagement and America’s deeper concern for things like private property rights and working conditions surely play a role, too. The Atlantic’s David Lepeska has some related thoughts on why New York’s Second Avenue subway line, which won’t be completed for years, is costing $1.7 billion per kilometre. He notes that such high-priced transport is not endemic in America: Washington, DC’s Silver Line is considerably cheaper per kilometre (partly because much of it is being built above ground) and light-rail projects in Minneapolis and Denver were comparative bargains. Slate’s Matt Yglesias, meanwhile, argues that Mr Doig and others who compare New York’s subway costs with China’s are missing the point. “The real issue Americans should be pondering is why our big infrastructure projects are so much slower and more costly than comparable projects in Europe or Japan,” he writes. After all, “even expensive projects in big, old, rich cities like London and Amsterdam come in far cheaper than a New York subway project.” This is indeed the right question to be asking, but the answers don’t come easily. American politicians often blame labour unions, but these are generally stronger in Europe than in the US. Benjamin Kabak, a blogger whom Mr Lepeska recommends, offers some theories. Alon Levy, a blogger whom we’ve linked to before, has a particularly interesting idea: he thinks the business culture and organisational structure of New York’s Metropolitan Transit Authority could be part of the problem. Mr Levy says the MTA’s in-house team managing infrastructure projects is probably too small and the agency could be too reliant on outside consultants

#### Transportation project spending is uncontrollable – biased cost analyses, lack of information, and other structural impediments

General Accounting Office, February 2000, “Funding Trends and Opportunities to Improve Investment Decisions”, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588838.pdf>

Federal agencies and the Congress face several challenges in determining the appropriate levels of and effective approaches to infrastructure investment. First, there is a general lack of accurate, consistent information on the existing infrastructure and its future needs. For example, in some cases, the current information may not distinguish between genuine needs and “wish lists.” In other cases, the information may not identify all the needs. In addition, federal agencies have not taken a consistent approach to analyzing the costs and benefits of potential infrastructure projects, which would help in setting priorities and determining noncapital alternatives. Moreover, until recently, agencies have not been required to relate their planned infrastructure spending to their missions and goals, so evaluating these plans has presented a challenge to agencies and the Congress. Finally, the federal budget structure does not prompt explicit debate about infrastructure spending that is intended to have long-term benefits. Overcoming these impediments will not be easy. Recent guidance by the Office of Management and Budget and legislation such as the Government Performance and Results Act may provide interim steps toward doing so. However, these steps might not go far enough toward improving infrastructure investments because spending decisions are made by a variety of agencies and levels of government that have differing goals and missions. In order to better coordinate these investments to meet national, regional, and local goals and ensure that they are mutually supportive, it is crucial that agencies throughout the government reduce inefficiencies in their current investments and analyze potential investments to identify those that achieve the greatest benefits in the most cost-effective manner.

#### Transportation infrastructure causes fiscal crises

William Coyne is a Land Use Advocate for the Environment Colorado Research and Policy Center, December 2003, “The Fiscal Cost of Sprawl”, <http://www.impactfees.com/publications%20pdf/fiscalcostofsprawl12_03.pdf>

THE high cost of providing and maintaining infrastructure for sprawling development hurts taxpayers and contributes to the fiscal crises facing many Colorado local governments. Sprawling development does not generate enough tax revenue to cover the costs it incurs on local municipalities to provide new infrastructure and public services. Local governments and their taxpayers end up footing the bill to provide public services to sprawling developments. Research by Colorado State University found that in Colorado, “dispersed rural residential development costs county governments and schools $1.65 in service expenditures for every dollar of tax revenue generated.” Additionally, the cost to provide public infrastructure and services for a specific population in new sprawling development is higher than to service that same population in a smart growth or infill development. Sprawling and “leapfrog” developments (those built far away from the current urban area) tend to be dispersed across the land, requiring longer public roads and water and sewer lines to provide service. Such developments also impose higher costs on police and fire departments and schools. Research from around Colorado demonstrates the high fiscal cost of sprawl relative to compact development: • Research conducted by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) in the planning process for the Metro Vision 2020 update found that sprawling development would cost Denver-area governments $4.3 billion more in infrastructure costs than compact smart growth through 2020. • DRCOG found that a 12-square-mile expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary around Denver to accommodate additional sprawling growth would cost taxpayers $293 million dollars, $30 million of which would be subsidized by the region as a whole. • University of Colorado at Denver researchers determined that future sprawling development in Delta, Mesa, Montrose, and Ouray Counties would cost taxpayers and local governments $80 million more than smart growth development between 2000 and 2025. • New research from the Center for Colorado Policy Studies at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs points to infill development and increased residential densities as important factors contributing to the substantial savings in infrastructure costs in Colorado Springs between 1980 and 2000. • A Federal Transit Administration report conducted by the Transit Cooperative Research Program estimates that smart growth would save the Denver-Boulder-Greeley area $4 billion in road and highway construction over 25 years—a savings of 21 percent. The costs of building and servicing infrastructure for new sprawling development is ultimately subsidized by the whole community. Local government generally bills the cost of new services and infrastructure on an average basis, rather than an incremental basis. That is, new costs are spread evenly among all taxpayers rather than charged only to those who generate the costs. This is, in effect, a subsidy from the whole community to new development. Existing residents, who were sufficiently served by the established infrastructure, must pay a share of the costly new infrastructure required to meet the expected demand of newcomers.

#### Federal spending on transportation is wasteful and requires constant federally funded maintenance

Barry Bosworth is a Senior Fellow in Economic Studies for the Brookings Institution and Sveta Milusheva is a Research Assistant at the Brookings Institution, October 2011, “Innovations in U.S. Infrastructure Financing: An Evaluation”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/10/20%20infrastructure%20financing%20bosworth%20milusheva/1020_infrastructure_financing_bosworth_milusheva.pdf>

Their data are limited to public sector investments in transportation and water infrastructure, and do not include estimates of the stock of capital. The share of total public capital investments covered by the CBO data has fallen from about 45 percent in 1960 to 30 percent in 2007. The most important forms of excluded public capital are equipment, buildings, and power; but the CBO definition is closer to the definition of infrastructure used in most research studies. The CBO analysis illustrates two important aspects of infrastructure expenditures. First O&M represents more than half of the total spending on infrastructure, and in some areas, such as mass transit and aviation, the proportion is two-thirds or greater. Infrastructure systems involve much greater costs than just the initial investment to build them. They involve major commitments to future operating and repair costs that need to be funded on an ongoing basis. The inclusion of O&M thus highlights a fundamental problem of infrastructure in the United States: the failure to maintain the investments on a timely and efficient basis. There is an underlying bias in the funding of infrastructure in that ‘free money’ (federal grants) is available for new capital investments, but state and local governments must finance the vast bulk of their own O&M costs. Not surprisingly, the result is excess investments in facilities that local governments are not prepared to maintain. In those cases where federal funding is available for maintenance, the amounts are limited and beset by perverse incentives. O&M has represented only 8 percent of total federal grants since 2000. There is a federal program for bridge repair, the Highway Bridge Program (HPB), but priority is given to states with the worst rating of bridge conditions–hardly an incentive for timely maintenance.

### Politics

#### Jackson-Vanik repeal will pass with bipartisan support

Vicki Needham, 7-19-12 (Staff Writer, The Hill, " Deal struck in House on Russia trade bill", http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/239005-house-democrats-republicans-reach-agreement-on-russia-trade-bill- :)

House Republicans and Democrats reached an agreement on Thursday for moving a bill that would extend permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) to Russia and make a statement on Moscow's human-rights record, upping the bill's chances of clearing Congress before the August recess. Top lawmakers on the House Ways and Means Committee announced that they will mark up the trade legislation next week. Panel Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.), ranking member Sandy Levin (D-Mich.), trade subcommittee Chairman Kevin Brady (R-Texas) and the subcommittee's top Democrat, Jim McDermott of Washington, collectively introduced legislation mirroring the measure approved Wednesday by the Senate Finance Committee. "I am pleased that we were able to gain bipartisan support for this important legislation that supports U.S. jobs and exports, and I look forward to marking it up next week," Camp said. The trade bill would repeal the 37-year-old Jackson-Vanik provision that violates international trade rules and include the Magnitsky human-rights legislation that has been approved by the House Foreign Relations Committee. The measures will likely be merged in the House Rules Committee before heading to the floor. "The bill we are introducing today includes important additional measures relating to the enforcement of key provisions, ranging from the protection of intellectual property rights, to barriers to U.S. exports, and Russia's compliance with its WTO commitments," Levin said. "At the same time, we must continue to use the opportunity of action on Russia PNTR to send a clear message to Russia of our deep concern about their continuing failure to work with the other nations of the world to address the violence against civilians in Syria," he said.

[plan is unpopular]

#### Repeal requires political leverage from Obama

Doug Palmer, 7-19-12 (Staff Writer, Chicago Tribune, " House lawmakers reach deal on Russia trade, rights bill", http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/sns-rt-us-usa-russia-tradebre86i10y-20120719,0,4282739.story :)

The Congress appears increasingly unlikely to approve a controversial bill to upgrade trade relations with Russia before the November elections, despite a push by the White House and U.S. business groups for votes this month. "I think practically speaking no one expects Congress to deal with (permanent normal trade relations) before the lame-duck" session after the elections, said Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, referring to the period between the November 6 congressional elections and the start of the new Congress in January, 2013. "I think there's a background fear that this will become a political football if the House moves forward," Hufbauer said. Congress is under pressure to lift a Cold War human rights provision known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment and approve "permanent normal trade relations," or PNTR, because of Russia's expected entry into the World Trade Organization in August. If it does not act, Russia could deny U.S. firms some of the market-opening concessions it made to join the WTO, putting those companies at a disadvantage to foreign competitors in one of the world's 10-largest economies. However, the push to pass the legislation comes at a low point in U.S.-Russia relations, with many U.S. lawmakers angry over Moscow's support for the government of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and questioning Russia's commitment to democracy and human rights. "Members are rightly concerned over recent developments in Russia, as well as Russia's policies with respect to Syria and Iran. This makes it incumbent upon the President to show leadership and for these issues to be addressed in a bipartisan fashion, enabling PNTR to move forward," a House Republican aide said.

#### Arctic activity is politically contentious – failure to ratify UNCLOS proves

SIPRI 12 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Kristopher Berg - researcher with the SIPRI Armed Conflict and Conflict Management Programme, “The Arctic Policies of Canada and the United States: Domestic Motives and International Context”, pg. 10, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, July 2012, http://www.scribd.com/doc/99895997/The-Arctic-policies-of-Canada-and-the-United-States-domestic-motives-and-international-context)

Much of the United States’ ambition in the Arctic is hampered by its inability to ratify the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).a The USA played an integral part in the negotiation of UNCLOS and, although an agreement on implementation that was acceptable to the US negotiators was reached in 1994, the US Senate has since failed to ratify the convention.b While the USA did not sign the agreement at the time of its negotiation because of the Department of the Interior’s strong feelings on seabed mining rights, it managed to omit the controversial deep-sea mining clause during negotiations in 1994. As the Arctic opens up and the USA begins to look north, more attention is given to the treaty and the stipulations under it that may allow the USA to expand its maritime territory along its extended continental shelf. Today, nearly all US maritime stakeholders, including the US Navy, the US Coast Guard and industry, as well as the administration, support ratification of UNCLOS. The US Senate’s Foreign Relations Committee also approves of the ratification of UNCLOS, having twice sent it to the full Senate, where the vote was blocked. Meanwhile, a handful of Republican senators oppose the convention on the grounds that it undermines US sovereignty, and they may seek to prevent the motion to ratify UNCLOS from reaching a vote on the Senate floor. Their opposition to the convention is, however, likely to be based on an ideo- logical desire to damage the current administration at any cost, rather than real concern over security or sovereignty. Even though the two-thirds majority that is needed in the Senate is likely to exist, the political costs associated with pursuing ratification are high for the already weakened administration of President Barack Obama. The ratification process for the 2010 Russian–US New START treaty proved that even a motion with broad bipartisan support can face difficulties in the current US political environment.c In May 2012, Senator John Kerry made a new push for the convention with strong support from the secretaries of State and Defense and the army chief of staff. Kerry plans to hold a series of senate hearings and hopes for a vote in the US Senate following the presidential elections in 2012.d In order to achieve ratification, Democrats must emphasize the existing biparti san support for the convention and depoliticize the issue. Republicans, for their part, must show statesmanship and responsibility, even at the cost of criticism from more conservative elements of their party.

SIPRI 12 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Kristopher Berg - researcher with the SIPRI Armed Conflict and Conflict Management Programme, “The Arctic Policies of Canada and the United States: Domestic Motives and International Context”, pg. 14, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, July 2012, http://www.scribd.com/doc/99895997/The-Arctic-policies-of-Canada-and-the-United-States-domestic-motives-and-international-context)

Both Alaskan senators have proposed a number of bills that remain stalled in the US Senate. Senator Mark Begitch has, among other things, proposed strengthening Alaska’s adaptation to climate change; better oil spill preven- tion and response; the implementation of the Arctic Council’s Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment; and the creation of a US Arctic ambassador, an idea opposed by the US State Department.66 Senator Lisa Murkowski is a vigorous proponent of UNCLOS and has proposed strengthening Arctic maritime infrastructure including new icebreakers and ports, and surveying the Arctic seabed for both safer transportation and delineation of the continental shelf.67 Murkowski was part of the US delegation at the April 2011 Arctic Council ministerial meeting.

#### Repeal is key to Relations

Gvosdev, 2-19-12 [Nikolas K., former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media. He is currently on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset]

The third is whether some of the new foundations in the U.S.-Russia relationship have solidified to the point that they can help weather the current storms. In contrast to the situation in 2008, there are now some important institutional connections in place. The Northern Distribution Network could represent enough ballast -- both in terms of the income generated for Russia and the safe route it offers the U.S. and NATO for the war effort in Afghanistan and for egress once the drawdown begins in the coming year -- to help prevent the relationship from veering out of control. The partnership between Exxon and Rosneft to develop both the Russian Arctic and additional projects in North America creates another set of incentives to keep ties on a level basis, as does the immense potential of a fully realized partnership between Russian and American firms in the nuclear power industry. American car manufacturers have found Russia to be a booming export market, while the U.S. space program is now dependent on Russia to ferry astronauts and cargo to maintain America’s manned presence in space. In short, there are a growing number of interests that depend on the preservation of healthy U.S.-Russia relations for their own success. But it is not yet clear whether they have sufficient clout to outweigh the naysayers on both sides. An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

#### US-Russia relations solve nuclear war and every major impact

Allison & Blackwill, ’11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin's decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation's interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia's cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran's drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### 2NC Links

#### Plan is politically unpopular

Seattle Times 11 (Kyung M. Song, Lawmakers confronting cold reality for pricey icebreakers, 10/9/11, http://byers.typepad.com/arctic/2011/10/lawmakers-confronting-cold-reality-for-pricey-icebreakers.html)

The Washington Democrat has co-sponsored a bill authored by Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, to prevent the service from decommissioning the Polar Sea before the Polar Star returns to service in 2013. The latter ship is undergoing a four-year, $57 million overhaul at Vigor Industrial (formerly Todd Shipyards) on Harbor Island. The work will add seven to 10 years to the ship's service. Cantwell argues that with a fleet containing only one currently working icebreaker, the Coast Guard can't afford to junk the Polar Sea, as decrepit as it may be. Constructing a new icebreaker could take a decade and as much as $1 billion, money that Congress is unlikely to approve anytime soon.

#### Tag me!

SIPRI 12 (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Kristopher Berg - researcher with the SIPRI Armed Conflict and Conflict Management Programme, “The Arctic Policies of Canada and the United States: Domestic Motives and International Context”, pg. 14, SIPRI Insights on Peace and Security, July 2012, http://www.scribd.com/doc/99895997/The-Arctic-policies-of-Canada-and-the-United-States-domestic-motives-and-international-context)

The chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator John Kerry, has also taken a personal interest in Arctic issues and pushed for the Senate to consent to the ratification of UNCLOS in 2009 and again in 2012.68 Some members of the US Senate remain opposed to the ratification of UNCLOS. Senator James Inhofe from the land-locked state of Oklahoma is one of its staunchest opponents and has, together with a handful of senators, twice successfully blocked the Senate from approving the ratification. They argue that, among other things, the convention undermines US sovereignty and allows an international body to tax the USA.69