**States CP – 1NC**

**Text: The 50 states should invest in high speed railroad transportation.  
  
Giving authority to the states would maximize solvency – best way to fund and manage**

**Edwards 11**

(Chris, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, November 16, 2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

The U.S. economy needs infrastructure, but state and local governments and the private sector are generally the best places to fund and manage it. The states should be the "laboratories of democracy" for infrastructure, and they should be able to innovate freely with new ways of financing and managing their roads, bridges, airports, seaports, and other facilities. It is true that — like the federal government — the states can make infrastructure mistakes. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country. If we ended federal involvement in high-speed rail, for example, California could continue to move ahead with its own system. Other states could wait and see how California's system was performing before putting their own taxpayers on the hook.

**1NC Shell**

**Jackson-Vanik will be repealed now**

Sorensen 6-27

By Loretta Sorensen, Midwest Producer. “Vilsack: Repeal Jackson-Vanik amendment or lose trade with Russia.” Posted: Wednesday, June 27, 2012 12:16 pm on Midwest Producer. http://www.midwestproducer.com/news/markets/vilsack-repeal-jackson-vanik-amendment-or-lose-trade-with-russia/article\_dc5cff3e-c07b-11e1-a016-0019bb2963f4.html.

If Congress fails to act before mid-August in repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, American farmers, ranchers and producers could lose a significant opportunity to capture market share for American agriculture products when Russia joins the World Trade Organization (WTO) this fall. In an interview with Midwest Producer, USDA Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack noted that delaying the repeal doesn't make good business sense or common sense. "Every one of our 100 legislators has a 'beef' if you will with Russia," Vilsack said. "It may be in regard to intellectual property, Internet issues, Russia's approach to Syria or any other of a host of issues. They're using this discussion (about Jackson-Vanik) as a vehicle for having all these other discussions which have nothing to do with trade. This is not the time nor the place to inject all these issues that have nothing to do with exports. "We saw a 70 percent increase in U.S. beef sales to Russia in the past 12 months," Vilsack added. "There's obviously a desire and an interest in purchasing American products. If we lose this opportunity, it will be difficult and take time to regain the lost market share." The Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 was implemented to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration of Soviet Jews, prisoners of conscience and victims of religious persecution. The legislation required the U.S. to enact annual certification of Russia's full compliance with the Jackson-Vanik amendment. With the collapse of the Soviet Union two decades ago, freedom of emigration became a reality for all citizens. If the amendment remains in place, the U.S. is the only country that will not be able to take full advantage of reduced tariffs, quotas and access to Russian markets once Russia completes the requirements for WTO membership. "Russian membership in the WTO is a good thing for the U.S.," Vilsack said. "Russia gains very little through repeal of the legislation. We gain far better access to Russian markets and a much leveler playing field to compete with other countries that will try to sell ag products to Russia." In December 2011, trade ministers at the 8th Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization celebrated conclusion of 18 years of negotiations for Russia to agree to comply with WTO requirements. Russia was then invited to become the 154th WTO member. In the process of approving Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia, Congress must pass a short and simple bill that grants Russia PNTR status and repeals Jackson-Vanik. Failure to do so will mean the U.S. will be in violation of WTO rules once Russia becomes a WTO member. Through Russia's WTO membership, Moscow will be required to enact a host of economic reforms that will further open the Russian market to U.S. goods and services and provide a process for addressing any future unfair or unsupported trade barriers that might arise. In an address to the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance on June 21, 2012, Vilsack noted that the USDA strongly supports establishing PNTR with Russia and ensuring that Russia remains one of the U.S. top export markets as it joins WTO. "PNTR is not a favor to Russia," Vilsack said. "It is a significant opportunity for America's farmers, ranchers and producers. It will provide improved, predictable access to Russia's 140 million consumers and an expanding middle class that has grown by more than 50 percent in the last decade." Vilsack explained that the U.S. has been extending market access to Russia since 1992 on an annual basis. U.S. agricultural exports to Russia in fiscal year 2011 were nearly $1.4 billion, contributing significantly to the U.S. agricultural trade surplus. The U.S. imported only $25 million of agricultural products from Russia in 2011. As part of its WTO membership agreement, Russia will reduce tariffs on a number of agricultural products. Soybean tariffs will be at zero. For soybean meal, tariffs will be reduced from 5 percent to 2.5 percent. Maximum bound tariffs on most cheeses will drop from 25 percent to 15 percent within three years. Russia's duties are already relatively low for many fruits and tree nuts, but those rates will be bound and, in many cases, reduced substantially within a few years of accession. Through the Russian WTO membership, U.S. farmers will have more certain and predictable market access, Russia will be obligated to apply its trade regime in a manner consistent with WTO rules, and they will be obligated to follow detailed rules governing transparency in development of trade policies and measures. Compliance with Russia's obligations will be enforceable through use of the WTO dispute settlement process. "I believe Jackson-Vanik will be repealed," Vilsack said. "There is bipartisan support for the repeal. I believe members of Congress realize farmers, ranchers and producers will be at a serious disadvantage if the repeal doesn't happen. We can't cede that much territory to our competitors."

High speed rail unpopular

Freemark ’11(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 8th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/08/the-white-house-stakes-its-political-capital-on-a-massive-intercity-rail-plan/)

The White House Stakes Its Political Capital on a Massive Intercity Rail Plan $53 billion proposed for investments over the next six years. The President wants to “Win the Future,” but will his Republican opponents relax their opposition to rail spending? Vice President Joe Biden spoke in Philadelphia this morning to announce that the Obama Administration intends to request from Congress $8 billion in federal funds for the advancement of a national high-speed rail system as part of a six-year transportation reauthorization bill. The White House’s commitment to fast trains has been evident throughout the Administration’s two-year lifespan, beginning with the addition of $8 billion for the mode in the 2009 stimulus bill and continued with $2.5 billion included in the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. Yet this new funding, which would add up to $53 billion over the six-year period, is remarkable for its ambition. It is clear that President Obama’s 2012 re-election campaign, already being framed in terms of “winning the future,” will hinge partially on whether voters agree with his assessment of the importance of investing in the nation’s rail transport infrastructure. In his speech, Mr. Biden argued that American wealth was founded on “out-building” the competition. Infrastructure, he noted, is the “veins and the arteries of commerce.” The President and his team will be making this case to the American people the next two years, hoping that the public comes to endorse this message of national advancement through construction. Whether the proposal — to be laid out in more detail with next week’s introduction the President’s full proposed FY 2012 budget — has any chance of success is undoubtedly worth questioning. Republicans have campaigned wholeheartedly against rail improvement projects in Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin; even Florida’s project, which would require no operating subsidies once in service, hangs in the balance. But as part of the larger transportation reauthorization legislation, which is apparently slated to move forward by this summer, a real expansion in high-speed rail funding seems possible, especially if Mr. Obama pressures the Democratic-controlled Senate to push hard for it.

**Political Capital is key to balance the fight within the agenda**

Stokes, ’11 [Bruce Stokes January 26, 2011 An Agenda, If You Can Keep It <http://nationaljournal.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/member/daily/an-agenda-if-you-can-keep-it-20110126?mrefid=site_search>]

After years of relative quiescence, Congress actually has a trade agenda in 2011: possible votes on the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and on Russia’s application to join the World Trade Organization. Whether, when, how, and which elements of this agenda will be completed will largely depend on political calculations in the White House and on Capitol Hill. “The first question,” observed William Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, “is, how many of these fights does the administration want to have?” At the top of the list will be the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which President Obama made his own by arm-wrestling the South Koreans for fixes to benefit the American auto industry. Now, that it has the support of Ford and the United Auto Workers, most observers agree that the deal with South Korea has sufficient votes for passage. And Obama has said he wants Congress to act on it by June. But the business community also wants action on the Colombia and Panama agreements negotiated by the George W. Bush administration. “From our perspective,” said Calman Cohen, president of the Emergency Committee for American Trade, “they are like three children. We want them all to go forward.” Congressional GOP leaders agree. “I strongly believe that we should consider all three agreements in the next six months,” House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said at a trade hearing this week. Objections to the Panama accord, based on tax and labor issues, seem to pose no major obstacles. Organized labor continues to highlight the murders of union organizers in Colombia and other labor-rights abuses there, but Ways and Means ranking member Sander Levin, D-Mich., a longtime critic of Colombia’s record on these issues, suggested in testimony this week that some accommodation might be possible. “I believe there is now an opportunity for the two governments to work together mutually to achieve real progress on the ground,” he said. Republican leaders in Congress have talked of voting on all three trade deals, possibly one right after the other, to facilitate the legislative calendar and, the administration suspects, to aggravate divisions among Democrats. Parliamentarians, meanwhile, will have to decide if fast-track negotiating authority still applies to the Colombia agreement. Because Congress failed to act on it when it was first submitted, the fast-track authority for the deal expired. This is not a problem in the House, where Republicans control the Rules Committee, but it is in the Senate, where fast-track is needed to facilitate a vote. Business lobbyists think that the Korea deal could move by itself before the August recess but that doing all three together will take considerably more time, contrary to Camp’s ambitions. Members of the business community are less sanguine about legislation blessing Russia’s application to join the WTO, where membership can be held up by any current member. Georgia has yet to give its assent to Russia’s application, which might make the need for U.S. action moot. To give Moscow the green light, Congress would have to accord Russia most-favored-nation trading status, thus granting it the lowest possible U.S. tariffs. That, in turn, requires waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 trade act, effectively acknowledging that emigration from Russia is no longer a U.S. concern. Although Washington has no complaints about Russian emigration policy, Jackson-Vanik has long been seen as useful leverage over Moscow that many in Congress may be loath to relinquish. Capitol Hill staffers warn that passage of Russian WTO membership will be an uphill fight. Moscow has few champions in Congress, where Senate debate late last year over the New START deal demonstrated deep-seated suspicion among conservatives. Russia’s piracy of intellectual property and its past use of health and safety standards to bar the importation of U.S. poultry have also soured business interests. Buyers’ remorse over China’s admission to the WTO fuels congressional reluctance to make the same mistake twice. And Moscow’s past history of quixotic actions—cutting off gas to Ukraine, for example—makes advocates of WTO membership wary of going out on a limb only to have Moscow cut it off. Moscow is anxious to join the WTO, however, and membership is a key element in the administration’s “reset” of U.S.-Russia relations. Moreover, a Russia that is subject to international rules and dispute settlement might be better than a Russia operating outside the law. Ever since the financial crisis began in 2008, Russia has been one of the most frequent instigators of protectionist trade practices. WTO membership could help discipline such behavior. Veterans of past trade battles on Capitol Hill advise that the administration might have to give Congress something to vote for—some new oversight or restraint—to ease the pain of voting to waive Jackson-Vanik. When China was granted admission to the WTO, for example, Congress created a commission to report on Beijing’s human-rights record. After two years of relegating divisive trade issues to the back burner, in 2011 the administration now has a legislative trade agenda. The question is how much political capital it is willing to invest to get it through Congress. The White House can anticipate hand-to-hand combat in budget negotiations with Republicans over discretionary spending. Such conflict will unavoidably preoccupy administration strategists, who may want to husband their resources for more electorally attractive issues. Congress could accomplish a fair amount on trade this year, but doing so could be an uphill slog.

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.

**AT: Economy**

**1. HSR is less efficient than airlines – it won’t solve congestion**

**Barro 6/25**

(Josh Barro, “Future of high-speed travel is air, not rail”, JUNE 25, 2012, http://bostonglobe.com/opinion/2012/06/24/future-high-speed-travel-air-not-rail/K38lewkqpV0RM3ZvyYphiN/story.html)

High-speed rail, long considered the future of fast medium-distance travel, is in trouble. California’s grand plan for a statewide high-speed network is mired in cost overruns and may never be built. New Jersey has cancelled a planned tunnel under the Hudson River, which would have cleared a key bottleneck in the Northeast Corridor. Straightening out the slow, curvy rail corridor between Boston and New York would be hugely expensive and take years. But there is another option for expanding our intercity transportation capacity at much lower cost: reform of our nation’s airports and airways. By changing the way we charge airlines to use airports, we can get a lot more travel out of the infrastructure we already have — and reduce fares and delays while we’re at it.

**2. Even if they solve congestion, it’s only in a few large cities; the railways wouldn’t connect smaller-mid sized cities that are also a source of economic growth.**

**3. Airlines solve congestion better**

**Barro 6/25**

(Josh Barro, “Future of high-speed travel is air, not rail”, JUNE 25, 2012, http://bostonglobe.com/opinion/2012/06/24/future-high-speed-travel-air-not-rail/K38lewkqpV0RM3ZvyYphiN/story.html)

The results are absurd. Between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m on a typical Monday, there are 26 scheduled flights from the New York area to the Chicago area. That’s a flight every seven minutes — more frequent than many subway lines. Some of those flights use planes with as few as 75 seats. The situation might not seem as dire at Logan Airport, which isn’t subject to slot controls. But Boston travelers, who suffer as delays in New York radiate outward, would still benefit greatly from reform. Better systems for slotting and pricing would charge essentially flat fees, with only a modest upcharge by weight to account for wear and tear on runways. This would encourage airlines to operate larger planes, fewer times a day. Suddenly, “at capacity” airports like New York’s LaGuardia would be able to serve more passengers with fewer aircraft movements. Even more air capacity can be added by modernizing our air traffic control systems. Planes can get stuck in “traffic” in the wide-open sky because controllers on the ground must move them along pre-defined routes. Air traffic control upgrades are ongoing, but they are moving slowly; repricing airport access could generate more revenue to speed up the job. So why haven’t we done it already? One reason is that the airlines have been resistant to change. The slot system allows incumbent airlines to keep competitors out. Yet fixing all these inefficiencies won’t just help travelers; it’s also a boon to taxpayers. The argument for high-speed rail is that we can’t squeeze more capacity out of our airports: that we need to move Boston-New York passengers onto trains so that Logan can be used for long-distance flights. But we can get more out of Logan as well as LaGuardia without spending countless billions on new infrastructure — if only we are smarter about how we price scarce space.

**4. The jobs from the plan are only short term – as soon as construction is done, economic growth will halt again.**

**5. Cars will always be the main source of transport – HSR won’t change anything**

**Davies 10**

(Professor Dr. Alan Davies, Urban planner, University of Melbourne. ABC Unleashed. " Common Urban Myths About Transport" http://www.ptua.org.au/myths/popular.shtml.)

Taking Melbourne as a case study, behavioural data shows that most travellers prefer to travel by car and consequently public transport carries less than 10 per cent of all motorised trips within the metropolitan area.... Travellers value their time highly and are prepared to pay for convenienceIt is almost always easier to use the car for the various demands of modern life, like dropping the kids off at childcare on the way to work, shopping at the supermarket, visiting mum and dad on the other side of town, commuting to work in the suburbs or going to dinner or the movies.

**AT: Warming**

**1. They can’t solve for warming – countries like Russia and China will continue to emit greenhouse gases.**

**2. Nuclear war turns warming – it’s infinitely worse**

**Hoffman ’06**

[Ian, Oakland Tribune Staff Writer, Dec 12, “Nuclear Winter looms, experts say,” http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qn4176/is\_20061212/ai\_n16906378; DOA:6-29-12]

"Nuclear weapons represent the greatest single human threat to the planet, much more so than global warming," said Rutgers University atmospheric scientist Alan Robock. By dropping imaginary Hiroshima-sized bombs into some of the world's biggest cities, now swelled to tens of millions in population, University of Colorado researcher O. Brian Toon and colleagues found they could generate 100 times the fatalities and 100 times the climate-chilling smoke per kiloton of explosive power as all-out nuclear war between the United States and former Soviet Union. For most modern nuclear-war scenarios, the global impact isn't nuclear winter, the notion of smoke from incinerated cities blotting out the sun for years and starving most of the Earth's people. It's not even nuclear autumn, but rather an instant nuclear chill over most of the planet, accompanied by massive ozone loss and warming at the poles.

**3. Warming is key to prevent an ice age & extinction**

**Hoyle and Wickramashinge ‘1**

Fred and Chandra, School of Mathematics @ Cardiff U., Astrophysics and Space Science, “Cometary Impacts and Ice-Ages”, Vol. 275, No. 4, March, Springer

The 18O/16O analysis of Greenland ice cores shows that an immense melting of glacier ice began about 13,000 years ago and was essentially completed within a millenium. But this information is slow-moving in time, although it possesses the great merit of being of world-wide significance. On a more restricted geographical scale, fossil insect records show that the summer temperature in Britain rose by 10oC or more in as little as 50 years, an essentially decisive indication of a catastrophic event as its cause. The fossil insect record also shows that a second catastrophic event of a similar nature occurred 10,000 years ago, again with a major temperature rise in only a few decades. It is therefore cometary impacts that we must thank for the equable spell of climate in which human history and civilisation has prospered so spectacularly. The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world's major food-growing areas inoperable, and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. Since bolide impacts cannot be called up to order, we must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating. 5. Conclusions Ice-age conditions are dry and cold, the local temperature being reduced over the entire Earth. The high atmosphere probably had a haze of small ice crystals while the lower atmosphere was dusty. Such conditions were stable, capable of persisting until a large bolide hit one of the major oceans. The water then thrown high into the stratosphere provided a large temporary greenhouse effect, but sufficient to produce a warming of the world ocean down to a depth of a few hundred metres. It is this warming that maintains the resulting interglacial period. The interglacial climate possesses only neutral equilibrium however. It experiences random walk both up and down, until a situation arises in which the number of steps downward become sufficient for the Earth to fall back into the ice-age trap. Thereafter only a further large bolide impact can produce a departure from the grey, drab iceage conditions. This will be so in the future unless Man finds an effective way to maintain a suitably large greenhouse effect.

**4. They don’t get enough cars of the road to solve for warming – their evidence indicates that at best it would be a 30%, not near enough to get rid of warming.**

5. Climate Change is inevitable

**Walker ‘8, PhD, and King**

(Gabrielle, PhD in Chemistry, Sir David, Professor @ Oxford and Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment at the University of Oxford, and a senior scientific adviser to UBS, The Hot Topic, pg. 47)

Most people have now realized that climate change is upon us. If pushed, most would probably also say that if we don’t do something to change the way we live, things are likely to get worse. But few seem to have noticed one of the most important points to emerge from the last few years of scientific projections. All the evidence suggests that the world will experience significant and potentially highly dangerous changes in climate over the next few decades no matter what we do now.

**6. Heat waves would happen even without warming**

**Michaels and Balling ‘9**

(Patrick, professor of environmental sciences @ The University of Virginia and a senior fellow in the environmental studies at the CATO institute; Robert, professor in the climatology program in the School of Geographical Sciences at @ASU. “Climate of Extremes: Global Warming Science They Don’t Want You to Know” pgs 178-180)

Chase et al. also examined the trends in the data over the 25 years and reported:” Analyses do not provide strong support for the idea that regional heat or cold waves are significantly increasing or decreasing with time during the period considered here (1979-2003).” In other words, heat waves like the one in Europe in 2003 can and will occur by chance even if temperature does not rise or the variability of temperature does not change. There is no question that the heat wave of 2003 was a natural disaster in Europe with a substantial loss of human life. Europe was not prepared for an even that, from a purely statistical view point, was inevitable, with or without global warming.