# Round 5 vs. Wake CD (Aff)

## 1AC

#### Same as round 4.

## 2AC

### Deterrence

#### Prefer our evidence on the question of nuclear war – none of their impact evidence has quantitative studies like nuclear peace theory.

Rauchhaus ‘9

[Rauchhaus, “Evaluating the Nuclear Peace Hypothesis: A Quantitative Approach,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2/5/09 jcr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/53/2/258>]

In recent years, neo-liberal explanations of the Long Peace have received the most rigorous empirical scrutiny. 7 Realist explanations including the distribution of power, system polarity, and alliance systems have also received considerable attention. 8 Surprisingly, the nuclear peace hypothesis—one of the central tenants of realist explanations for the Long Peace— has received relatively little quantitative scrutiny. Scholars have employed case studies, counterfactual analysis, and formalized their arguments with game theory, but, with the exception of this issue (Gartzke and Jo, Horowitz, Beardsley and Asal, This issue), only a handful of studies have attempted to quantitatively evaluate the effects of nuclear weapons (Bueno de Mesquita and Riker 1982; Geller 1990; Asal and Beardsley 2007). Moreover, previous quantitative studies have exclusively focused on the relationship between nuclear weapons and crises, or between nuclear weapons and dispute escalation. The relationship between nuclear weapons and the probability of war remains quantitatively untested. The central purpose of this paper is to offer an empirical answer to the question: do nuclear weapons reduce the probability of war? To answer this question, this project borrows 3 heavily from the last 15 years of work on democratic peace theory (DPT). Beginning with Maoz and Russett (1993), the dyadic DPT research design has been reproduced in dozens of articles and survived peer review in nearly every leading journal of political science and international relations. Building on Pevehouse and Russett (2006) and using the same key “control” variables, this study incorporates new data that allow for the quantitative evaluation of the nuclear peace hypothesis. The results presented below indicate that the impact of nuclear weapons is more complicated than is conventionally appreciated. Both proliferation optimists (Waltz 1981) and proliferation pessimists (Sagan 1994) find confirmation of some of their key claims. As proliferation optimists contend, when two states possess nuclear weapons, the odds of war drop precipitously. However, in most other respects, proliferation pessimists find vindication of their position. In disputes where only one of two parties posses nuclear weapons, there is an increased chance of war. Moreover, nuclear weapons are generally associated higher likelihoods of crises, uses of force, and conflicts involving lower-levels of casualties. The findings of this article are consistent with the larger themes of the special issue, demonstrating that nuclear possession can enhance the security of their possessors by shifting conflict to the lower end of the intensity spectrum.

### Warming

#### Mathematical models agree with us – climate-induced biodiversity loss leads to sixth mass extinction.

Bellard et al 2012

[Ce ́line Bellard, Cleo Bertelsmeier, Paul Leadley, Wilfried Thuiller and Franck Courchamp, “Impacts of climate change on the future of Biodiversity,” Ecology Letters, 15: 365–377, online]

Ecologists are developing a better understanding of the mechanisms by which species and ecosystems can be impacted by climate change. The timing of species’ life cycle events is expected to be further altered, species distributions will change radically, trophic networks will be affected and ecosystem functioning may be severely impaired, leading in the worst cases to countless species extinctions. Over the past decades, some of this understanding has been effectively translated into mathematical models that can be used to forecast climate change impacts on species distributions, abundance and extinctions. These models are characterised by their high diversity of underlying structures and assumptions, with predictions differing greatly depending on the models used and species studied. Most of these models indicate alarming consequences for biodiversity with worst-case scenarios leading to extinction rates that would qualify as the sixth mass extinction in the history of the earth (Barnosky et al. 2011).

#### Best studies conclude no natural ice age coming for 10,000 years

Revkin 8 (Andrew C. Revkenm, Environment reporter, 2008, “Skeptics on human climate impact seize on cold spell, NEW YORK TIMES, Lexis)

Despite the recent trend toward global warming, scientists have long wondered whether the Earth is nearing a new ice age, an end to the 12,000-year temperate spell in which civilizations arose. Some have said such a transition is overdue, given that each of the three temperate intervals that immediately preceded this current one lasted only about 10,000 years. But now, in an eagerly awaited study, a group of climate and ice experts say they have new evidence that Earth is not even halfway through the current warm era. The evidence comes from the oldest layers of Antarctic ice ever sampled. Some scientists earlier proposed similar hypotheses, basing them on the configuration of Earth's orbit, which seems to set the metronome that ice ages dance to. Temperature patterns deciphered in sea sediments in recent years backed the theory. But experts say the new ice data are by far the strongest corroborating evidence, revealing many similarities between today's atmospheric and temperature patterns and those of a warm interval, with a duration of 28,000 years, that reached its peak 430,000 years ago. The findings are described Thursday in the journal Nature in a report by the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica. The evidence comes from a shaft of ice extracted over five grueling years from Antarctica's deep-frozen innards, composed of thousands of ice layers formed as each year's snowfall was compressed over time. The deepest ice retrieved so far comes from 10,000 feet deep and dates back 740,000 years. The relative abundance of certain forms of hydrogen in the ice reflects past air temperatures. Many ice cores have been cut from various glaciers and ice sheets around the world, but until now none have gone back beyond 420,000 years. "It's very exciting to see ice that fell as snow three-quarters of a million years ago," said Dr. Eric Wolff, an author of the paper and ice core expert with the British Antarctic Survey.

### Airborne Wind CP

#### Perm do both.

#### Links to politics. Pushing renewables is unpopular and partisan.

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

#### Can’t solve for warming. Two warrants. 1.) Nuclear reprocessing is necessary in the interim to make nuclear act as a bridge fuel so that we can QUICKLY avoid tipping fuels associated with warming. That’s 1AC Chakravorty. 2.) Renewable tech is not progressing fast enough right now, meaning that nuclear is necessary to hedge our short-term portfolio. That’s Harvey.

#### Can’t solve advantage two. Renewable investment won’t lead to reprocessing which is necessary to increase the domestic stockpile of tritium.

#### Wind power increases emissions – volatility reduces efficiency of conventional plants

Hawkins 10 (Kent, holds electrical engineering degrees from Royal Military College of Canada and Queen’s University, “Subsidizing CO2 Emissions via Windpower: The Ultimate Irony”, <http://www.masterresource.org/2010/06/subsidizing-co2-emissions/>, Acc: 8/1/12, og)

The two studies and calculator results demonstrate that claimed CO2 emissions are not reduced, but are increased, with the introduction of wind plants, and a straight substitution of gas for coal production is a far superior strategy. This is by no means the last word, as all three analysis approaches call for comprehensive and objective studies, based on complete information, to confirm these findings.¶ Point of Zero Fossil Fuel and Emissions Savings¶ The Netherlands study shows that the point where CO2 emissions overall become negative occurs at about 2% efficiency reduction across the fossil fuel fleet and corresponds to about 3% wind penetration. This is shown in Figure 2 which is reproduced from the Netherlands study. ΔF is the change in fossil fuel consumption and ΔR is the percent reduction in efficiency of the total fossil fuel fleet.¶ If the wind proponents are right and ΔR is zero, then ΔF is approximately 1.00 GWy. Therefore the fossil fuel consumption of 18.45 GWy as shown in Table 2 of the Netherlands study would be 18.45-1.00 = 17.45 GWy. That is to say, in theory the introduction of wind saves 1.00 GWy, but at ΔR of 2% gives this back due to the inefficient operation of the fossil fuel plants. Therefore the typical wind proponent claim is that the 1.00 GWy would be saved and the percentage saving is about 1.00/17.45, or 5.7%. Compare this to the calculated wind proponent claim of 6.3% for the Netherlands in Figure 1.¶ However theoretically possible, this has been demonstrated by Colorado and Texas experience not to be the case. Further, increases in the efficiency loss for the fossil fuel fleet above 2% will result in increased fossil fuel consumption (negative ΔF), and hence CO2 emissions, again as shown by the Colorado and Texas experience. Such increases in efficiency loss could be caused by:¶ Increased wind penetration¶ Increased wind volatility which may occur between jurisdictions and from year to year.¶ This report, sponsored by the Independent Producers Association of Mountain States, ¶ concludes that the emissions benefits of renewable energy are not being realized as planned ¶ based on examination of four years of Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCO) ¶ operational history. Integrating erratic and unpredictable wind resources with established coal ¶ and natural gas generation resources requires PSCO to cycle its coal and natural gas-fired ¶ plants.¶ 3¶ Cycling coal plants to accommodate wind generation makes the plants operate ¶ inefficiently, which drives up emissions. Moreover, when they are not operated consistently at ¶ their designed temperatures, the variability causes problems with the way they interact with ¶ their associated emission control technologies, frequently causing erratic emission behavior ¶ that can last for several hours before control is regained. Ironically, using wind to a degree ¶ that forces utilities to temporarily reduce their coal generation results in greater SO2, NOX and ¶ CO2 than would have occurred if less wind energy were generated and coal generation were ¶ not impacted.

#### Conditionality is a voting issue – being able to kick positions at will destroys argumentative responsibility, skews the 2AC, the focal point of all aff offense, because we have to spend more time answering things than they do kicking them, and justifies aff conditionality to be reciprocal. Counter interpretation is dispositionality. Allows us to stick them to positions. Solves all their offense.

#### Wind power can’t displace conventional fuels

Kielisch 9 (Kurt, President, Appraisal Group One, “WIND TURBINE IMPACT STUDY”, <http://docs.wind-watch.org/AGO-WIND-TURBINE-IMPACT-STUDY.pdf>, Acc: 7/31/12, og)

The increased use of wind power in Germany has resulted in uncontrollable fluctuations ¶ in generation due to the random character of wind power feed-in. This significantly increases ¶ the demands placed on the control balancing process and increases grid costs. Their massive ¶ increase of new wind farms in recent years has greatly increased their need for fossil-fueled ¶ reserve capacity.¶ 185,186¶ As wind power generating capacity increases, its ability to displace conventional sources ¶ decreases. Wind power is essentially adding surplus capacity rather than replacing ¶ conventional plants. One-third of the time, widespread wind power facilities in the U.K. (which ¶ boasts the best wind resource in Europe) would be producing at less than 14% of the turbines’ ¶ capacity.

#### Plan sends the key signal to jumpstart cooperation with Russia—they’ll say yes.

Rojansky, deputy director Russia and Eurasia Program at Carnegie, ‘10

[Matthew, “As New START Debate Rages, Quiet Nuclear Progress With Russia”, U.S. News and World Report, 12-9-2010,

http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/12/09/as-new-start-debate-rages-quiet-nuclear-progress-with-russia]

Beyond benefiting relations, cooperation on peaceful nuclear energy makes financial sense. The United States and Russia have invested substantially in civilian nuclear research and development, and both share basic interests in capitalizing on the global "nuclear energy renaissance" by developing proliferation-resistant reactor technologies, increasing environmental safety, and making nuclear energy more economically competitive. And when it comes to civil nuclear power, Russia brings a lot to the table. For instance, the United States does not operate so-called "fast breeder" reactors and reprocessing facilities that don't produce nuclear waste that can be used for weapons, but Russia does. And, while the United States hasn't built a single new n uclear power plant since 1973, Russia opened its first fast breeder reactor that very year and plans to bring 26 new nuclear facilities online before 2030. And the Kremlin has already allocated some $3.6 billion for research on fast breeders and other projects under a program dedicated to the next generation of nuclear technology. With U.S. support, Russia has developed a sophisticated infrastructure to securely store spent nuclear fuel—and Moscow even offered to store and reprocess spent fuel from the United States, while no American state has been willing to do the same. Russian companies already supply roughly half of the uranium consumed in U.S. and European power plants and will need to supply more in the future as the United States is only able to produce a fifth—at most—of its nuclear fuel stock domestically. Fortunately, Russia's nuclear industry is interested in expanding its uranium enrichment and reprocessing activity in the U.S. market and potentially cooperating with American firms, including GE and Westinghouse, on bids for contracts in other countries. Closer U.S.-Russia cooperation on nuclear power means better nuclear security. As a major player in civil nuclear markets worldwide, Russia has a unique window into potential risks and opportunities to insist on measures that protect sensitive sites and technologies. Russia, with U.S. support, also has the chance to compete more effectively with China's nuclear industry, which is less scrupulous in its nonproliferation commitments. The importance of partnering with Russia was made clear during Secretary Clinton's recent trip to Central Asia. Belarus, the former Soviet republic, agreed to give up its stock of highly enriched uranium by 2012 in return for U.S. help in developing a new nuclear power reactor. But Russia has had its eye on this potentially lucrative project, and has the right experience to work effectively with Belarus's Soviet-era infrastructure. Washington should cooperate—instead of compete—with Moscow to build an environmentally safe, proliferation-proof reactor in Belarus. A quarter century after the Chernobyl disaster, this would be a powerful symbol that both sides can move beyond the Cold War legacy.

#### Effective relations solve nuclear war

Lukyanov ’11

(Fyodor, editor-in-chief of Russia in Global Politics magazine, “Nuclear destruction remains the basis of relations”, The Telegraph, 1-5-2011, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/opinion/8241050/Nuclear-destruction-remains-the-basis-of-Russia-US-relations.html)

When President Dmitry Medvedev warned in his latest state-of-the-nation address that a new arms race could begin in the next decade, the hall erupted in applause. No wonder. For many of the Russian senators in the audience, that term calls to mind their younger years, something pleasant in and of itself. Added to which many people on both sides of the Atlantic, it seems, sorely miss those “good old days” when everything was clear: two worlds, two systems, and explicit rules of the game.¶ One finds oneself thinking of the advantages of a systemic confrontation, given the political and legal free-for-all into which the planet has been sinking ever since.¶ But reminiscences aside, what did the president mean? And we should consider that Prime Minister Vladimir Putin also said in his recent interview with Larry King that an arms race would lead not only to the failure of the anti-missile defence shield but also to the non-ratification of Start II. The latter is doubtful: that agreement is not of such calibre. But as for the anti-missile defences, Moscow’s logic is understandable.¶ The question remains: can Russia and the US break the vicious circle of mutual nuclear containment, or will this type of relationship, frankly absurd today, be preserved in future?¶ Whatever Moscow and Washington do, the material and technological basis of their relations remains not simply restraint, but Mutually Assured Destruction. Another use for the vast arsenals they amassed up to the late Eighties simply does not exist. No international problem requires such a quantity of nuclear charges and missiles. The political logic of that period has long since lost its force; the whole world has changed. But you can’t argue with weapons: the logic of arsenals still dictates, no matter how often Russia and the United States reiterate that they no longer see each other as adversaries.¶ A quick liquidation of stockpiles will not be achieved. First of all, strategic nuclear forces are mainly political weapons and a matter of status. No one will simply give these up. This is especially true of Russia, which no longer has any other features of a superpower. And, judging by discussions underway in Washington, idealists there are being squeezed on all sides, too.¶ Second, one needs at the very least a qualitatively different level of trust between Russia and the United States; the first shoots that appeared during the “reset” may very soon be trampled.¶ And finally, the time when these two giants set the tone in the nuclear sphere has long since past. Proliferation goes on, quietly. China’s nuclear arsenal, though only a fraction of Russia’s and America’s, is becoming an increasingly important factor in that country’s growing influence. Neither Washington nor Moscow can allow the other to be in the same “league” with Beijing because then the counterweights to its influence would be even less.¶ Nevertheless, the needlessness of assured destruction is obvious, and this situation must be somehow overcome. The only way is a gradual rapprochement in the strategic sphere which will make the nuclear containment of Russia and the United States an anachronism. And for this, joint work on anti-missile defences would be ideal. If this is undertaken in earnest, sooner or later it will become apparent that missiles aimed at each other are patently absurd given that the “adversaries” are building a joint shield. This is a long, hard road, the success of which, though not guaranteed, is none the less possible. Especially when one realises the real threats facing both countries in the 21st century.¶ On the other hand, it’s obvious what will happen if, in the sphere of anti-missile defence, nothing comes together and they each go their own way. In that case, the old type of relations will inevitably recur since that same nuclear rubicon will be preserved. An American missile defence system would be built against any other country possessing missile potential, including, of course, Russia – even if Russia were not the main object. Moscow would then automatically begin searching for ways of overcoming that anti-missile shield.¶ No one will abolish mutual nuclear deterrence as the basis of balance so long as the two nuclear superpowers are not engaged in a common cause. All of this goes beyond the bounds of rational argument, but the burden of arsenals aimed at one another will continue to return us to the confrontation of 30 years ago, even if in a farcical form.¶ One must not forget that all this is a game of nerves. These gigantic arsenals are inapplicable; the anti-missile system is virtual since most likely it will never be created. The paradox is that the political effect of the idea of an anti-missile shield is more than real since it touches the heart of the problem of strategic stability.¶ To imagine an arms race of the classic kind that existed in the latter half of the 20th century is impossible. The entire developed world is too concerned with budget deficits and national debt: in reality these problems represent a far greater threat to stability than do any classic threats. True, in that situation nuclear weapons regain the significance they seemed to be losing. Meanwhile, Nato’s just-published strategic conception clearly states that nuclear weapons, primarily American, are that alliance’s supreme guarantee of security. So say goodbye to a non-nuclear world. And in the United States, where only recently there was talk of investing in hi-tech conventional weapons of a new generation, cost estimates now show that preserving the nuclear component would be cheaper.¶ Be that as it may, anti-missile defence represents a fork in the road: one way leads to a new system of relations between Russia and the United States, with both sides ceasing to view the other as a strategic threat; the other leads back to a model of the Cold War – albeit a wittingly senseless one.

### NNSA Tradeoff DA

#### NNSA is actually terrible and incapable of solving anything – government review – also their cards explaining why they’ve failed are Michael Scott-level excuses

Oak Ridge Environmental Alliance 12 [Sep 11, 2012, “OREPA calls for Abolition of NNSA, cites numerous government”, nonprofit organization, Larry Coleman, Shelley Wascom, Barbara Hickey, President, government watchdog organization]

The National Nuclear Security Administration, responsible for managing the nation’s nuclear weapons stockpile and the facilities which engineer, design, produce and test nuclear warheads, has failed to provide significant “value added” to the federal government since its founding in 2000. Instead, NNSA management incompetence has resulted in massive budget overruns and consistent failure to meet schedules on major construction projects. NNSA failure to provide rigorous oversight of operating contractors at weapons sites has led to breakdowns in basic security operations. NNSA has been the target of remarkable criticisms by the General Accounting Office and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, including a remarkable summary of mismanagement on safety, funding, contractor oversight, and project management incompetence released on Tuesday, September 12, 2012 by the GAO in its testimony before Congress. Aside from an occasional personnel shuffle and a rigorous effort to shift blame to contractors, NNSA’s response to criticisms is consistently, “We get it now, we’re compiling lessons learned, we’ll do better.”

#### Disease can’t cause extinction – it’s genetically impossible

Richard Posner, Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Chicago, judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, January 1, 2005**,** Skeptic, “Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them,” <http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract>

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

#### NNSA tradeoff is inevitable – can’t attract young workers and no qualified applicants.

Walker, Contributor, ‘12

[Molly, “NNSA could soon face workforce gaps but struggles to monitor them”, 5-1-12,

http://www.fiercegovernment.com/story/nnsa-could-soon-face-workforce-gaps-struggles-monitor-them/2012-05-01]

The National Nuclear Security Administration and the contractors who operate the national lab sites for NNSA may soon face a workforce shortage, according to an April 26 Government Accountability Office report (.pdf). NNSA's hiring and retention efforts have typically focused on "attracting early career hires with competitive pay and development opportunities," but the positions may not be appealing to today's young workers, say report authors. NNSA "staff must often work in secure areas that prohibit the use of personal cell phones, e-mail, and social media, which is a disadvantage in attracting younger skilled candidates," says GAO. The isolated location of the sites also means career opportunities for candidates' spouses are limited. What's more, the pool of qualified applicants is dwindling. Many of the most qualified applicants from top science, technology, and engineering programs are not U.S. citizens and would be unable to obtain security clearances, says GAO.

#### No tradeoffs—different talent pool, new nuclear demand solves

APS 8

[APS (American Physical Society), Report from the APS Panel on Public Affairs Committee on Energy and Environment, June 2008, Readiness of the U.S. Nuclear Workforce for 21st Century Challenges, http://www.aps.org/policy/reports/popa-reports/upload/Nuclear-Readiness-Report-FINAL-2.pdf]

Workforce shortages in the arena of commercial nuclear power, and the problem of maintaining modernized training facilities, mainly stem from the 30-year stasis in U.S. demand for new civilian nuclear power plants1. The number of operating civilian nuclear reactors in the U.S. has remained at about 100 during this time. Thus, U.S. vendors have been forced to look abroad for sales. Some have either ceased construction of new reactors entirely or else significantly scaled back business in this area. Their continuing, largely static, nuclear engineering workforce needs have been met through a combination of hiring those trained in university nuclear engineering programs and retraining others whose original expertise was in some other field (usually mechanical engineering). Retirees from the nuclear Navy also have played an important role. A natural result of this stasis was for many years a greatly reduced interest among undergraduates in nuclear science and engineering programs2. In turn, this put great pressure on U.S. universities to scale back in these areas. Recently, however, the Federal government, through the Department of Energy (DOE), dramatically increased funding for these educational efforts. This played a major role in increasing undergraduate student enrollments in nuclear engineering from a low point of 480 in 1999 to 1,933 in 2007. Declaring the problem to be solved, DOE called for the termination of its university nuclear science and engineering programs for FY 2007. Congress in turn provided reduced funding for FY 2007 and transferred all the programs except reactor fuel services to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for FY 2008. These “feast or famine” gyrations have led to significant instabilities: the number of university nuclear engineering departments has decreased from 66 in the early 1980s to 30 today, and the number of university reactors has dwindled from 63 to 25 during essentially the same period.

### Immigration Reform Politics

#### Warming outweighs.

The New York End Times 6 The New York End Times is a non-partisan, non-religious, non-ideological, free news filter. We monitor world trends and events as they pertain to two vital threats - war and extinction. We use a proprietary methodology to quantify movements between the extremes of war and peace, harmony and extinction. http://newyorkendtimes.com/extinctionscale.asp

We rate Global Climate Change as a greater threat for human extinction in this century. Most scientists forecast disruptions and dislocations, if current trends persist. The extinction danger is more likely if we alter an environmental process that causes harmful effects and leads to conditions that make the planet uninhabitable to humans. Considering that there is so much that is unknown about global systems, we consider climate change to be the greatest danger to human extinction. However, there is no evidence of imminent danger. Nuclear war at some point in this century might happen. It is unlikely to cause human extinction though. While several countries have nuclear weapons, there are few with the firepower to annihilate the world. For those nations it would be suicidal to exercise that option. The pattern is that the more destructive technology a nation has, the more it tends towards rational behavior. Sophisticated precision weapons then become better tactical options. The bigger danger comes from nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists with the help of a rogue state, such as North Korea. The size of such an explosion would not be sufficient to threaten humanity as a whole. Instead it could trigger a major war or even world war. Under this scenario human extinction would only be possible if other threats were present, such as disease and climate change. We monitor war separately. However we also need to incorporate the dangers here .

#### CIR won’t pass – fiscal issues + gun control thump

Gonzalez and Nowicki, 1-4

[Daniel and Dan, “‘Cliff’ fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight”, 1-4-13, AZCentral,

<http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20130103immigration-reform-at-crossroads.html>, RSR]

But immigration reform has a long history of being sidetracked by other issues. Health-care reform and fixing the economy knocked immigration reform off the table in 2009 and 2010. Now, spending cuts and gun control are threatening to derail immigration reform again. That’s because the window to pass immigration legislation is short, analysts and immigration-reform advocates say. If nothing happens this year, immigration reform may become too politically radioactive to tackle leading up to the 2014 congressional midterm election and then the 2016 presidential election. Obama has said numerous times since the election that he wants to begin tackling immigration reform this month. In his first term, he failed to deliver on his pledge to pass a sweeping bill that would have included a legalization program for the more than 11 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S., including about 350,000 in Arizona. To win back support from Latino voters leading up to the election, Obama directed Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano to implement broad administrative changes aimed at helping some undocumented immigrants remain in the United States. One of those changes allows undocumented immigrants to remain in the country while they attempt to legalize their status through a spouse who is a U.S. citizen or other immediate relative. The rule change was finalized this week, a year after it was proposed by the Obama administration, and takes effect on March 4. In the past, illegal immigrants had to first leave the country to apply for a waiver to avoid having to wait outside the country for 10 years as punishment for entering illegally. After the change, illegal immigrants will still have to leave the country to apply for a green card, but they will be able to apply for the waiver inside the U.S., greatly reducing the amount of time they will have to spend separated from relatives who are U.S. citizens. A second change, announced on June 15, allows young undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as minors to apply to live and work temporarily in the country without the threat of deportation. So far, more than 367,000 young undocumented immigrants, often referred to as “dreamers,” have applied for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. Meanwhile, the clock is ticking on immigration reform. Although Obama says he wants to jump right into immigration reform, he and Congress will have to focus their attention for months on several unresolved issues left over from the New Year’s Day deal to avert the “fiscal cliff,” including a March1 deadline to avoid billions of dollars in across-the-board spending cuts and a late February/early March deadline to raise the debt ceiling. “That is problem Number 1 for immigration reform. That will dominate the agenda for the time being,” said Louis DeSipio, a political-science professor at the University of California-Irvine. Immigration reform also will have to compete with gun-control legislation. After the shooting in Newtown, Obama appointed Vice President Joe Biden to head an anti-violence commission to come up with new gun-control measures by the end of this month. “That is going to put more pressure on Congress,” DeSipio said. Gun control, plus the divisive atmosphere demonstrated by the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-run Senate during the fiscal-cliff debate, “makes it more and more unlikely that Congress will actually be able to debate a comprehensive immigration-reform bill,” he said.

#### No PC loss from pushing nuclear.

Hinckley, adjunct professor of international energy policy at Georgetown University, ‘12

[Elias, partner with the law firm of Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton,

“Hard Choices Ahead for US Energy”, <http://www.ourenergypolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/EHinckley-policy-article.pdf>]

What remains unclear is how policymakers will react. Some amount of policymaking support has been lost, as there has been simply too much discourse devoted to the potential hazards of nuclear power. However, the downside to continuing to champion the role of nuclear energy as part of a secure US energy future appears limited at this stage. There is little nationalized resistance and, as a result, no clear political cost to support nuclear policies, and possibly the benefit of the impression of proactivity on broad energy policy initiatives, and the results may be politicians continuing to champion nuclear power with no real expectation of new facilities being developed over the near or midterm

#### CIR won’t pass and PC is not key – House Republicans are key.

Soto, Senior Analyst for Latino Decisions and Fellow at the Center for Politics and Governance at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, at Austin, 1-4

[Dr. Victoria M. DeFrancesco, “Opinion: Immigration reform will not be easy, but it’s not impossible”, 1-4-13, NBC Latino,

http://nbclatino.com/2013/01/04/opinion-immigration-reform-will-not-be-easy-but-its-not-impossible/, RSR]

Unlike in his first administration, the president seems to be on board and ready for rolling up his sleeves and getting into immigration reform, but that won’t cut it. The problem for immigration reform in 2013 is rooted in Capital Hill. The president’s support is a necessary condition for any major policy overhaul, but it is not a sufficient condition. Let’s just assume the president can arm-wrestle the Senate Democrats and a few Senate Republicans into supporting his immigration reform. Two out of three won’t cut it. The Republican-controlled House is what stands in the way of immigration reform. More specifically, the GOP’s split mindset regarding Latinos and immigration is what will likely prevent the president from crossing off immigration reform from his 2013 to-do list. There are moderate GOP voices, such as that of Jeb Bush, that are calling for Republicans to not just go along, but lead in an immigration overhaul effort. These are the folks who see the demographic handwriting on the wall and recognize that the Republican Party cannot survive by alienating the fastest-growing segment of the electorate. However, those voices are few and far between. Immigration reform during this year or during any point in President Obama’s second term will not be easy. But it’s not impossible. Getting immigration reform to move in the House will entail a reframing of the issue to an economic one. Over the last several years we have seen that the GOP is unmoved by strategic considerations of Latino electoral growth and/or humanitarian appeals. Immigration reform advocates — from the president down to the lay person — are wasting their breath if they think a Tea Partier will be swayed by the hard knock story of a DREAMER.

#### Cantor and House Republicans support nuclear power

Politico 11 (Cantor: nuclear power 'essential' for U.S. energy needs, http://www.politico.com/blogs/glennthrush/0311/Cantor\_nuclear\_power\_essential\_for\_US\_energy\_needs.html)

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor defended nuclear energy production Monday, after a series of explosions at a nuclear reactor in Japan, calling it “essential” to meeting American energy needs. The problems at the Fukushima plant 150 miles north of Tokyo have reignited the debate over the safety of nuclear energy production. Cantor told reporters Monday that the tsunami that ravaged Japan last week is to blame, not the reactor itself. “As far as we know, this is the result of a tsunami,” he said. “Nuclear power is an essential mix of the energy economy in this country.” The tsunami caused technical problems at the Japanese plant, which left nuclear rods exposed, raising the specter of Chernobyl-style meltdown. The timing couldn’t have been worse for House Republican leaders, who demanded last week that President Barack Obama speed up approval of new nuclear energy facilities.

#### CIR will not pass unless Obama gets Democrats on board.

The Columbian, 1-6

[1-6-13, “In Our View: Immigration Reform in '13?”,

<http://www.columbian.com/news/2013/jan/06/immigration-reform-in-13/>, RSR]

In a Wednesday editorial, the Dallas Morning News astutely pointed to former President George W. Bush's noble and valid attempt to change immigration laws back in 2006. Bush's efforts failed, the newspaper said, "because Senate Republicans balked. But the opposition didn't stop the Bush White House from fully engaging Congress, including recalcitrant Republicans. Obama may have a similar problem with his own party. The dirty little secret in the 2006 and 2007 immigration battles was that some Democrats were content to let Senate Republicans kill the effort. Labor-friendly Democrats didn't want a bill, either. And they may not want one this year. That reluctance is a major reason the president needs to invest in this fight. He must figure out how to bring enough Democrats along, while also reaching out to Republicans."

#### Democrats love nuclear power – perceived safer than alternatives, public backs it and Fukushima doesn’t matter.

Bartash, ‘11

[Jeffry, “Democrats warm to nuclear, domestic drilling”, 4-15-11, Marketwatch

<http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-04-15/economy/30789692_1_nuclear-power-nuclear-plants-nuclear-energy>, RSR]

WASHINGTON (MarketWatch) — At a hearing this week, Democratic Sen. Tom Carper of Delaware asked one of the nation’s top regulators how many Americans have been killed by nuclear power. ”There are no known fatalities in the U.S. from the use of nuclear energy,” replied Gregory Jaczko, chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Carper then turned to Lisa Jackson, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. He asked her how many people have been killed or had their lives shortened by the use of pollution-emitting fossil fuels. Tens of thousands, she said. The senator sat back in his chair and nodded. “All sources of energy involve risks,” he said. Carper, a longtime supporter of nuclear power, is not the only Democrat who’s weighing every option available on how to fuel the massive U.S. economy. Many other members of his party are as well — no doubt egged on by soaring gas prices and public discontent. And while Democrats aren’t chanting “drill, baby, drill,” they appear to be concluding that nuclear power and more domestic drilling, once anathema, are vital to America’s energy future. At several hearings this week, nary a word was said about abolishing nuclear power despite the recent disaster in Japan. And Democrats say the are open to drilling for more natural gas in the continental U.S. despite growing concerns over an extraction practice called “fracking.”

### Production K

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus the status quo or a competitive policy option.

#### This is key to ground and predictability – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Case outweighs.

#### Perm do both. The permutation resolves the critique because we can refocus energy production politics while we try to avert short-term disasters. This is a good political approach because the failure to engage the political process turns the affirmative into spectators who are powerless to produce real change.

Rorty 98 (prof of philosophy at Stanford, Richard, 1998, “achieving our country”, Pg. 7-9)JFS

Such people find pride in American citizenship impossi­ble, and vigorous participation in electoral politics pointless. They associate American patriotism with an endorsement of atrocities: the importation of African slaves, the slaughter of Native Americans, the rape of ancient forests, and the Viet­nam War. Many of them think of national pride as appropri­ate only for chauvinists: for the sort of American who re­joices that America can still orchestrate something like the Gulf War, can still bring deadly force to bear whenever and wherever it chooses. When young intellectuals watch John Wayne war movies after reading Heidegger, Foucault, Stephenson, or Silko, they often become convinced that they live in a violent, inhuman, corrupt country. They begin to think of themselves as a saving remnant-as the happy few who have the insight to see through nationalist rhetoric to the ghastly reality of contemporary America. But this insight does not move them to formulate a legislative program, to join a political movement, or to share in a national hope. The contrast between national hope and national self­-mockery and self-disgust becomes vivid when one compares novels like Snow Crash and Almanac of the Dead with socialist novels of the first half of the century-books like The Jungle, An American Tragedy, and The Grapes of Wrath. The latter were written in the belief that the tone of the Gettysburg Address was absolutely right, but that our country would have to transform itself in order to fulfill Lincoln's hopes. Transfor­mation would be needed because the rise of industrial capi­talism had made the individualist rhetoric of America's first century obsolete. The authors of these novels thought that this rhetoric should be replaced by one in which America is destined to become the first cooperative commonwealth, the first class­less society. This America would be one in which income and wealth are equitably distributed, and in which the govern­ment ensures equality of opportunity as well as individual liberty. This new, quasi-communitarian rhetoric was at the heart of the Progressive Movement and the New Deal. It set the tone for the American Left during the first six decades of the twentieth century. Walt Whitman and John Dewey, as we shall see, did a great deal to shape this rhetoric. The difference between early twentieth-century leftist in­tellectuals and the majority of their contemporary counter­parts is the difference between agents and spectators. In the early decades of this century, when an intellectual stepped back from his or her country's history and looked at it through skeptical eyes, the chances were that he or she was about to propose a new political initiative. Henry Adams was, of course, the great exception-the great abstainer from ·politics. But William James thought that Adams' diagnosis of the First Gilded Age as a symptom of irreversible moral and political decline was merely perverse. James's pragmatist theory of truth was in part a reaction against the sort of de­tached spectators hip which Adams affected. For James, disgust with American hypocrisy and self­-deception was pointless unless accompanied by an effort to give America reason to be proud of itself in the future. The kind of proto- Heideggerian cultural pessimism which Adams cultivated seemed, to James, decadent and cowardly. "Democracy," James wrote, "is a kind of religion, and we are bound not to admit its failure. Faiths and utopias are the no­blest exercise of human reason, and no one with a spark of reason in him will sit down fatalistically before the croaker's picture. "2

#### Prefer calculation of consequences, meaning aff outweighs.

Isaac ‘2 Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, Dissent, Vol. 49 No. 2, Spring 2002

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

#### State focused nuclear power solutions are good

Nordhaus 11, chairman – Breakthrough Instiute, and Shellenberger, president – Breakthrough Insitute, MA cultural anthropology – University of California, Santa Cruz, 2/25/‘11

(Ted and Michael, <http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/the_long_death_of_environmenta>)

Tenth, we are going to have to get over our suspicion of technology, especially nuclear power. There is no credible path to reducing global carbon emissions without an enormous expansion of nuclear power. It is the only low carbon technology we have today with the demonstrated capability to generate large quantities of centrally generated electrtic power. It is the low carbon of technology of choice for much of the rest of the world. Even uber-green nations, like Germany and Sweden, have reversed plans to phase out nuclear power as they have begun to reconcile their energy needs with their climate commitments. Eleventh, we will need to embrace again the role of the state as a direct provider of public goods. The modern environmental movement, borne of the new left rejection of social authority of all sorts, has embraced the notion of state regulation and even creation of private markets while largely rejecting the generative role of the state. In the modern environmental imagination, government promotion of technology - whether nuclear power, the green revolution, synfuels, or ethanol - almost always ends badly. Never mind that virtually the entire history of American industrialization and technological innovation is the story of government investments in the development and commercialization of new technologies. Think of a transformative technology over the last century - computers, the Internet, pharmaceutical drugs, jet turbines, cellular telephones, nuclear power - and what you will find is government investing in those technologies at a scale that private firms simply cannot replicate. Twelveth, big is beautiful. The rising economies of the developing world will continue to develop whether we want them to or not. The solution to the ecological crises wrought by modernity, technology, and progress will be more modernity, technology, and progress. The solutions to the ecological challenges faced by a planet of 6 billion going on 9 billion will not be decentralized energy technologies like solar panels, small scale organic agriculture, and a drawing of unenforceable boundaries around what remains of our ecological inheritance, be it the rainforests of the Amazon or the chemical composition of the atmosphere. Rather, these solutions will be: large central station power technologies that can meet the energy needs of billions of people increasingly living in the dense mega-cities of the global south without emitting carbon dioxide, further intensification of industrial scale agriculture to meet the nutritional needs of a population that is not only growing but eating higher up the food chain, and a whole suite of new agricultural, desalinization and other technologies for gardening planet Earth that might allow us not only to pull back from forests and other threatened ecosystems but also to create new ones. The New Ecological Politics The great ecological challenges that our generation faces demands an ecological politics that is generative, not restrictive. An ecological politics capable of addressing global warming will require us to reexamine virtually every prominent strand of post-war green ideology. From Paul Erlich's warnings of a population bomb to The Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth," contemporary ecological politics have consistently embraced green Malthusianism despite the fact that the Malthusian premise has persistently failed for the better part of three centuries. Indeed, the green revolution was exponentially increasing agricultural yields at the very moment that Erlich was predicting mass starvation and the serial predictions of peak oil and various others resource collapses that have followed have continue to fail. This does not mean that Malthusian outcomes are impossible, but neither are they inevitable. We do have a choice in the matter, but it is not the choice that greens have long imagined. The choice that humanity faces is not whether to constrain our growth, development, and aspirations or die. It is whether we will continue to innovate and accelerate technological progress in order to thrive. Human technology and ingenuity have repeatedly confounded Malthusian predictions yet green ideology continues to cast a suspect eye towards the very technologies that have allowed us to avoid resource and ecological catastrophes. But such solutions will require environmentalists to abandon the "small is beautiful" ethic that has also characterized environmental thought since the 1960's. We, the most secure, affluent, and thoroughly modern human beings to have ever lived upon the planet, must abandon both the dark, zero-sum Malthusian visions and the idealized and nostalgic fantasies for a simpler, more bucolic past in which humans lived in harmony with Nature.

#### Floating PIKs are bad.

#### Status quo discourse surrounding Yucca siting eliminates native culture through the valuation of technical arguments over cultural arguments

Endres 12 [Associate Professor of Communications at the University of Utah, Danielle, “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process”, Process, Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 6:3, 328-345, RSR]

Despite this progress, flaws remain in many currently used processes of participation (Depoe & Delicath, 2004). Although decision makers have adopted more dialogic participatory models of participation in some settings (e.g., Dietz & Stern, 2008), the NWPA participation process followed for Yucca Mountain remains an essentially technocratic Decide-Announce-Defend (DAD) model in which decisions are made by scientific and policy experts and then presented to the public for approval. Most DAD participation processes value scientific and technical arguments over social-, cultural-, and value-based arguments (e.g., Depoe & Delicath, 2004; Farrell & Goodnight, 1981; Fiorino, 1990; Katz & Miller, 1996; Toker, 2002; Waddell, 1990, 1996). Expanding upon these critiques of DAD models, I specifically examine the role for values in these models. Although scientific, cultural, and social dimensions of decision making are all influenced by values, technocratic decision makers often assume that scientific and technical arguments are value free, thus relegating values to the realm of the social and cultural dimensions that are already marginalized. Therefore, technocratic decision making automatically assumes one set of implicit values while excluding other competing values under the false assumption that science is value free. These flaws in DAD participation processes also apply in the more specific realm of decision making over nuclear technologies. The public sphere surrounding nuclear technologies is ‘‘constricted and degraded by technocratic domination’’ (Taylor, Kinsella, Depoe, & Metzler, 2007, p. 381). Stakeholder participation in nuclear issues is particularly problematic because of secrecy, discursive containment, and the perception that the highly technical nature of nuclear technologies is best handled by experts (e.g., Kinsella, 2001, 2005; Taylor, 1998; Taylor et al., 2007). Scientific and technical knowledge dictate the process with little attention paid to other relevant forms of expertise. In the case of Yucca Mountain, participation in the Yucca Mountain siting decision occurred in the form of comment periods held during both the EIS process (1996 2004) and site authorization decision (2001 2002). While the EIS comment period valued scientific and technical arguments over social and cultural arguments (Ratliff, 1997), the site authorization comment period explicitly called for only scientific and technical arguments (Endres, 2009a). The DOE explicitly framed the site authorization comment period as: (1) an opportunity for the DOE to educate ‘the public’ and (2) for ‘the public’ to comment on the scientific and technical arguments produced by Yucca Mountain Project scientists (DOE, 2002b, 2002c). The participation process created neither a role for non-technical arguments nor a role for the values underlying both technical and non-technical arguments. Yet, opponents and proponents still made value-based claims, which formed a significant stasis point in the controversy.

#### Resistance to waste storage in Yucca Mountain is specifically crucial to challenge nuclear colonialism.

Endres 9 [Associate Professor in Communication @ Utah, Danielle, “The Rhetoric of Nuclear Colonialism: Rhetorical Exclusion of American Indian Arguments in the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Siting Decision,” Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, Vol. 6, No. 1, March 2009]

Now, with over 60 years of uranium mining, nuclear weapons production and¶ nuclear power, we face a high-level nuclear waste crisis. Once again, power brokers¶ have looked to exploit American Indian lands, resources and peoples. In the twenty-year¶ process of researching and authorizing a federal high-level nuclear waste¶ repository site, only sites on American Indian land were seriously considered. In¶ addition to the Yucca Mountain site, American Indian nations were also targeted for¶ temporary waste storage through the now-defunct Monitored Retrievable Storage¶ (MRS) program.17 And recently, a proposal by Private Fuel Storage (PFS) and the¶ Skull Valley Goshutes to temporarily store nuclear waste at Skull Valley Goshute¶ reservation was defeated by Skull Valley activists working with the State of Utah¶ against the Skull Valley government and PFS.18 The struggle over the Yucca Mountain¶ nuclear waste site is, as Kuletz pointed out, a continuation of struggles against nuclear¶ colonialism: ‘‘Indian protests over the use of Yucca Mountain as a high-level nuclear-waste¶ dump cannot be seen as an anomaly. Rather, they are a part of a persistent¶ pattern of resistance to military occupation and nuclear activity.’’19 Although we do¶ not yet know the health and environmental effects of permanent nuclear waste¶ storage, nuclear colonialism is not just about health and environmental devastation.¶ It also intersects with sovereignty, nuclearism and colonialism, to which I now turn.

#### Their argument about “nuclear power violently exporting violence to the periphery” is the status quo: we try to reap all the benefits of supposedly clean nuclear energy while shunting the waste the power creates off on minority populations. For example, our Yucca advantage is about how we are about to site nuclear waste storage on native lands.

#### Taking action against warming represents an opportunity to rethink status quo politics for a more just society.

Smith ‘10 (Brendan, co-founder of Labor Network for Sustainability, 11-23, “Fighting Doom: The New Politics of Climate Change,” Common Dreams, <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/11/23-1>)

I admit I have arrived late to the party. Only recently have I begun to realize what others have known for decades: The climate crisis is not, at its core, an environmental issue. In fact it is not an "issue" at all; it is an existential threat to every human and community on the planet. It threatens every job, every economy in the world. It threatens the health of our children. It threatens our food and water supply. Climate change will continue to alter the world our species has known for the past three thousand years. As an oyster farmer and longtime political activist, the effects of climate change on my life will be neither distant nor impersonal. Rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures may well force me to abandon my 60-acre farm within the next forty years. From France to Washington state, oystermen are already seeing massive die-offs of seed oysters and the thinning shells science has long predicted. I can see the storm clouds and they are foretelling doom. But my political alter ego is oddly less pessimistic. Rather than triggering gloom, the climate crisis has surprisingly stirred up more hope than I have felt in twenty years as a progressive activist. After decades of progressive retreat it is a strange feeling. But I am haunted by the suspicion that this coming crisis may be the first opportunity we have had in generations to radically re-shape the political landscape and build a more just and sustainable society. § Marked 10:39 § The Power of Doom The modern progressive movement in the U.S. has traditionally grounded its organizing in the politics of identity and altruism. Organize an affected group -- minorities, gays, janitors or women -- and then ask the public at large to support the cause -- prison reform, gay marriage, labor rights, or abortion -- based on some cocktail of good will, liberal guilt, and moral persuasion. This strategy has been effective at times. But we have failed to bring these mini-movements together into a force powerful enough to enact broad-based social reform. It takes a lot of people to change society and our current strategy has left us small in numbers and weak in power. The highlights of my political life -- as opposed to oystering -- have been marked by winning narrow, often temporary, battles, but perennially losing the larger war. I see the results in every direction I look: growing poverty and unemployment, two wars, the rise of the right, declining unionization, the failure of the Senate's climate legislation and of Copenhagen, the wholesale domination of corporate interests. The list goes on and on. We have lost; it's time to admit our strategy has been too tepid and begin charting anew. This time can be different. What is so promising about the climate crisis is that because it is not an "issue" experienced by one disenfranchised segment of the population, it opens the opportunity for a new organizing calculus for progressives. Except for nuclear annihilation, humanity has never faced so universal a threat where all our futures are bound inextricably together. This universality provides the mortar of common interest required for movement building. We could literally knock on every door on the planet and find someone -- whether they know it or not -- who has a vital self-interest in averting the climate crisis by joining a movement for sustainability. With all of humanity facing doom, we can finally gather under one banner and count our future members not in the thousands but in the millions, even billions. But as former White House "Green Jobs Czar" Van Jones told the New Yorker in 2009, "The challenge is making this an everybody movement, so your main icons are Joe Six-Pack, Joe the Plumber, becoming Joe the Solar Guy, or that kid on the street corner putting down his handgun, picking up a caulk gun." The climate crisis is carrying us into uncharted waters and our political strategy needs to be directed toward making the climate movement an "everybody movement." Let me use a personal example. As an oysterman on Long Island Sound my way of life is threatened by rising greenhouse gases and ocean temperatures. If the climate crisis is not averted my oysters will die and my farm will be shuttered. Saving my livelihood requires that I politically engage at some level. Normally I would gather together my fellow oyster farmers to lobby state and federal officials and hold a protest or two. Maybe I would find a few coalitions to join. But we would remain small in number, wield little power, and our complaints about job loss would fall on largely unsympathetic ears in the face of so many suffering in so many ways. And what would we even petition our government to do about the problem? Buyouts and unemployment benefits? Re-training classes? Our oysters will still die and we will still lose our farms. To save our lives and livelihood we need to burrow down to the root of the problem: halting greenhouse gas emissions. And halting emissions requires joining a movement with the requisite power to dismantle the fossil fuel economy while building a green economy. To tackle such a large target requires my support for every nook and cranny effort to halt greenhouse gases and transition to a green economy. I need to gather up my fellow oyster farmers and link arms with students blocking new coal-fired power plants while fighting for just transition for coal workers; I need to join forces with other green workers around the country to demand government funding for green energy jobs, not more bank and corporate bailouts; I need to support labor movement efforts in China and elsewhere to climb out of poverty by going "green not dirty." I have a stake in these disparate battles not out of political altruism, but because my livelihood and community depend on stopping greenhouse gases and climate change. In other words, the hidden jewel of the climate crisis is that I need others and others need me. We are bound together by the same story of crisis and struggle. Some in the sustainability movement have been taking advantage of the "power of doom" by weaving together novel narratives and alliances around climate change. Groups in Kentucky are complementing their anti-mountain top removal efforts by organizing members of rural electrical co-ops into "New Power" campaigns to force a transition from fossil fuels to renewable power -- and create jobs in the process. Police unions in Canada, recognizing their members will be first responders as climate disasters hit, have reached out to unions in New Orleans to ensure the tragedies that followed Katrina are not repeated. Artists, chefs, farmers, bike mechanics, designers, and others are coalescing into a "green artisan movement" focused on building vibrant sustainable communities. Immigrant organizers, worried about the very real possibility of ever-worsening racial tensions triggered by millions of environmental refugees flooding in from neighboring countries, are educating their membership about why the climate crisis matters. My hope is that over the coming years we will be able to catalog increasing numbers of these tributaries of the climate crisis. Our power will not stem from a long list of issue concerns or sponsors at events -- we have tried that as recently as the October 2nd Washington D.C. "One Nation Working Together" march with little impact. Nor, with the rise of do-it-yourself organizing, will our power spring from top-down political parties of decades past. Instead oystermen like me, driven by the need to save our lives and livelihood, will storm the barricades with others facing the effects of the climate crisis. We will merge our mini-movements under a banner of common crisis, common vision and common struggle. We will be in this fight together and emerge as force not to be trifled with. This Time We Have an Alternative I am also guardedly optimistic because this time we have an alternative. My generation came of age after the fall of communism, and as a result, we have been raised in the midst of one-sided debate. We recognize that neoliberalism has ravaged society, but besides nostalgic calls for socialism, what has been the alternative? As globalization swept the globe, we demanded livable wages and better housing for the poorest in our communities; we fought sweatshops in China; we lobbied for new campaign finance and corporate governance laws. But these are mere patchwork reforms that fail to add up to a full-blown alternative to our current anti-government, free-market system. Never being able to fully picture the progressive alternative left me not fully trusting that progressive answers were viable solutions. But when I hear the proposed solutions to the climate crisis, the fog lifts. I can track the logic and envision the machinery of our alternative. And it sounds surprisingly like a common sense rebuttal to the current free-market mayhem: We face a global emergency of catastrophic proportions. Market fundamentalism will worsen rather than solve the crisis. Instead we need to re-direct our institutions and economic resources toward solving the crisis by replacing our carbon-based economy with a green sustainable economy. And by definition, for an economy to be sustainable it must addresses the longstanding suffering ordinary people face in their lives, ranging from unemployment and poverty to housing and healthcare. For years I have tossed from campaign to campaign, but the framework of our new progressive answer to the climate crisis now provides a roadmap for my political strategy. It helps chart my opponents -- coal companies and their political minions, for example -- as well as my diverse range of allies. It lays out my policy agenda, ranging from creating millions of new green jobs to building affordable green housing in low-income communities. I finally feel confident enough in my bearings to set sail. The Era of Crisis Politics While building a new green economy makes sense on paper, it is hard to imagine our entrenched political system yielding even modest progressive reform, let alone the wholesale re-formatting of the carbon economy. But I suspect this will change in the coming years, with our future governed by cascading political crises, rather than political stasis. We are likely entering an era of crisis politics whereby each escalating environmental disaster -- ranging from water shortages and hurricanes to wildfires and disease outbreaks -- will expose the impotence of our existing political institutions and economic system. In the next 40 years alone, scientists predict a state of permanent drought throughout the Southwest US and climate-linked disease deaths to double. As Danny Thompson, secretary-treasurer of the Nevada AFL-CIO, told the Las Vegas Review Journal, the ever-worsening water crisis could be "the end of the world" that could "turn us upside down, and I don't know how you recover from that." As if that is not enough, these crises will be played out in the context of a global economy spiraling out of control. Each hurricane, drought or recession will send opinion polls and politicians lurching from right to left and vice versa. Think of how quickly, however momentarily, the political debate pivoted in the wake of Katrina, the BP disaster, and the financial crisis. As White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel famously said "Never let a serious crisis go to waste...It's an opportunity to do things you couldn't do before." While addressing the climate crisis requires radical solutions that cannot be broached in today's political climate, each disaster opens an opportunity to advance alternative agendas -- both for the left and right. While politicians debate modest technical fixes, ordinary people left desperate by floods, fires, droughts and other disasters will increasingly -- and angrily -- demand more fundamental reforms. While our current policy choices appear limited by polls and election results, in an era of crisis politics what appears unrealistic and radical before a storm may well appear as common sense reform in its wake. My generation has been raised in the politics of eternal dusk. Except for a passing ray of hope during the Obama campaign, our years have been marked by the failure of every political force in society -- whether it be political elites or social movement leaders -- to address the problems we face as a nation and world. They have left us spinning towards disaster. We can forge a better future. Climate-generated disasters will bring our doomed future into focus. The failure of political elites to adequately respond to these cascading crises will transform our political landscape and seed the ground for social movements. And if we prepare for the chaos and long battle ahead, our alternative vision will become a necessity rather than an impossibility. As a friend recently said to me, "God help us, I hope you're right."

## 1AR

### Warming

#### Myth about global cooling has never been substantiated in scientific literature—Their evidence is based on selective misreading and inaccuracy

Peterson, Connolley and Fleck 8 (Thomas C. Peterson, William M. Connolley, and John Fleck, September 2008, “The Myth of the 1970s Global Cooling Scientific Consensus,” Albuquerque Journal, Albuquerque, New Mexico) http://ams.allenpress.com/archive/1520-0477/89/9/pdf/i1520-0477-89-9-1325.pdf)

Despite active efforts to answer these questions ,the following pervasive myth arose: there was a consensus among climate scientists of the 1970s that either global cooling or a full-fledged ice age was imminent (see the “Perpetuating the myth” sidebar). A review of the climate science literature from 1965to 1979 shows this myth to be false. The myth’s basis lies in a selective misreading of the texts both by some members of the media at the time and by some observers today. In fact, emphasis on greenhouse warming dominated the scientific literature even then. The research enterprise that grew in response to the questions articulated by Bryson and others, while considering the forces responsible for cooling, quickly converged on the view that greenhouse warming was likely to dominate on time scales that would be significant to human societies (Charneyet al. 1979). However, perhaps more important than demonstrating that the global cooling myth is wrong, this review shows the remarkable way in which the individual threads of climate science of the time—each group of researchers pursuing their own set of questions—was quickly woven into the integrated tapestry that created the basis for climate science as we know it today.

### CP

#### Iran won’t be aggressive – empirics – they are rational, wouldn’t leak to terrorist, won’t be aggressive.

Pillar 12 (Paul, Professor in the Security Studies at Georgetown University, Former National Intelligence Officer for the Near East and South Asia from 2000 to 2005, “We Can Live with a Nuclear Iran”, Washington Monthly,

http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/marchapril\_2012/features/we\_can\_live\_with\_a\_nuclear\_ira035772.php?page=5>)

What difference would it make to Iran's behavior and influence if the country had a bomb? Even among those who believe that war with the Islamic Republic would be a bad idea, this question has been subjected to precious little careful analysis. The notion that a nuclear weapon would turn Iran into a significantly more dangerous actor that would imperil U.S. interests has become conventional wisdom, and it gets repeated so often by so many diverse commentators that it seldom, if ever, is questioned. Hardly anyone debating policy on Iran asks exactly why a nuclear-armed Iran would be so dangerous. What passes for an answer to that question takes two forms: one simple, and another that sounds more sophisticated. The simple argument is that Iranian leaders supposedly don't think like the rest of us: they are religious fanatics who value martyrdom more than life, cannot be counted on to act rationally, and therefore cannot be deterred. On the campaign trail Rick Santorum has been among the most vocal in propounding this notion, asserting that Iran is ruled by the "equivalent of al-Qaeda," that its "theology teaches" that its objective is to "create a calamity," that it believes "the afterlife is better than this life," and that its "principal virtue" is martyrdom. Newt Gingrich speaks in a similar vein about how Iranian leaders are suicidal jihadists, and says "it's impossible to deter them." The trouble with this image of Iran is that it does not reflect actual Iranian behavior. More than three decades of history demonstrate that the Islamic Republic's rulers, like most rulers elsewhere, are overwhelmingly concerned with preserving their regime and their power-in this life, not some future one. They are no more likely to let theological imperatives lead them into self-destructive behavior than other leaders whose religious faiths envision an afterlife. Iranian rulers may have a history of valorizing martyrdom-as they did when sending young militiamen to their deaths in near-hopeless attacks during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980s-but they have never given any indication of wanting to become martyrs themselves. In fact, the Islamic Republic's conduct beyond its borders has been characterized by caution. Even the most seemingly ruthless Iranian behavior has been motivated by specific, immediate concerns of regime survival. The government assassinated exiled Iranian dissidents in Europe in the 1980s and '90s, for example, because it saw them as a counterrevolutionary threat. The assassinations ended when they started inflicting too much damage on Iran's relations with European governments. Iran's rulers are constantly balancing a very worldly set of strategic interests. The principles of deterrence are not invalid just because the party to be deterred wears a turban and a beard. If the stereotyped image of Iranian leaders had real basis in fact, we would see more aggressive and brash Iranian behavior in the Middle East than we have. Some have pointed to the Iranian willingness to incur heavy losses in continuing the Iran-Iraq War. But that was a response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of the Iranian homeland, not some bellicose venture beyond Iran's borders. And even that war ended with Ayatollah Khomeini deciding that the "poison" of agreeing to a cease-fire was better than the alternative. (He even described the ceasefire as "God's will"-so much for the notion that the Iranians' God always pushes them toward violence and martyrdom.) Throughout history, it has always been worrisome when a revolutionary regime with ruthless and lethal internal practices moves to acquire a nuclear weapon. But it is worth remembering that we have contended with far more troubling examples of this phenomenon than Iran. Millions died from forced famine and purges in Stalin's Soviet Union, and tens of millions perished during the Great Leap Forward in Mao Tse-tung's China. China's development of a nuclear weapon (it tested its first one in 1964) seemed all the more alarming at the time because of Mao's openly professed belief that his country could lose half its population in a nuclear war and still come out victorious over capitalism. But deterrence with China has endured for half a century, even during the chaos and fanaticism of Mao's Cultural Revolution. A few years after China got the bomb, Richard Nixon built his global strategy around engagement with Beijing. The more sophisticated-sounding argument about the supposed dangers of an Iranian nuclear weapon-one heard less from politicians than from policy-debating intelligentsia-accepts that Iranian leaders are not suicidal but contends that the mere possession of such a weapon would make Tehran more aggressive in its region. A dominant feature of this mode of argument is "worst-casing," as exemplified by a pro-war article by Matthew Kroenig in a recent issue of Foreign Affairs. Kroenig's case rests on speculation after speculation about what mischief Iran "could" commit in the Middle East, with almost no attention to whether Iran has any reason to do those things, and thus to whether it ever would be likely to do them. Kroenig includes among his "coulds" a scary possibility that also served as a selling point of the Iraq War: the thought of a regime giving nuclear weapons or materials to a terrorist group. Nothing is said about why Iran or any other regime ever would have an incentive to do this. In fact, Tehran would have strong reasons not to do it. Why would it want to lose control over a commodity that is scarce as well as dangerous? And how would it achieve deniability regarding its role in what the group subsequently did with the stuff? No regime in the history of the nuclear age has ever been known to transfer nuclear material to a nonstate group. That history includes the Cold War, when the USSR had both a huge nuclear arsenal and patronage relationships with a long list of radical and revolutionary clients. As for deniability, Iranian leaders have only to listen to rhetoric coming out of the United States to know that their regime would immediately be a suspect in any terrorist incidents involving a nuclear weapon. The more sophisticated-sounding argument links Iran with sundry forms of objectionable behavior, either real or hypothetical, without explaining what difference the possession of a nuclear weapon would make. Perhaps the most extensive effort to catalog what a nuclear-armed Iran might do outside its borders is a monograph published last year by Ash Jain of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Jain's inventory of possible Iranian nastiness is comprehensive, ranging from strong-arming Persian Gulf states to expanding a strategic relationship with Hugo Chávez's Venezuela. But nowhere is there an explanation of how Iran's calculations-or anyone else'swould change with the introduction of a nuclear weapon. The most that Jain can offer is to assert repeatedly that because Iran would be "shielded by a nuclear weapons capability," it might do some of these things. We never get an explanation of how, exactly, such a shield would work. Instead there is only a vague sense that a nuclear weapon would lead Iran to feel its oats. Analysis on this subject need not be so vague. A rich body of doctrine was developed during the Cold War to outline the strategic differences that nuclear weapons do and do not make, and what they can and cannot achieve for those who possess them. Such weapons are most useful in deterring aggression against one's own country, which is probably the main reason the Iranian regime is interested in developing them. They are much less useful in "shielding" aggressive behavior outside one's borders, except in certain geopolitical situations in which their use becomes plausible. The Pakistani-Indian conflict may be such a situation. Pakistan's nuclear arsenal may have enabled it to engage in riskier behavior in Kashmir than it otherwise would attempt, because nuclear weapons help to deter Pakistan's ultimate nightmare: an assault by the militarily superior India, which could slice Pakistan in two and perhaps destroy it completely. But if you try to apply that logic to Iran, no one is playing the role of India. Iran has its own tensions and rivalries with its neighborsincluding Iraq, Saudi Arabia, other states on the Persian Gulf, and Pakistan. But none of these pose the kind of existential threat that Pakistan sees coming from India. Moreover, none of the current disputes between Iran and its neighbors (such as the one over ownership of some small islands also claimed by the United Arab Emirates) come close to possessing the nation-defining significance that the Kashmir conflict poses for both Pakistan and India. Nuclear weapons matter insofar as there is a credible possibility that they will be used. This credibility is hard to achieve, however, in anything short of circumstances that might involve the destruction of one's nation. In the case of Iran, there would need to be some specific aggressive or subversive act that Tehran is holding back from performing now for fear of retaliation-from the Americans, the Israelis, the Saudis, or someone else. Further, in order for Iran to neutralize the threat of retaliation, the desired act of mischief would have to be so important to Tehran that it could credibly threaten to escalate the matter to the level of nuclear war. Proponents of a war with Iran have been unable to provide an example of a scenario that meets these criteria, however. The impact of Iran possessing a bomb is therefore far less dire than the alarmist conventional wisdom suggests.

### Politics

#### Democrats need to get on board – blocking passage in the SQUO.

Munro 12-30

[Neil, “Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest”, The Daily Caller, 12-30-12,

<http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/2/>, RSR]

During Bush’s term, for example, African-American Democrats kept a low profile on immigration, ensuring that the issue was not brought up for a vote in the House in 2007 and 2008. “A bunch of Democrats are not going to be supportive,” de Posada predicted. That rejection would damage Obama’s standing among Latinos in the 2014 race, he said, and help GOP outreach.

#### **Democrats have to support immigration reform – they influence Obama.**

Navarette, Washington Post Writers Group, 1-4

[Ruben, “Obama not to be trusted on immigration”, My San Antonio, 1-4-13,

<http://www.mysanantonio.com/opinion/commentary/article/Obama-not-to-be-trusted-on-immigration-4168190.php>, RSR]

If you look back at his comments during the 2008 Democratic primaries, what Obama seemed most concerned about was not the plight of illegal immigrants but rather that employers might use illegal labor to pay U.S. workers lower wages. There is this Democratic Party narrative suggesting that African American and blue-collar workers are hurt by competition from immigrants. Obama's policies spring from there.