# Topicality

### 2AC

#### 1. We meet- plan creates incentives and secures a market for nuclear energy

#### 2. We meet- paying them is the financial incentive

#### 3. Counter interpretation- financial incentives are disbursement of public funds or contingent commitments

Webb 93

(lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Ground- it is grounded in the literature and is the only way to intrinsically keep military affs in the topic which are key to beat states counterplans, and it links much harder to disads

#### Predictability- our evidence has a definitive list and an intent to define, and is supported in the literature

#### Limits- only adds procurement affs to their list, but limits out all indirect incentive effects their allows

#### Education- key to talk about different actors use of energy and how energy’s connection to the military, and no aff makes sense where the government is the consumer

#### Reasonability key to prevent a race to the most limiting definition

# Case

### Deployable Soon

#### We could commercialize SMR’s within 5 years

Freed 10

Josh Freed, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz, Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy Program, Jeremy Ershow, Third Way Clean Energy Program, Sept 2010, Thinking Small On Nuclear Power, http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Thinking\_Small\_On\_Nuclear\_Power.pdf

Several U.S. companies are in the advanced stages of developing small reactors that adapt existing technology to produce smaller amounts of baseload electricity.15 These technologies are nearly ready for deployment. Final decisions about design, siting, and regulatory approval could be made within the next five years.16 The federal government can take several steps to help make this possible. First, economic barriers to entry must be lowered. For first movers, costs of licensing, design and regulatory approval will be comparable to those of the larger reactors because existing regulations have not yet been tailored to suit new designs. As the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) gains expertise in evaluating SMRs, and as economies of scale develop, these costs will decrease. Until this happens, the Department of Energy’s new cost-sharing program for near-term licensing and deployment of light water SMRs will help reduce some of the financial impact.17[i] The NRC also needs to continue its commitment to allocate sufficient resources and build the expertise necessary to evaluate and license SMRs in a timely fashion. The Department of Energy (DOE) and Department of Defense (DOD) can also prime the market pump by serving as a buyer of first-of-a-kind technologies. This could include deploying SMRs on DOE-owned sites, many of which are already zoned to support nuclear power plants,18 and appropriate DOD facilities in the United States. DOD, the largest single energy consumer in the U.S., comprises 78% of federal energy use, and is the most significant energy consumer in several metropolitan areas.19 DOE should also work closely with the private sector to develop standardized designs, with the goal of achieving demonstration and licensing within a decade.20 The potential market for SMRs is global. As we note in “Getting Our Share of Clean Energy Trade,” whichever country emerges as the market leader could dominate a good part of the $6 trillion global energy market.21 The U.S. could seize that mantle and all the jobs and exports that come with it. American reactors could be deployed within a decade domestically22 and go global soon after.

#### Current SMR technology is well established- Navy ships

Freed 10

(Josh, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz is a Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy ¶ Program, Jeremy Ershow was formerly a Policy ¶ Advisor at Third Way, “Thinking Small On Nuclear Power” <http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third_Way_Idea_Brief_-_Thinking_Small_On_Nuclear_Power.pdf>, SEH)

The light water technology that current SMRs use is well-established; ¶ American manufacturers have designed and built small, light water reactors for ¶ 60 years to fuel the Navy’s carriers and submarines.¶ 29¶ While advanced reactor ¶ technology is further off, innovation is necessary to complete the transition to ¶ clean energy. Advanced reactor technologies are promising technologies that ¶ we need to invest in today

### AT Waste Confidence

#### Waste confidence won’t impact licensing

**NYT**, 8/9/**’12**

(<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/08/09/an-uncertain-phase-for-nuclear-power-licenses/>)

But as with many disputes in the nuclear industry, it’s complicated. **The reactors**, it turns out, **do not need a license renewal to keep running.**

The commission has a “timely renewal doctrine,” not unlike what some other federal agencies practice, that allows the status quo to remain while the agency deliberates. “If you are already in the queue, when you cross the end of your license and renewal is under consideration, you can continue operating,’’ said Eliot Brenner, a spokesman. The plant’s operator, Entergy, had to apply for a renewal five years before the license was due to expire, and did so in 2007.

Utilities applying for licenses for other plants will have to wait, although **no groundbreakings were likely in the near future anyway.** Two twin-unit plants in the South, Vogtle 3 and 4 in Georgia and Summer 2 and 3 in South Carolina, already have combined construction and operating licenses. A spokesman for the commission said that **the moratorium order was silent on those licenses**, so those reactors could proceed. Vogtle 3 and Summer 2 are both scheduled to begin commercial operation in 2016.

### DoD Fast Tracked

#### DOD avoids NRC regulatory hurdles

Butler ‘11

(LtCol Butler is currently assigned to Headquarters, North American Air Defense Command-U.S. Northern Command/J594 (Strategy, Policy, and Plans Directorate), Security Cooperation ntegration Branch. This article was his Chase Prize Essay Contest entry. “Why the Marine Corps should lead the environmental and energy way forward and how to do it” March 18, 2011 accessed online September 15, 2012 at <http://www.mca-marines.org/gazette/not-green-enough>)

Fifth, the cumbersome, bureaucratic certification process of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), often enough to scare away potential entrepreneurs and investors, is not necessarily a roadblock to success. The NRC is “responsible for licensing and regulating the operation of commercial nuclear power plants in the United States.” Military installations offer unique platforms that could likely bypass an extended certification process. With established expertise and a long safety record in nuclear reactor certification, operations, training, and maintenance, the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program comprises the civilian and military personnel who:¶ . . . design, build, operate, maintain, and manage the nuclear-powered ships and the many facilities that support the U.S. nuclear-powered naval fleet.”34¶ Bypassing the NRC and initiating SMR experimentation under ADM Hyman Rickover’s legacy umbrella of naval reactors could shorten the process to a reasonable level for Marine and naval installations.35¶ ¶ Finally, Marine Corps-SMR technology opens the pathway for related endeavors and synergetic undertakings. The Army has several smart and influential individuals poised to partner in nuclear energy endeavors, and our naval brethren enjoy a long history of nuclear reactor expertise. Partnerships and enhanced use leases to support SMR deployments should be leveraged.36 As the collective military expertise in SMR technology grows, additional capabilities, such as expeditionary and vehicular power sources, could be explored. And related technologies, such as hybrid/electric vehicle power storage and recharging facilities and water desalination plants, could collocate with nuclear plants on installations to both use the energy.37

# States

#### Perm do both

#### Perm do the counterplan

#### “alternative financing” includes the CP

**GAO 9**, “Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Take Actions to Address Challenges in Meeting Federal

Renewable Energy Goals”, December, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/299755.html>

DOD has also joined with private sector entities, entering into various types of arrangements to develop renewable energy projects. Because these different arrangements with the private sector provide DOD with an alternative to using only up-front appropriations to fund renewable energy projects, we refer to these arrangements as alternative financing approaches. For the purposes of this report, we define an alternative financing approach as any funding arrangement other than projects in which total project costs are funded only through full up- front appropriations. DOD has entered into several different types of these approaches that have resulted in renewable energy projects.

#### DoD procurement professionals will ignore the CP–only fiat overcomes bureaucratic reluctance

Warwick 8

W.M. Warwick, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Dept. of Energy, 2008, Purchasing Renewable Power for the FederalSector: Basics, Barriers, and Possible Options, www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\_reports/PNNL-16485.pdf

To date, DOD has not used 10 USC 2394 or 10 USC 2922 (a) to enter into long-term power purchase agreements for renewable power. The lack of precedent is a major reason why this authority has not been used. Committing an agency to longer term contracts is risky and thus far, procurement professionals have been reluctant to do so. Their reasons are many and varied. One of the major stumbling blocks is inherent to the “ideal” renewable power contract model. As discussed, the best terms appear to be available by entering into a contract with a developer needing a power purchase contract to obtain construction financing. In other words, the contract is a promise to provide power from an as yet unbuilt project. There are limits to how far in advance the government can enter into contracts for future delivery of products and services. This also raises questions about how to pick a “winner.” To comply with Federal procurement requirements (10 USC 2922 (a) and 41 USC 253), the procurement should be competitive, which opens the door to offers from proposers and projects that may not be equal. Unfortunately, most procurement professionals feel (and are) unqualified to assess the merits of such proposals. Similarly, the power supply has to be synchronized with the current supplier’s contract termination. What happens if the new provider’s project isn’t operational when the current contract ends? Finally, what is the government cost estimate for a project like this? That requires a projection of future power costs, which does not exist and would be imperfect if it did. Available projections are not site specific enough to answer this question, and none extend out to the 30 plus years needed for the economic analysis. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) determined that LCC procedures are also inadequate for markets that are as volatile as energy and power markets have been and are likely to be into the future. Similarly, although the renewable power price can be forecasted with some precision, the necessary firming, shaping, and other services cannot. This point can be illustrated using the wind farm example cited previously (Figure 1). Finally, use of 10 USC 2922 (a) requires approval of the Secretary of Defense (SecDef). This means a contract will need to pass up the chain-of-command within a Service, through the Service Secretary, and then on to the SecDef. According to an Army general, decisions for SecDef approval pass through over 20 inboxes before they reach the SecDef. Because energy contracts are often time sensitive (many price offers expire within a day), this process may be too unwieldy to be effective.

#### Won’t acquire new tech

CNA 10, non-profit research organization that operates the Center for Naval Analyses and the Institute for Public Research, “Powering America’s Economy: Energy Innovation at the Crossroads of National Security Challenges”, July, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/WEB%2007%2027%2010%20MAB%20Powering%20America%27s%20Economy.pdf>

In our final discussion, we consider the end of the innovation pipeline—deployment—and we look at how fine-tuning the incentives might help pull more innovative, new energy technologies through the pipeline. Energy use at installations is governed under a stricter rubric than operational energy: a variety of regulatory and legislative mandates have steered DOD toward lowering energy consumption, increasing use of renewables, and promoting conservation and energy efficiency. However, the adoption of new clean energy technologies is still hampered in key installation acquisition programs. To help achieve its energy goals, DOD often employs two mechanisms: the Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP) and Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPCs). The ECIP program is backed by Congressional appropriations (through military construction funding), and it is designed to allow installations to purchase technologies that save money through conserving energy [55]. The program is viewed widely as being successful, cited as saving more than two dollars for each dollar invested. ESPCs are contracting vehicles that allow DOD to invest in energy-related improvements without expending funds appropriated by Congress. Through ESPCs, DOD partners with private firms that make the energy improvements; in return, the firms’ investments are paid back through the energy savings. While these programs have improved installation energy use, as they are currently structured, they favor older technologies that are well-established on the commercial market. This is especially the case for ESPCs, which are inherently risk averse. The private sector firms that enter into these contracts only do so if they are guaranteed to make a profit; as such, the energy improvements are done so with tried-and-tested technologies whose payback schedules and energy savings are well-defined. Many of these investments are also made with small profit margins. As such, companies are not willing to take risks on these contracts by using new and perhaps unproven technologies. Altering these programs to reduce the advantages provided to already commercialized products will encourage the acquisition of more innovative technologies on installations. One change could include a guaranteed return on investment (similar to that given on older technologies) for those developers proposing cutting-edge technologies. Another change could include giving first preference to innovations that come from public/private partnerships (incubators, energy hubs, etc.). Given DOD’s size and the fact that installations mirror U.S. infrastructure, the use of innovative technologies on its installations provides a clear demand signal to the developer.

Can’t solve the NRC—kills CP solvency—only the DOD solves

CSPO 10, Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at ASU, “four policy principles for energy innovation & climate change: a synthesis”, June, <http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Synthesis.pdf>

Government purchase of new technologies is a powerful way to accelerate innovation through increased demand (Principle 3a). We explore how this principle can be applied by considering how the DoD could purchase new nuclear reactor designs to meet electric power needs for DoD bases and operations. Small modular nuclear power reactors (SMRs), which generate less than 300 MW of power (as compared to more typical reactors built in the 1000 MW range) are often listed as a potentially transformative energy technology. While typical traditional large-scale nuclear power plants can cost five to eight billion dollars, smaller nuclear reactors could be developed at smaller scale, thus not presenting a “bet the company” financial risk. SMRs could potentially be mass manufactured as standardized modules and then delivered to sites, which could significantly reduce costs per unit of installed capacity as compared to today’s large scale conventional reactor designs. It is likely that some advanced reactors designs – including molten salt reactors and reactors utilizing thorium fuels – could be developed as SMRs. Each of these designs offers some combination of inherently safe operation, very little nuclear proliferation risk, relatively small nuclear waste management needs, very abundant domestic fuel resources, and high power densities – all of which are desirable attributes for significant expansion of nuclear energy. Currently, several corporations have been developing small nuclear reactors. Table 2 lists several of these companies and their reactor power capacities, as well as an indication of the other types of reactor innovations that are being incorporated into the designs. Some of these technologies depend on the well-established light water reactor, while others use higher energy neutrons, coolants capable of higher temperature operation, and other innovative approaches. Some of these companies, such as NuScale, intend to be able to connect as many as 24 different nuclear modules together to form one larger nuclear power plant. In addition to the different power ranges described in Table 2, these reactors vary greatly in size, some being only 3 to 6 feet on each side, while the NuScale reactor is 60 feet long and 14 feet in diameter. Further, many of these reactors produce significant amounts of high-temperature heat, which can be harnessed for process heating, gas turbine generators, and other operations. One major obstacle is to rapid commercialization and development are prolonged multi-year licensing times with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Currently, the NRC will not consider a reactor for licensing unless there is a power utility already prepared to purchase the device. Recent Senate legislation introduced by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) has pushed for DOE support in bringing down reactor costs and in helping to license and certify two reactor designs with the NRC. Some additional opportunities to facilitate the NRC licensing process for innovative small modular reactors would be to fund NRC to conduct participatory research to get ahead of potential license applications (this might require ~$100million/year) and potentially revise the current requirement that licensing fees cover nearly all NRC licensing review costs. One option for accelerating SMR development and commercialization, would be for DOD to establish SMR procurement specifications (to include cost) and agree to purchase a sufficient amount of SMR’s to underwrite private sector SMR development. Of note here may be that DARPA recently (3/30/10) issued a “Request for Information (RFI) on Deployable Reactor Technologies for Generating Power and Logistic Fuels”2 that specifies may features that would be highly desirable in an advanced commercial SMR. While other specifications including coproduction of mobility fuel are different than those of a commercial SMR power reactor, it is likely that a core reactor design meeting the DARPA inquiry specifications would be adaptable to commercial applications. While nuclear reactors purchased and used by DOD are potentially exempt from many NRC licensing requirements3, any reactor design resulting from a DOD procurement contract would need to proceed through NRC licensing before it could be commercially offered. Successful use of procured SMR’s for DOD purposes could provide the knowledge and operational experience needed to aid NRC licensing and it might be possible for the SMR contractor to begin licensing at some point in the SMR development process4. Potential purchase of small modular nuclear reactors would be a powerful but proven way in which government procurement of new energy technologies could encourage innovation. Public procurement of other renewable energy technologies could be similarly important.

# Immigration

### Flooding the Zone Solves

#### Obama proposing multiple competing bills solves

Todd et al 2-5

Chuck is an NBC News’ Chief Political Correspondent, “Flooding the Zone,” <http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/02/05/16852487-first-thoughts-flooding-the-zone>

\*\*\* Flooding the zone: Exactly one week away from President Obama’s State of the Union address, the White House has spent the early days of the second term flooding the zone with its legislative agenda. Last week, the president delivered his big immigration speech in Las Vegas. Yesterday, he spoke about gun violence in Minnesota. Today, he’s meeting at the White House with progressive, labor, and business leaders to discuss immigration reform and the budget situation. What’s going on here: The Obama White House wants to overload Washington’s political circuits in an effort to see what it can get through Congress -- without letting Congress define what issues get addressed. After all, Republicans want to solely talk about the budget before the March budget showdown (see yesterday’s multiple coordinated responses by House Republicans on the White House’s announcement it would be late with its budget). Yet by flooding the zone, Team Obama -- with the bully pulpit and the State of the Union at its disposal -- wants to widen the political dialogue beyond that one issue. This “flooding the zone” concept is how the Obama White House operated in the first six months of the first term, and it’s where he got most of his legislative achievements. When the White House got bogged down on ONE issue (health care, debt ceiling, etc), officials determined they lost some of their political capital.

### Popular

#### Plan popular in Congress- Only 1 vote against it and both parties cosponsor

Pendidikan ‘11

Cinta writes for the Love and Like Education Blog, “Sanders is the Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research,” <http://loveandlikeeducation.blogspot.com/2011/08/bernie-sanders-and-small-modular.html>

Sanders is Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research¶ Bernie Sanders and Small Modular Reactors¶ Senator Bernie Sanders often speaks about his opposition to Vermont Yankee as having something to do with the age of the plant, the fact it is owned by Entergy, or his "state's rights" stance about regulating nuclear power plants.¶ Recently, however, Sanders made it clear that he is against nuclear power in any form and is proud of that opinion. On Senator Sanders website, he featured the fact that he was the only vote against "a pair of measures that would promote the development of small modular reactors."¶ One of these measures was the Nuclear Power Act S512. This act would authorize the Secretary of Energy to start a cost-shared program for development of small modular reactors (SMRs).¶ This act had strong bi-partisan support, being sponsored by 3 Republican and 4 Democratic Senators. The act requires research and development funds for SMRs. The Act is still in process, and does not have a firm dollar amount attached, but the dollar amount is likely to be small (in government terms, at least.). Current estimates are $100 million per fiscal year for four years, starting next year.¶ The act also requires that industry cost-share the expense. If industry doesn't think it is worth spending money on the research, the research will not receive government funding either.¶ As a background to the probable cost of this Act, we should note that President Obama requested $4.8 billion dollars for Department of Energy research, of which $3.2 billion is allocated for renewable energy and energy efficiency research. (This number has changed with the debt deal, but new numbers are not available at this time.)¶ Small Modular Reactors for The Future¶ Sander's opposition to this Nuclear Power Act will hurt America's chances to develop an important new exportable technology. Outside of Europe, the nuclear renaissance remains in full swing, with reactors being ordered and built in Arabia, China, India and Southeast Asia. Developing a strong set of SMR designs would be America's best chance to re-entering the world market for nuclear power.¶ SMRs are modular (assembled in a factory and delivered to the site), small (50 to 225 MW) and have many safety features, such as passive cooling. SMRs are expected to have a huge international market. They suitable for many places that do not have the population density or money for the current crop of huge reactors (1200 MW, built on site at great expense). SMRs would make nuclear power affordable and salable many places.¶ Westinghouse and Babcock & Wilcox have invested significant amounts of their own money in developing these products. The NRC is also active in assessing preliminary designs. At another Senate committee meeting on SMRs, Commissioner Magwood of the NRC said that he does not expect decisions made by the NRC to be the critical factor in the success or failure of SMRs. Magwood noted that SMRs have passive safety features and large water inventories; these would be considered during license review.¶ America Fallen Behind¶ America has fallen far behind the rest of the world in most nuclear technologies. Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) and Boiling Water Reactors (BWRs) were developed in this country. They are being sold all over the world, but not by United States companies. We're out of the running. Other countries licensed and improved our original technologies. Companies from France, Korea, Russia and China compete to build large reactors in China, Arabia, and Southeast Asia.¶ Three American companies have put millions of dollars into the development of SMRs: Westinghouse, Babcock & Wilcox, and NuScale (a small start-up). Many people in the nuclear industry feel that the race to develop the first successful SMR is a truly high-stakes race, being fought at the level of nationwide efforts. Luckily, SMR development has bi-partisan support, and Mr. Sanders was alone in his opposition to supporting American industry efforts to develop these plants.¶ Should Government Be Involved?¶ Of course, one can make a case that the government should get out of the energy research business altogether. If Senator Sanders wished to save tax dollars by cutting all energy-research programs, he might have a valid case. However, if the government does plan to spend money on energy research, cost-sharing with industry on a new nuclear technology is certainly a far better use of funds than many of the projects in the swollen DOE renewable budget.

#### Military policy on energy isn’t subject to political debate

Heslop ‘11 (Janelle, Analyst at GreenOrder and LRN Advsior Group, “3 Reasons Why the Military is Leading the Clean-Energy Change” 10/11/11)

3. Even while national progress on energy policy stagnates in the midst of partisan debate, the military has the ability to make large, impactful and immediate investments in clean energy. This is because the military's commitment to renewable energy adoption, though fiscally subject to congressional approval, is not dictated by the same political discourse that is hindering the creation of a national energy bill. As a result, the military does not need to wait for the political debate to complete its course, and with its large purchasing power can confidently begin [investing](http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2011/10/12/3-reasons-why-military-is-leading-clean-energy-charge?page=0%2C1) in a clean energy future now. In fact, the military's goals on energy are far more aggressive than what seems politically feasible in the civilian world in the near term and will likely stay that way for some time.

### Obama Capital Fails

#### Obama capital fails- style and circumstance

Cost 2-9

Dr. Jay has a Ph. D in Political Science from Deleware and is a staff writer at the Weekly Standard, “Obama the Bargainer,” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/obama-bargainer_699205.html>

The recent inaugural festivities would have seemed more than a little strange to the Framers of the Constitution, had they been on hand to see the show. After all, here was their “republic” unified in celebration of vast executive powers being vested in a single human being. Did they not wage a bloody war to overcome such 17th-century notions?¶ And yet, the republic bequeathed by the likes of Madison and Jefferson prizes the inaugural ceremony. It is the most important rite in what Gene Healy of the Cato Institute calls “the cult of the presidency,” which is a decidedly bipartisan affair. Liberals celebrated Obama’s power, conservatives bemoaned it, but all acknowledged it.¶ What then is this power, exactly? The answer is scarcely to be found in the Constitution itself. Article II is shorter than your average newspaper column and spends most of its time reviewing the complicated procedures by which the chief executive is to be selected.¶ The presidency has come to mean much more than the measly powers granted its occupant by the Constitution; the job of the modern president is to fill the spaces left between the various articles and sections and clauses of the founding document. What our system disperses among branches, states, localities, parties, and interest groups, the president brings together, coordinating their efforts for the national good.¶ This is a virtually impossible task, for the formal powers of the president do not meet the informal expectations we the people have set for him. As Harry Truman predicted in the summer of 1952, when it was clear that Dwight Eisenhower would succeed him, “He’ll sit here and he’ll say ‘Do this! Do that!’ And nothing will happen. Poor Ike—it won’t be a bit like the Army. He’ll find it very frustrating.”¶ As usual, the ornery Missouri-farmer-turned-haberdasher hit the nail on the head. Commands simply won’t cut it, for many of the people whom the president would command need not heed him. Members of Congress, judges, cabinet department heads, even leaders of the military have their own mandates that do not require ironclad fealty to the president.¶ Instead, a president succeeds by persuading others to do what he wants. As presidential adviser Richard Neustadt once put it, the job of the president¶ is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his. Because men may differ in their views on public policy, because differences in outlook stem from differences in duty—duty to one’s office, one’s constituents, oneself—that task is bound to be more like collective bargaining than like a reasoned argument among philosopher kings.¶ Thus, with the festivities finished and the glow of the inauguration fading, it is fair to ask: Just how powerful will President Obama be in his second term? In other words, how successful will he be at persuading the diverse agents of our government to do what he wants them to do?¶ If the lessons of his first term guide our expectations for the second, then the most likely answer is: not very.¶ At first blush, this assertion might sound absurd. A weak President Obama? Proof of the contrary is in the pudding: The massive stimulus, the health care bill, and financial reform were all epic in their scope and ambition. Surely both left and right agree—whether they celebrate or bemoan the fact—that Obama is a very strong, liberal president.¶ But presidential power—the ability to persuade—has many sources, some external, some internal. The external sources are all reducible to “the political context.” How many seats does the president’s party control in Congress? What is the status of the opposition party? What was the relative strength of the president and his party in the last election? What is his job approval rating? And so on. All of these factors set the boundaries for how easily the president can persuade others.¶ In 2009 and 2010, President Obama enjoyed a very favorable political context. Today, the political context is more favorable to him than it was in 2011, but markedly diminished from the heady days of 2009. So, for instance, President Obama can call for action on “climate change” until he is blue (or, perhaps, green) in the face, but the political environment—including arguably the most conservative House of Representatives since the 1920s—means he lacks the power to make it happen.¶ The internal sources of strength are the president’s political skills, which he deploys in particular circumstances. So the question becomes: How good is he at persuading others, given the political context? If political context is the science of presidential power, quantifiable in electoral results and congressional voting scores, persuasive skill is the art. Here, we must put down the American Political Science Review and pick up Machiavelli’s Prince. As for President Obama’s first term, no other incoming president in recent history had such a surplus of political capital and misused it so terribly. The reason? He lacks important skills that are integral in the exercise of presidential power.¶ ¶ All presidents are unique, each possessing or lacking skills useful to a chief executive. Obama is notable in that he has mastered some vital skills better than any recent predecessor, but he exhibits virtually no facility with others. His strengths have been enumerated extensively by a fawning press corps. His favorable coverage is due not only to the media’s ideological commitment to his policy goals, but also to his natural gifts. He awes the press, and many other groups in society, by his very presence. Moreover, he knows he has this power over them. This ability, more than any other, made him president and remains his single greatest source of power.¶ Yet though he affects some people intensely, he himself seems largely unaffected by others. This helps explain why he has used his speaking ability so unevenly: He is wont to misread people, and therefore situations. His Tucson speech, for instance, after the shooting of Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, was a political stroke of genius. He intuited what the moment called for and delivered it perfectly. By contrast, his 2009 speech to the International Olympic Committee pitching Chicago was a waste of time and made him look small. Similarly, he has time and again left business leaders feeling nonplussed, inviting them to the White House mainly to serve as window dressing for another teleprompter performance. ¶ It is on Capitol Hill that Obama seems most out of touch with his audience. In particular, he does not understand what the key players in Congress expect, yet he is convinced he knows them better than they know themselves. What’s more, he gives little and inconsistent guidance as to what he expects from them. That goes for both Republicans and Democrats.¶ For Republicans, the warning signs appeared early, on the stimulus bill passed in the president’s first month in office. Obama and his team were supremely confident that they could get a $900 billion package through Congress with solid Republican support, so much so that when House minority whip Eric Cantor warned that they would receive no backing from House Republicans, they told him not to embarrass himself with such an absurd prediction.¶ Team Obama failed to anticipate how turned off the congressional GOP would be by the spending side of the package: Democratic appropriators were unloading a wish list that had accumulated during more than a decade of Republican governance. The White House also thought the Republicans would be attracted to the tax cuts that constituted roughly one-third of the package. But the White House did not understand how Republicans view taxes—specifically, the difference between tax credits, which the stimulus favored heavily, and rate cuts, which Republicans prefer. None of this should have come as a surprise to anyone who had done any homework on the congressional GOP. After all, Republicans killed a 1993 stimulus bill that was qualitatively similar, but less than a tenth the size of the 2009 package.¶ What did Team Obama surmise when its predictions fell flat? It certainly did not take time to gauge the congressional GOP more carefully, to build a more nuanced picture of Republicans’ motives and expectations. Instead, it adopted the cartoonish caricature one finds in a Paul Krugman column: Republicans are contemptible knaves, willing to let the economy go down the drain to embarrass the president.¶ The stimulus also featured another theme of presidential-congressional relations under Obama: mixed messages from the White House. Early in the negotiations over the bill, President Obama told House minority leader John Boehner and Cantor that he was interested in their ideas. He did not want to play partisan games; he just wanted to jump-start the economy. Yet when Cantor presented the president a list of suggestions, Obama brought the dialogue to an icy conclusion by infamously declaring, “I won, so I think I trump you on that.” During the deliberations on the bill, the president’s chief of staff, Rahm Emanuel, was known to respond to other GOP suggestions by shouting, “We have the votes. F— ’em!”¶ ¶ For the first two years of Obama’s tenure, congressional Republicans did not register with the White House at all. Contact was so sparse that when the GOP took control of the House of Representatives, the White House did not even have Boehner’s cell phone number so the president could place a congratulatory call.¶ The case of Michigan Republican Dave Camp is illustrative. According to Bob Woodward in The Price of Politics,¶ The administration’s approach to Congress was different from what he was used to. He had first come to Washington as a congressional staffer during the Reagan administration. Reagan had deployed administration liaisons all over Congress. Camp could remember Reagan getting on the phone with a lowly freshman congressman to discuss legislation. .  .  . During Obama’s first two years in office, Camp was the ranking Republican on the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee. He was one of the more politically moderate House Republicans. Yet the administration’s Hill staff didn’t even seem to know who he was. He never saw them.¶ During the debt ceiling battle of 2011, the president again exhibited cluelessness about the motivations of congressional Republicans. Precious time during the month of July was wasted as Obama insisted again and again on decoupling the Bush-era tax cuts, making permanent the cuts for those making under $250,000, and letting the cuts in the high-end rates expire. His argument was that the congressional GOP could avoid the wrath of Grover Norquist because it would not actually have to vote to increase taxes. It seemed never to cross his mind that tax rate increases such as he was proposing were anathema to congressional Republicans.¶ The bigger problem during the debt ceiling fight, and probably the biggest contributor to the near-default of the country that summer, was Obama’s failure to heed Boehner’s warning that $800 billion in additional tax revenue was his “red line,” above which he could not go. The justification for that figure was that it was all that could be squeezed out of tax reform (and even that was optimistic according to many analysts); beyond that, tax rates would have to be raised in order to bring in more revenue. In late July, after Boehner had made a “grand bargain” offer that included $800 billion in new revenue, Obama asked for another $400 billion. Memories diverge on exactly who said what—Boehner is convinced Obama said he had to have the extra money, while Obama believes he only suggested it. This ambiguity might have been avoided if Obama had not made the rookie mistake of making such a big request over the phone instead of in person. And, anyway, he should have known not to ask, given Boehner’s previous warnings about his red line. Unsurprisingly, the deal blew up shortly afterwards.¶ It boils down to the difference between listening and waiting to talk. With congressional Republicans, Obama always seems to do the latter. So, once again, he was left disappointed, and once again he assumed the worst of his negotiating partners. He surmised that there were simply too many extreme Tea Party Republicans who were prepared to breach the debt ceiling, and that Boehner lacked control of his caucus. Again, a basic understanding of Republican history would have corrected this notion. Like Newt Gingrich and Denny Hastert before him, Boehner is responsible to a majority of the Republican caucus, which for generations has opposed the kinds of rate increases that $1.2 trillion in new revenue would have required.¶ Not only did Obama fail to listen during the debt ceiling struggle, he consistently sent the other side mixed messages. A case in point: Obama’s demagogic April 2011 speech blasted Paul Ryan’s budget as “leaving seniors at the mercy of the insurance industry” and abandoning “the fundamental commitment this country has kept for generations.” In private, however, Obama had praised Ryan for offering a serious proposal and emphasized that both sides had to avoid scaring the elderly for political points. Worse, he had held a bipartisan summit that very day to encourage the two sides to come together on a plan.¶ ¶ ¶ Obama’s problems communicating with Congress are not limited to the right side of the aisle. Although Democrats need not worry about White House demagoguery or fret that Obama fails to understand their concerns, he has nevertheless done a poor job of engaging them in dialogue. In particular, the White House has often cut congressional Democrats out of the loop, inhibiting interbranch coordination and angering leaders by what they feel is trampling on their institutional rights.¶ Indeed, the president’s signature achievement—Obamacare—almost did not happen because of this. The process by which the health care bill was written was chaotic, to say the least. At one point five bills were circulating on Capitol Hill, three in the House and two in the Senate. Each differed, sometimes dramatically, in how to expand coverage and how to pay for it. And yet the White House did virtually nothing in 2009 to coordinate these efforts.¶ In fact, White House aides privately thought the final House bill was a liberal fantasy, and they had worked out a deal with medical providers that did not include the so-called public option. Yet the president never came out against that proposal, or any other, for that matter. After multiple calls over the summer of 2009 for President Obama to set some ground rules on what he expected, he gave a speech in early September that, though his aides promised specificity, was once again vague.¶ Finally, in early January, when the two chambers had passed their bills and it came time to work out the finer points, President Obama actually stormed out of a meeting after Nancy Pelosi tartly expressed her frustration with his lack of leadership. It was left to Emanuel to finish the negotiations. Worse, the needless delays due to the lack of presidential leadership sapped public support for the reform effort, led to Scott Brown’s victory in the Senate race in Massachusetts that January, and eventually forced Democrats to pass a gratuitously slipshod and ill-conceived bill that otherwise never would have become law.¶ After the 2010 midterms, House Democrats lost their majority, but not all of their clout. It would have been virtually impossible for Boehner to pass a compromise debt ceiling plan through the House in 2011 without at least some Democratic support, so it was appropriate for Pelosi and her leadership team to be kept in the loop. For a while, they were, but as Boehner and Obama approached a grand bargain, House Democrats were excluded.¶ Amazingly, so was Harry Reid. Any deal would obviously have to bear the imprimatur of the Senate majority leader, yet he was cut out of the final talks. It was only after the New York Times scooped the Boehner-Obama grand bargain that the White House brought Senate Democrats into the loop. Unsurprisingly, they were apoplectic, believing that the deal extracted too little from the congressional GOP, and feeling that they had been ignored. In fact, it was the outrage of the Senate Democrats that prompted the White House to go back to Boehner at the last minute to ask for more tax revenue, scuttling the big deal once and for all.¶ All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure.¶ There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill.¶ In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president’s job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: ¶ ¶ The reason people put me in this office is people felt that I had connected our current predicaments with the broader arc of American history and where we might go as a diverse and forward-looking nation. And that narrative thread we just lost, in the day-to-day problem solving that was going on. .  .  . What the president can do, that nobody else can do, is tell a story to the American people about where we are and where we need to go.¶ While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices.¶ The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one “actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.” President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one “in the arena.”¶ What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi’s power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side.¶ But little such progress will be due to President Obama. It is highly unlikely that he will act as the collective bargainer

 Neustadt envisioned. He will not be the one to help hammer out policy differences

 between Senate Democrats and House Republicans, such as illegal immigrants’ status under Obamacare, or help the appropriators find the money needed for enforcement, or create a political space where both parties can declare victory.¶ Sure enough, last week’s campaign-style speech in Las Vegas on immigration reform was classic Obama. Not only did it do nothing to advance the ball on the sensitive negotiations in Congress, but the president demanded immediate amnesty, something to which Republicans will never agree. He also said he would “insist” that Congress vote on his proposal if it did not act in a timely fashion.¶ That captures Obama’s problem in a nutshell. “Insisting” that Congress do something is a good way to make sure nothing happens. Instead, as Harry Truman once said, the president must spend his time “flattering, kissing, and kicking people to get them to do what they are supposed to do anyway.” Barack Obama does not do this. He thinks it beneath him. After four years in office, he still fails to grasp the essence of modern presidential power.

### Winners Win

#### Winners win - even controversial policies boost Obama’s capital

Singer 9 (Juris Doctorate candidate at Berkeley Law, Jonathon, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital,” 3/3/2009, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result.

### Econ Defense

**No recession impact**

Coleman ‘3

(Glenn, writer for Money Magazine, CNN, “Peter Lynch: Why he's buying now,” 1-24, http://money.cnn.com/2003/01/23/funds/lynch/)

Recessions are scary things, and the obvious worries about jobs and bonuses and bills and bankruptcies-- the background noise that keeps you awake at night, Lynch calls it--often mute an important fact: **The U.S. economy has seen 10 recessions since 1945, and it has emerged from nine of them stronger than before**. Of course, it's not a fact yet that we'll pull ourselves No. 10 in better shape.

#### Economic decline does not cause shooting wars

Miller 2k

(Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### No internal link to impact

Harrington ‘09

http://www.tryfreedom.us/2009/12/13/economics-paper-on-illegal-immigration/

Even if illegal immigrants reduce wages more than prices for a small percentage of American consumers, illegal immigration still has major benefits during a recession. As the economy turned down last year and the demand for labor, particularly unskilled labor, shrank due to both the housing bubble bursting and the decrease in income leading to a drop in demand for goods and services, illegal aliens began to leave the country.[21] For the first time since the Department of Homeland Security began to record estimates of the number of illegal immigrants, the estimate of the number of undocumented residents within the United States decreased.[22] As proven earlier, most unskilled illegal immigrants are from Latin America which is nearby and so, have the ability to return to their country of origin when necessary.[23] One illegal immigrant that came to America four years earlier to work in construction and now was leaving America to return to his country stated that he had worked only three days over the past year due in part to new competition from American laborers.[24] So, as illegal immigrants leave, the unskilled labor market will shrink and unemployed Americans will be able to find jobs, although they may be less lucrative jobs than the Americans had previously held.

# Canada Shale

## AT Canada Shale

### Author Indicts

#### Their author concedes its inevitable and that alternative energies solve

Zerbisias 12

(Antonia, Toronto Star, 2-24-12, “Ottawa’s focus on Alberta oilsands is killing manufacturing jobs in Eastern Canada, economists say,” http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/article/1136578--ottawa-s-focus-on-alberta-oilsands-is-killing-manufacturing-jobs-in-eastern-canada-economists-say)

Economists suggest there are ways to cure Dutch Disease, or at least lessen its impact.¶ Canada could invest in other industries, including green technologies. Or it could go the foreign currency route, by investing abroad. That’s what Norway does with its oil wealth. By creating a petroleum fund with foreign currency, it also pays down its debt, which reduces the upward pressure on the krone and protects the country’s exports.¶ But, as Coulombe says, “We cannot do that in Canada because we have a sophisticated and complicated federal and provincial system and it is the provinces that own the natural resources.”¶ Alberta doesn’t seem particularly disposed to help Eastern Canada, which, ironically, imports most of its oil from the Middle East, Mexico and Norway.¶ “When the federal government talks about diversifying our markets, we shouldn’t be looking to northeast Asia, we should be looking to Canada,” says Allan. “We hear we have to diversify to Asia because Asia needs to protect its source of supply so it’s not dependent on Saudi Arabia. But Canada also has a dependency on Middle Eastern countries.¶ “So why are our federal leaders so concerned about everybody else’s oil security and not Canada’s? We should be looking at what we can do to help Eastern Canada avoid the unpredictable and volatile (prices) and perhaps supply restrictions that are going to happen in the years to come.”¶ Coulombe fears that little or nothing can or will be done to protect Canadian consumers and manufacturers from the effects of Dutch Disease.¶ “I don’t think the manufacturing sector will come back; I think we have to accept that,” says Coulombe. “The growth of China is like a big train. Canada will be more and more a country that will live on its natural resources.”¶ There’s another old Canadian expression, attributed to the late University of Toronto economist Harold Innis. He compared Canadians to “hewers of wood and drawers of water” because we were dependent for so long on exporting our raw materials to buy back value-added manufactured goods.¶ Today, we are selling our oil to buy back gasoline, jet fuel, asphalt, plastic and other petroleum-based products.¶ That would make us “deliverers of crude and drawers of water.”

### 2AC- No Secession

#### No one in Canada wants to secede

The Toronto Star February 19, 2010 Friday ”Is Bouchard ready for a comeback?” Chantal Hebert, Toronto Star

Even if Bouchard had not rained on the upcoming anniversary parade, it would have taken more than a double-barrelled commemoration of federalist and sovereignist failures to send Quebecers back to the referendum barricades. A poll published Thursday showed two-thirds of respondents agreed with Bouchard's call to put sovereignty on the back burner indefinitely and more than half did not believe the province would ever secede from Canada.

#### Rhetoric of secession is symbolic and empirically denied

Belleville Intelligencer(Ontario) November 24, 2006 Friday Legal experts say Quebec resolution is strictly a symbolic gesture NATIONAL; Pg. 6

The Conservative government has concocted a nationalist placebo, not a constitutional prescription for the federation, according to legal experts.

But they warn the very legal emptiness of Prime Minister Stephen Harper's proposed motion to recognize the Quebecois as a nation within a united Canada may yet put pressure on all federalist politicians to do something more meaningful, like enshrining Quebec's nationhood in the Constitution.

For the moment, however, constitutional law authority Peter Russell said Thursday the motion "means nothing in law."

"It's what I call symbolic engineering. It's about hoping you'll make people feel good. The risk is that you'll make others feel awful."

Harper stunned opposition parties Wednesday when he introduced the motion in the Commons. The move was aimed at pre-empting a Bloc Quebecois motion which called for recognition of Quebecers as a nation, but with no mention of Canada.

The motion won the support of the NDP and Liberals, although leadership hopefuls Bob Rae and Gerard Kennedy, as well as some Liberal MPs, remain uneasy about the potential legal implications.

Their concerns were heightened after Quebec Premier Jean Charest lauded the motion as historic and asserted that it will have significance, both in domestic law and on the international stage.

"It changes the way our laws are interpreted. It changes the way Quebecers will see their future because the recognition of Quebec as a nation is a way for us to occupy the place that is owed us in Canada and elsewhere in the world," Charest said Wednesday.

But constitutional expert Patrick Monahan, dean of Osgoode Hall law school, dismissed Charest's interpretation.

"A resolution of the House of Commons is not legally binding," he noted.

Furthermore, Monahan pointed out that the last parliamentary resolution on Quebec's distinctiveness - passed with great fanfare immediately after the razor-thin federalist victory in the 1995 referendum - has disappeared without a trace, even though it was theoretically a stronger motion.

"It's never been referred to in any (court) case. It's never been mentioned in any court decision."

The 1995 resolution recognized Quebec as a distinct society and instructed the federal government to take that distinctiveness into account in everything that it does. Harper's resolution does not instruct the government to do anything.

In international law, University of Western Ontario political scientist Robert Young said nations do have the right to self- determination.

But, as the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled, self-determination does not imply a right to secede and form an independent state. Young said the only exception is for nations which have been "severely repressed," something Quebec could never credibly claim.

"So, the fact that they've been recognized as a nation by the government of Canada is irrelevant," he said.

In domestic law, Young said it's hard to imagine a scenario in which Canadian courts would be influenced by a parliamentary resolution recognizing Quebecers as a nation.

If Quebec was to challenge a federal power or try to encroach on federal jurisdiction, he said it's conceivable that the province might try to argue that its status as a nation gave it the right to do so. But he doubted any court would accept such an argument, noting that aboriginal people have been dubbed first nations for years with no discernable bearing on court rulings.

Monahan noted that Harper has cleverly worded the motion so that it's the Quebec people who are recognized as a nation, not the province. Quebecois are not a legal entity and, therefore, likely couldn't use such recognition to wrestle more powers, he said.

### 2AC Resil

#### Russia’s economy is resilient – oil, metals, and financial reserves

Garrels 8

(Annie – a foreign correspondent for National Public Radio in the United States, “RUSSIAN ECONOMY STRONG DESPITE COMMODITY FALLOUT”, 9/20/08, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=94647099>)

For the past six years**, Russia's economy has boomed in large part because of soaring prices for oil and metals.** Russia is strong in these areas ó too strong, though, for a balanced economy. Russian shares have bled almost 50 percent of their value since May, but many analysts say Russia still remains a resilient economy. And after the Georgia invasion and weeks of harsh, anti-western rhetoric, both Russian President Dmitri Medvedev and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin have tried to reassure foreign investors. When those commodities prices dropped, Russia's stock market was hit hard. "The question is if they fall significantly further," says James Fenkner with Red Star Assets in Moscow. Fenkner is one of the more cautious voices in Moscow, and other analysts like Roland Nash of Renaissance Capital look at other indicators, like direct foreign investment. "The level of foreign investment is twice the per capita of Brazil, **four times that of China**, and six times that of India this year," Nash says. "The market arguments for Russia are still very good and there is still a lot of money coming in." Too Dependent On Commodities The Russia government recognizes it is too dependent on commodities, and while their prices were high, it amassed **huge reserves as a cushion**. The country now has a balanced budget and financial analysts predict its economy will continue to grow at about six percent. Vladmir Tikhomirov, senior economist at Uralsib Financial Corporation, says this is enough to avoid a crisis, but it is not what the Kremlin hoped for. "It's not enough to make fundamental changes to the economic structures," Tikhomirov says. "Russia must have to be a more competitive and efficient economy." Moscow may now be the most expensive, glamorous city in the world, but the rest of the country lags behind. Tikhomirov says the Russia needs to improve basic infrastructure like roads as well as small and mid-size businesses. For this, Russia needs a stable global financial system

### 2AC No Impact

#### Econ decline won’t change Russia’s foreign policy or cause domestic unrest – empirically denied

Blackwill 9

(Robert Blackwill 2009; former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning; RAND, "The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution", http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Now on to Russia. Again, fi ve years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it aff ect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary infl uence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western efforts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

### Nat Gas Inev

#### European fracking will reduce Russia’s leverage

**Blas 12**—Commodities Editor [Javier Blas, “Russia faces challenge to gas supremacy,” Financial Times, Last updated: April 17, 2012 3:25 pm, pg. http://tinyurl.com/97e36nr

The biggest risk for Russia is not the US shale gas but the potential of the development of similar reserves in neighbouring Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and Ukraine. ¶ Eastern European countries are racing to tap shale deposits using the same technology—hydraulic fracturing, known as fracking, and horizontal drilling—used in the US gas industry. ¶ Gazprom supplies Europe with about 20 per cent of its gas needs, so the development of shale deposits in its backyard is a serious long-term threat.¶ Until now, European companies have found it difficult to renegotiate their expensive contracts with Gazprom because the lack of alternative suppliers. Over the next decade, the development of the European shale industry could give the Continent’s natural gas consumers a bit more leverage.

## Impact Turns

#### SMR’s frees up massive amounts of oil and natural gas.

Loudermilk 11

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs” Journal of Energy Security, May 2011, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375>, SEH)

Lastly, and often ignored, is the ability of small reactors to bring a secure energy supply to locations detached from the grid. Small communities across Canada, Alaska, and other places have expressed immense interest in this opportunity. Additionally, the incorporation of small reactors may be put to productive use in energy-intensive operations including the chemical and plastics industries, oil refineries, and shale gas extraction. Doing so, especially in the fossil fuels industry would free up the immense amounts of oil and gas currently burned in the extraction and refining process. All told, small reactors possess numerous direct and indirect cost benefits which may alter thinking on the monetary competitiveness of the technology.

#### Shale boom key to global economy – international energy policy

Henry 8/15

(Lowman S. Henry is chairman & CEO of the Lincoln Institute and host of the weekly Lincoln Radio Journal. “Hitting ‘pay dirt’ in Pennsylvania” Updated: Monday, October 15, 2012 http://triblive.com/opinion/2740302-74/pennsylvania-development-gas-marcellus-oil-shale-impact-pay-america-domestic#axzz29xMVzlSO, TSW)

There is no doubt that development of Pennsylvania’s Marcellus shale natural gas resources has fueled an economic boom across a wide swath of rural Pennsylvania, a region that has floundered economically for decades. But, the impact is being felt not only in those communities, but across Penn’s Woods and — as recent events illustrate — could actually play a global role.¶ After much debate, the General Assembly passed a tax — deceptively called an “impact fee” — on Marcellus gas drillers. The tax has resulted in more than $206 million in revenue to date. Ultimately, 58 companies have been singled out and are required to pay the additional tax above and beyond the taxes all other businesses in the state are required to pay.¶ Already substantial, the economic impact of Marcellus shale gas is only just beginning to be felt. Speaking at an industry conference in Philadelphia, Gov. Tom Corbett dubbed what has happened so far as the “tip of the spear,” which will spark a new industrial revolution in Pennsylvania. This was not rhetorical hyperbole.¶ Already the Shell is moving toward development of an ethane “cracker” plant in Beaver County that the Pennsylvania Economy League estimates could create 8,000 new jobs and have a $4.8 billion impact on the state’s economy.¶ In addition to the domestic benefits of Marcellus gas development, the shale reserve could play an important international energy policy role. Recent developments in the Middle East have underscored the fragility of America’s dependence on oil from that region. The Sept. 11 terrorist attack that killed the U.S. ambassador to Libya and widespread demonstrations revealed a cultural fault line that has opened a worldwide debate over freedom of speech that threatens to further destabilize the region.¶ It has become abundantly clear the United States must significantly reduce its dependence on oil from the Middle East. To do that, America must more rapidly develop domestic energy production, and a multifaceted approach is required. We must speed up the tapping of our abundant natural gas, coal and oil resources. Construction of the Keystone pipeline, issuance of more offshore oil drilling permits and responsible drilling in the Arctic Natural Wildlife Refuge are keys to oil development. The Obama administration’s “war on coal” must be ended and the industry re-incentivized to spur development.¶ Despite the overwhelming economic and strategic benefits of the Marcellus shale gas industry in Pennsylvania, challenges remain. Radical environmentalists seek to stop further drilling rather than to advocate for reasonable safeguards. Misinformation about fracking and other aspects of shale development runs rampant. And, as always, there are elected officials who see a goose laying golden eggs, which they want to take to finance unrelated politically popular programs.¶ For state government, the challenge going forward is to not get in the way. Lawmakers must avoid the temptation to overtax, and the administration must resist calls for overregulation. So far, a relatively reasonable balance has been struck. A lot is riding on keeping it that way.¶

#### Shale gas boom key to revive chemical industry – best report proves

Kever 8/11

(Jeannie Kever HOUSTON CHRONICLE “Shale gas could boost other industries” Thursday October 11, 2012 5:59 AM <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/business/2012/10/11/shale-gas-could-boost-other-industries.html>, TSW)

The shale-gas boom could cut costs significantly for the chemical industry and ultimately benefit the apparel, electronics, machinery and other industries, according to a new report.¶ The report by PricewaterhouseCoopers US suggests cheap natural-gas liquids could even prompt some companies to move production back to the United States.¶ Shale gas already has spurred an estimated $15 billion in new investments in Texas chemical plants, according to Hector Rivera, president and CEO of the Texas Chemical Council.¶ Rivera said the rebound started as the nation began to recover from the recession.¶ “Here in the United States, it has been a game-changer and has created an opportunity for a lot of companies to make new investments in the United States, as opposed to overseas markets where natural gas has historically been cheaper over the last 10 or 15 years,” he said.¶ Anthony J. Scamuffa, U.S. chemicals leader for PricewaterhouseCoopers, predicted that the effects of low-priced natural-gas liquids will ripple through the manufacturing chain.¶

#### Extinction

ICCA 2

International Council of Chemical Associations, June 20, "SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY", <http://www.cefic.be/position/icca/pp_ic010.htm>

The key finding of "Our Common Future", (the 1987 report of the United Nations' World Commission on Environment and Development), is that environmental, economic and social concerns must be integrated if the world's peoples are to advance and develop without jeopardizing the natural environment on which all life depends. Although today we cannot define the needs of future generations, the challenge for today's leaders is to pursue policies that will leave available an array of choices for future generations to meet their own needs.¶ Sustainable Development will only come about if three goals - economic, environmental and society-related - can be reconciled. To determine the limits of acceptability and scope for action requires a set of conventions which society at large accepts as valid.¶ Sustainability in economic terms means the efficient management of scarce resources as well as a prospering industry and economy. Sustainability in the environmental sense means not placing an intolerable load on the ecosphere and maintaining the natural basis for life. Seen from society's viewpoint, sustainability means that human beings are the centre of concern. In view, particularly, of the population increase worldwide, there needs to be provided as large a measure of equal opportunities, freedom, social justice and security as possible.¶ The chemical industry views Sustainable Development as a challenge put before all parts of society. In the advances made in its own operations, its improved performance and in the improvements to the human condition made through its products, the chemical industry sees cause for optimism and believes that Sustainable Development can be the intellectual framework around which the chemical industry, other industries and other sectors of society can reach consensus on how to improve living standards and the environment.¶ The main challenges facing the world include:¶ • Optimizing the benefits obtained from depleting resources ¶ • Assuring against excessive strains placed on the eco-system ¶ • The dynamic growth of the world population ¶ • Remedying social and economic inequalities ¶ These are challenges on a global scale. It follows, therefore, that the attainment of Sustainable Development will call for action on the part of the people, governments, businesses and organisations around the world. The global chemical industry has realized this challenge.¶ CONTRIBUTION OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The chemical industry is a key industry. Its products and services are instrumental in meeting the needs of mankind. It is present in all areas of life, from food and clothing, housing, communications, transport - right through to leisure activities. In addition, it helps to solve the problems of other sectors of industry, such as the energy sector, information technologies, environmental industries and the waste disposal sector, as examples.¶ Due to its size, the chemical industry is an important supplier to a broad range of downstream industries and is, as well, a customer of a broad range of products and services from other industries. It follows, therefore, that the chemical industry plays a major role in providing/ supporting performance improvements, research and development progress and, last but not least, employment in other industries.¶ In itself, it is a large-scale provider of jobs and makes a significant contribution to wealth creation and, hence, to the financing of both public works and the exercise of public responsibilities. Since living standards are determined to a large degree by material considerations, it is clear that the chemical industry with its unique capabilities is in a position to make a decisive contribution to Sustainable Development.¶ Commitment by the world chemical industry to the concept of Sustainable Development requires words to be transposed into company-specific action programmes in order to provide a framework for all those working in the sector. Its "Responsible Care" initiative, self-monitoring systems and other voluntary programmes such as Sustainable Technology (SUSTECH), Education-Industry Partnerships, Energy Efficiency Programmes are also part of this framework. Thereby, companies are also confronted with new challenges and must act responsibly. They must take account of the consequences of their actions upon society and future generations.¶ The global chemical industry believes that the key to improving the performance of the industry is both its commitment to achieving environmentally sound Sustainable Development and improved performance and transparency. Under the concept of "Responsible Care", chemical companies are committed, in all aspects of safety, health and protection of the environment, to seek continuous improvement in performance, to educate all staff and work with customers and communities regarding product use and overall operation. Through these efforts the industry is improving its efficiency, reducing risks to health and the environment and making better products which, in turn, help individual and industry customers.¶ THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY's LEADERSHIP IN INNOVATION¶ The very notion of Sustainable Development will require new approaches in a number of areas. Innovation at all levels and in all fields of activity is the most effective instrument for ensuring that the economic, and environmental goals, as well as those of society, are being advanced.¶ The chemical industry's contribution is to continue innovation of new products that meet customer needs and manufacturing processes that reduce risks to health and the environment. This contribution is based upon the knowledge and experience the industry has acquired from applying innovation not only to making, handling and use of chemical compounds, but also to reprocessing, recycling and solving environmental problems. The challenge facing the chemical industry is to maximize innovation, which can contribute to society meeting its goals for Sustainable Development.¶ The chemical industry is firmly convinced that leadership in innovation represents the best way of attaining Sustainable Development. For the individual company, this means:¶ • a consistent orientation towards products, technologies and solutions which offer the greatest promise for the future ¶ • development of new integrated environmental technologies ¶ • a close cooperation with the customers of the chemical industry ¶ • adaptation to the conditions of global competition ¶ • bringing the most promising products quickly on the market ¶ • strengthening the R&D effort which requires resources which can only be financed from profitable earnings ¶ • actively contributing ideas and suggestions to the policy debates taking place in society ¶ • improving process yield (efficiency). ¶ APPROACH TO THE ECONOMIC GOAL OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ The internationalization of the economy at large, in conjunction with a growing trend towards global competition, is becoming more and more apparent. This is being manifested by:¶ • an increase of imports and exports of goods as well as services ¶ • growing outward and inward flows of direct investment ¶ • an ever increasing exchange of technology transfers ¶ • globalization of monetary and financial schemes. ¶ The inter-relation of economic systems is complex, with a variety of relationships among countries. Multi-national chemical companies apply common standards in spreading investment capital and stimulating markets around the globe, thus setting the scene for the world market. What they need, in order to play a constructive role in Sustainable Development, is, first and foremost, freedom and fairness in international trade. Trade as an engine of economic growth is essential for Sustainable Development. A climate needs to be fostered within which such growth may take place on the basis of a clear set of rules with predictable consequences, by which investors may be guided in their long-term decision-making process. This includes bringing to a halt the growing intervention by governments in industry and their ever increasing demands to raise income by taxation, thus imposing a disproportionate load on the business community.¶ Wealth creation and profits are fundamental to Sustainable Development. They sustain economies (not just the chemical industry), and contribute, via re-investment and R&D, to new technologies and environmental improvements. Profits are needed to create flexible company structures oriented towards economic, environmental and society-related requirements.¶ The chemical industry is a major industrial sector and an essential contributor to welfare and employment on a global scale. In order to maintain this position under the imperative of Sustainable Development, the long-term future of the industry must be rooted in a dynamic policy, whereby continual innovation and re-engineering of companies result in an increase of productivity and, thus, keeping up international competitiveness as a pre-requisite of sustainable job creation.

#### Shale boom key reassert Latin American influence – focus shift

Pilko 8/5

(Alexey Pilko “Shale gas and oil revolution reshaping world economy and politics” Oct 5, 2012 16:17 Moscow Time http://english.ruvr.ru/2012\_10\_05/Shale-gas-and-oil-revolution-reshaping-world-economy-and-politics/, TSW)

New energy sources, i.e. shale gas and oil, could have a major impact on international relations. Large global players that still depend on imported energy may eventually become exporters themselves.¶ This situation, if it comes to pass (and this is still a big “if”, as the prospects for shale development are far from clear), will inevitably be a serious issue for Russia, which is a leading supplier of energy resources to the world market. Moscow will surely need to adjust its internal and external policies.¶ Ten years ago, it was impossible to imagine that the United States would become a major producer of natural gas and overtake Russia for first place in volume of production. Now, it is a fact. Many countries have begun to develop shale gas, including Poland, Ukraine, Australia, the UK and China. According to media reports, by 2032 the United Kingdom will be able to meet a quarter of its needs with this type of fuel.¶ New technologies have been developed that make it feasible to extract shale oil in many countries. For example, according to available information, Japan is betting on it. Japan Petroleum Exploration Company has managed to extract liquid shale oil, which may solve the country’s acute power shortage, exacerbated by Tokyo’s decision to abandon nuclear energy in the future.¶ The shale revolution, if it happens, will inevitably have a major impact on international relations. Imagine a purely theoretical scenario: the USA, Western Europe and China stop importing oil and gas, or at least dramatically reduce imports. It is safe to say that the oil monarchies of the Persian Gulf would be among the biggest losers in such a scenario. Demand for their products would plummet, and they would have to significantly scale back their geopolitical ambitions.¶ The United States would become less interested in Central Asia, and pipeline projects bypassing Russia would likely come to a halt. The future of Caspian Sea development would be in question. Perhaps, instead of trying to gain access to foreign energy reserves, Washington would focus its efforts on other areas, such as restoring its position in the Western Hemisphere (i.e. Latin America), which has weakened in recent years.¶

#### U.S. Military Bases key to Latin American Democracy

Olson ‘02

(Joy Olson, named Executive Director of WOLA in 2003, is a leading expert on human rights and U.S. policy toward Latin America. Under Ms. Olson’s direction, WOLA is pioneering new approaches to human rights advocacy, focusing on the underlying causes of injustice, inequality, and violence. The Washington Post has recognized WOLA as one of the best-managed non-profits in the Washington area.¶ Ms. Olson’s special expertise is in the area of military and security policy. She has been a longtime advocate for greater transparency of military programs in Latin America. She co-founded the Just the Facts project, which makes information about U.S. military policy in Latin America publicly accessible. For more than a decade, she has co-authored an annual study on trends in U.S. security assistance, including the recent report Waiting for Change.¶ Ms. Olson has testified before Congress on Latin America policy issues ranging from human rights in Mexico to drug policy to the problems of poverty and inequality in the region.¶ She is a frequent commentator in the media, including CNN, CNN Español, the BBC, the Lehrer News Hour, National Public Radio, and an array of national and international news outlets.¶ Prior to joining WOLA, Ms. Olson directed the Latin America Working Group (LAWG), a coalition of sixty non-governmental organizations working to promote peaceful and just U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America. Her many accomplishments include leading NGO efforts to increase U.S. funding for Central American peace accords implementation and a successful advocacy effort to lift the ban on food and medicine sales to Cuba. In the 1980s she worked on immigration and refugees issues, and developed legislation to suspend the deportation of Salvadoran refugees from the United States.¶ Ms. Olson earned a Masters in Latin American Studies from the National Autonomous University of Mexico, following two years’ work in community development in Honduras. “U.S. military programmes with Latin America¶ and their impact on human security” 2002 <http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art1448.pdf>, TSW)

Human security¶ In light of the existing military conflicts in the world today, many would consider the issues¶ presented for human security in the U.S. military relationship with Latin America to be rather benign.¶ However, in reality, the issues in Latin America go to the heart of the role of militaries in democratic¶ societies. In the last thirty years, Latin America has had too much bitter¶ experience with militaries involved in civilian governance. Although in¶ most Latin American countries today, the possibility of the military forcibly¶ taking control of the government seems remote, the roles taken by the¶ militaries at this time can either enhance or diminish civilian structures and credibility—and, in the end,¶ help make or break the success of democracy in this hemisphere.

#### Latin American democracy key to democracy worldwide

Fauriol and Weintraub ‘95

(Dr. Sidney Weintraub is the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Director of the Americas Program at the center. Georges A. Fauriol joins NED from the International Republican Institute (IRI), where he most recently served as Senior Vice President. He also served as IRI’s Vice President of Strategic Planning, and was Acting President in summer 2004. Prior to joining IRI in October 2001, Fauriol served as Director and Senior Fellow of the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies where he was the senior scholar specializing in Western Hemisphere issues – the Caribbean, Mexico, Central and South America, and Canada. Previously, Fauriol worked with the Foreign Policy Research Institute, the U.S. Information Agency and the Inter-American Development Bank. Fauriol is the author or coauthor of several books and more than 50 publications. He received his master’s and his doctorate degrees from the University of Pennsylvania, and a bachelor’s degree from Ohio University. “U.S. policy, Brazil, and the Southern Cone” *The Washington Quarterly. 18.3 (Summer 1995): p123.* Gale, TSW)

The democracy theme also carries much force in the hemisphere today. The State Department regularly parades the fact that all countries in the hemisphere, save one, now have democratically elected governments. True enough, as long as the definition of democracy is flexible, but these countries turned to democracy mostly of their own volition. It is hard to determine if the United States is using the democracy theme as a club in the hemisphere (hold elections or be excluded) or promoting it as a goal. If as a club, its efficacy is limited to this hemisphere, as the 1994 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in Indonesia demonstrated in its call for free trade in that region, replete with nondemocratic nations, by 2020. Following that meeting, Latin Americans are somewhat cynical as to whether the United States really cares deeply about promoting democracy if this conflicts with expanding exports.¶ Yet this triad of objectives - economic liberalization and free trade, democratization, and sustainable development/alleviation of poverty - is generally accepted in the hemisphere. The commitment to the latter two varies by country, but all three are taken as valid. All three are also themes expounded widely by the United States, but with more vigor in this hemisphere than anywhere else in the developing world. Thus, failure to advance on all three in Latin America will compromise progress elsewhere in the world.

#### Democracy prevents extinction

Diamond ‘95

Larry Diamond, Hoover Institution senior fellow, co-editor of the Journal of Democracy, December 1995, A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives,” http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. **Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons** continue to **proliferate. The very source of life** on Earth, **the** global **ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered.** Most of **these** new and unconventional **threats** to security **are** associated with or **aggravated by the** weakness or **absence of democracy**, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. **Countries that govern** themselves **in a** truly **democratic fashion do not go to war with one another.** They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. **Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse"** their own populations, **and they** are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies **do not sponsor terrorism** against one another. **They do not build w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. **They are** more **environmentally responsible because they must answer to** their own **citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments.** They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

#### US military bases key to train counter-narcotics

Olson ‘02

(Joy Olson, named Executive Director of WOLA in 2003, is a leading expert on human rights and U.S. policy toward Latin America. Under Ms. Olson’s direction, WOLA is pioneering new approaches to human rights advocacy, focusing on the underlying causes of injustice, inequality, and violence. The Washington Post has recognized WOLA as one of the best-managed non-profits in the Washington area.¶ Ms. Olson’s special expertise is in the area of military and security policy. She has been a longtime advocate for greater transparency of military programs in Latin America. She co-founded the Just the Facts project, which makes information about U.S. military policy in Latin America publicly accessible. For more than a decade, she has co-authored an annual study on trends in U.S. security assistance, including the recent report Waiting for Change.¶ Ms. Olson has testified before Congress on Latin America policy issues ranging from human rights in Mexico to drug policy to the problems of poverty and inequality in the region.¶ She is a frequent commentator in the media, including CNN, CNN Español, the BBC, the Lehrer News Hour, National Public Radio, and an array of national and international news outlets.¶ Prior to joining WOLA, Ms. Olson directed the Latin America Working Group (LAWG), a coalition of sixty non-governmental organizations working to promote peaceful and just U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America. Her many accomplishments include leading NGO efforts to increase U.S. funding for Central American peace accords implementation and a successful advocacy effort to lift the ban on food and medicine sales to Cuba. In the 1980s she worked on immigration and refugees issues, and developed legislation to suspend the deportation of Salvadoran refugees from the United States.¶ Ms. Olson earned a Masters in Latin American Studies from the National Autonomous University of Mexico, following two years’ work in community development in Honduras. “U.S. military programmes with Latin America¶ and their impact on human security” 2002 http://www.unidir.org/pdf/articles/pdf-art1448.pdf, TSW)

Training¶ While consistently reliable data is unavailable, official sources indicate that in 1999 the United¶ States trained about 13,000 Latin American military personnel. That figure certainly increased in 2000¶ and 2001, during which the United States trained entire¶ battalions in Colombia. Rather than a precise figure, because¶ much information on training is currently classified, this number¶ should be viewed as an indicator of the large-scale nature of¶ U.S. military training in the hemisphere and the importance¶ that the United States gives this training. Training takes place in various ways: individuals are chosen for training and brought to U.S.¶ military training institutions to receive individual courses, training is also carried out in the region by¶ individuals or small groups of U.S. trainers sent to train a group of military personnel, and in the case¶ of Colombia, entire new counter-narcotics battalions were formed with the help of U.S. training. The¶ types of courses given also vary greatly, including everything from infantry training to learning about¶ new technologies for equipment maintenance, or how to maintain weapons systems, to courses designed¶ to teach and promote military justice systems.¶ Training also occurs for different reasons. The traditional U.S. foreign military training programme¶ is known as the International Military Education and Training (IMET) programme. Through IMET foreign¶ military personnel are allowed to take regular courses in U.S. military training institutions, where courses¶ are given in English. In the case of Latin America, courses were also given in Spanish at the U.S. Army’s¶ School of the Americas and the Inter-American Air Force Academy. The School of the Americas had¶ been the subject of protest for many years because the school had trained a number of Latin American¶ military personnel who later went on to commit serious human rights violations. In 2000, the Army¶ decided to formally close the school and open a new institution, without the baggage of history, in the¶ same location. The new school is called the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation¶ and is once again a training facility focused on Latin America, providing courses in Spanish. A few¶ hours of human rights training is included in every course offered by the new school.¶ Training is also provided for counter-narcotics and counter-terrorism purposes. In recent years,¶ counter-narcotics have become one of the principal rationales for training. At present, the majority of¶ foreign military training of Latin Americans is for counter-narcotics purposes. With the enhanced U.S.¶ focus on counter-terrorism, the increased financing of existing counter-terrorism programmes and the¶ establishment in December of 2001 of a new military training programme (the Counter-terrorism¶ Fellowship Program), this rationale for training is likely to capture an increased percentage of overall¶ training.U.S. military programmes in Latin America¶ With the exception of Mexico, the U.S. military’s relationship with Latin America is governed by¶ Southcom, and it coordinates the related programmes and activities. During the 1980s the U.S. military¶ had a clear mission, which was to fight the Cold War in the Western Hemisphere. During the 1990s¶ Southcom’s role was redefined, and now includes counter-narcotics work and humanitarian assistance¶ as well as regular exercises. These days, Southcom maintains close relationships with every Latin American¶ military with the exception of Cuba. These relationships generally¶ involve offers of U.S. training, assistance with analysis of defence¶ needs and the purchase of defence articles, and coordination of¶ multinational training exercises. Southcom could be facing another¶ redefinition of its role as the United States focuses on issues of¶ ‘homeland defence’ and will likely undergo a process of command¶ structure reorganization and redirection of resources.¶ One of the main vehicles for rotating U.S. military personnel through Latin America is known as¶ ‘Humanitarian and Civic Assistance’ (HCA). HCA is considered a training programme for U.S. military¶ personnel. During HCA training exercises, the U.S. military sends large numbers of reservists and¶ others to practice transferring themselves and their equipment to another country. While in country,¶ they perform humanitarian activities, building schools, digging wells and vaccinating children. However,¶ the humanitarian by-product of these exercises is considered by the military as secondary to the primary mission—training. These training exercises are also carried out in response to natural disasters¶ in the region as a means of providing humanitarian assistance.¶ Today, the U.S. military in Latin America is often known for its role in counter-narcotics activities.¶ Since 1989, the U.S. Department of Defense has been the single lead agency in the detection and¶ monitoring of drugs coming into the United States. The United States maintains a significant network¶ of radar sites and FOLs, and carries out intelligence processing for counter-narcotics purposes. Within¶ each country, the U.S. military seeks partners with whom to work to fulfil its counter-narcotics mission.¶ This means training and coordination with, and often weapons transfers to, host nation military and/¶ or police forces. The impact of the military’s counter-narcotics mission is seen most vividly in Colombia,¶ where the United States has been instrumental in helping the military develop and implement its¶ counter-narcotics strategy by training, equipping and providing intelligence to entire new battalions. Human security¶ In light of the existing military conflicts in the world today, many would consider the issues¶ presented for human security in the U.S. military relationship with Latin America to be rather benign.¶ However, in reality, the issues in Latin America go to the heart of the role of militaries in democratic¶ societies. In the last thirty years, Latin America has had too much bitter¶ experience with militaries involved in civilian governance. Although in¶ most Latin American countries today, the possibility of the military forcibly¶ taking control of the government seems remote, the roles taken by the¶ militaries at this time can either enhance or diminish civilian structures and credibility—and, in the end,¶ help make or break the success of democracy in this hemisphere.¶ Alternate roles¶ As the U.S. military’s Cold War role subsided at the end of the Central American conflicts, its¶ presence in Latin America began to change focus. The U.S. military began to emphasize ‘alternative’¶ roles for itself—roles not directly related to external defence—and encouraged Latin American militaries¶ to do the same. Alternate roles in Latin America include counter-narcotics, disaster relief, humanitarian¶ assistance, fire fighting and other activities. All of these are functions that the state must provide its¶ citizenry. However, the important question is should these be military or civilian roles and does the¶ military role expansion in some way risk democracy and human security? Here we will examine two¶ ‘alternative’ military roles, counter-narcotics and humanitarian assistance, and the implications these¶ roles have on democratic institutions.¶ THE DRUG WAR¶ In 1989, the U.S. Congress made the Department of Defense the lead agency for the detection¶ and monitoring of drugs coming into the United States. Within the confines of U.S. borders, the¶ detection and eradication of drugs is in the domain of law enforcement. Since 1878, the United States¶ has adhered to the Posse Comitatus Act as a fundamental guideline establishing the division of civilian¶ and military functions. This law generally prohibits the involvement of defence personnel in domestic law enforcement. The principle being applied is that civilian police perform law enforcement functions¶ and the military defends the state against external threats. In essence, the U.S. military is not to be used¶ as a force against U.S. citizens. However, the concept of Posse Comitatus, which is strictly abided by¶ domestically, is not applied to the roles the United States promotes for foreign militaries through¶ engagement and training programmes.¶ It is the U.S. military’s job, in conjunction with the Coast Guard, to stop drugs from entering the¶ United States. Many other civilian agencies are also involved, but the military is the lead agency and¶ they take seriously their congressionally mandated responsibility. The U.S. military has to find effective¶ partners in Latin America to help it carry out its mission, and very clearly encourages Latin American¶ militaries to adopt domestic counter-narcotics roles. The United States collects intelligence about the¶ air and sea traffic of suspected drug shipments, but does not have the legal authority to make arrests in¶ the territory of other nations, so they need a partner on the ground or at sea who, using good¶ intelligence, can interdict shipments.¶ Take El Salvador as an example. After the war, the role of the military in domestic matters was¶ highly restricted. However, in 1999 the military was given a counter-narcotics role. Shortly thereafter,¶ the United States signed a ten-year agreement with El Salvador to use the Comalapa Airbase for¶ counter-narcotics surveillance flights. Once the role had been established, it was clear that the Salvadoran¶ Navy was not well equipped to be a partner in interdiction efforts, so the FOL agreement was followed¶ by the transfer of a significant amount of excess defence articles from the United States for use by the¶ Salvadoran Navy, beefing up its interdiction capabilities. A similar process took place when the Mexican¶ military’s counter-narcotics role was expanded to include interdiction in the mid-1990s. Once the¶ military’s involvement in interdiction was established within Mexico, the United States undertook an¶ extensive military training programme and equipment transfer aimed at enhancing counter-narcotics¶ capabilities.¶ The drug problem within the hemisphere is very real, and a threat to human security in and of itself.¶ It plagues most countries of the hemisphere with a variety of ills including addiction, corruption, violence¶ and other illicit activities. However, defining the hemispheric narcotics problem as a ‘war’ has serious¶ implications for human security as well. Wars are fought by militaries, and¶ require military solutions, training and weapons. A number of Latin American¶ countries have quite recent histories of military rule, and coming out of these¶ periods they have restricted the internal roles of their armed forces. The¶ counter-narcotics role expands the militaries’ parameters for domestic action.

#### That destroys biodiversity- cooperation key

Osario 11

(Jairo Enrique, Chief, Naval Intelligence, Colombia, “Trans-Atlantic Symposium: On Dismantling Transnational Illicit Networks” <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/177140.pdf>, SEH)

Jairo Enrique Osorio offered insight into the Colombian cocaine supply chain from bottom to top. ¶ Growers, Osorio said, are the virtual slaves of ―terrorist‖ cartels, forced to cultivate a plant with a ¶ destructive impact on local biodiversity. Colombian authorities currently use three methods to eradicate ¶ coca plants: providing economic support for growers seeking to switch to a different cash crop; forced ¶ eradication of crops; and herbicide. Once coca leaves are harvested, they are processed into paste at ¶ ―kitchens‖ in the middle of the jungle. The paste is then purified in other remote locations, which the ¶ authorities attempt to locate using military intelligence. Osorio said that stopping raw material from ¶ reaching production areas is crucial to dismantling the supply chain. Eighty percent of shipments exit ¶ Colombia, which, with 6 million square nautical miles of coastline to protect, presents a challenge for law ¶ enforcement. Osorio underlined the importance of cooperation to attack every stage in the supply chain, in ¶ particular the exchange of information relating to maritime interdiction.

#### Impact’s extinction

Fraser 10

(Caroline, "Could Re-Wilding Avert the 6th Great Extinction?," 1/5, Scientific American, Adapted from the book REWILDING THE WORLD: Dispatches from the Conservation Revolution by Caroline Fraser, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=could-re-wilding-avert-6th-great-extinction>)

Why do species matter? Why worry if some go missing? Part of the answer lies in the relationships coming to light between creatures like the canyon coyotes and the chaparral birds. After the nineteenth century’s great age of biological collecting, when collectors filled museums to bursting with stuffed birds and pinned beetles, the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have proved to be an age of connecting. Biologists have begun to understand that nature is a chain of dominoes: If you pull one piece out, the whole thing falls down. Lose the animals, lose the ecosystems. Lose the ecosystems, game over. This was the essential insight of conservation biology, a new scientific field launched with the determination to identify threats to ecosystems and to design the methods to deal with them. E. O. Wilson has called it “a discipline with a deadline.” The Society for Conservation Biology, founded in 1985, became one of the fastest-growing scientific organizations of its time, bringing together diverse specialties from ecology and population genetics to sustainable agriculture and forestry, revolutionizing the once sleepy field of natural history. The tremendous variety of species held in wilderness areas, particularly the tropics, is our bank and lifeline, our agricultural and medical insurance policy. Three-quarters of the world’s food supply comes from twelve plant species, but those species are dependent on thousands of others: pollinators (insects, bats, birds), soil microbes, nitrogen-fixing bacteria, and fungi. The tropical rain forests contain a pool of genetic diversity for important food crops, a source for vital new strains that can be hybridized to fight pests and diseases. Botanists are combing the planet for wild ancestors of soybeans, tomatoes, hard wheat, and grapes, believed to contain valuable genes for drought tolerance and other characteristics, but much diversity has already been lost. Genetic engineering alone cannot replace what hundreds of millions of years of evolution have given us. Wild replacements for pineapples, pomegranates, olives, coffee, and other crops lie in biodiversity-rich areas that must be saved. In terms of medicine, our most important modern pharmaceuticals, including quinine, morphine, aspirin, penicillin, and many other antibiotics, are derived from microbes, plants, and animals found in tropical and marine environments. The first comprehensive scientific treatise on our reliance on other species, Sustaining Life: How Human Health Depends on Biodiversity, published in 2008, confirmed the importance of genetic variety, describing groups of threatened organisms crucial to agriculture and human medicine. Predictably, our close relatives, primates, make up a key group. Contributing to work on smallpox, polio, and vaccine development, primates allow research on potential treatments for hepatitis C and B, Ebola and Marburg viruses, and HIV/AIDS. The list of threatened plants and animals we rely on is weird and varied, including amphibians, bears, gymnosperms (the family of plants that includes pine trees), cone snails, sharks, and horseshoe crabs. Cone snails, a large genus of endangered marine mollusks, inject their prey with paralyzing toxins that are prized in medical research for their use in developing pain medications for cancer and AIDS patients who are unresponsive to opiates. The blood of the horseshoe crab, which carries antimicrobial peptides that kill bacteria, is being tested in treatments for HIV, leukemia, prostate cancer, breast cancer, and rheumatoid arthritis; it also yields cells crucial in developing tests to detect bacteria in medical devices, and its eyes have allowed Nobel Prize–winning researchers to unravel the complexities of human vision. Cone snails and horseshoe crabs are exactly the kinds of species that people tend to dismiss, seeing no utility in them, no connection to human need. This was the attitude expressed in 1990 by Manuel Lujan Jr., secretary of the interior during the George H. W. Bush administration, who asked in exasperation, “Do we have to save every subspecies?” It was the attitude expressed in 2008 by presidential candidate John McCain, who repeatedly declared his opposition to the funding of research on grizzly bear DNA. He got a cheap laugh whenever he said, “I don’t know if that was a paternity issue or a criminal issue.” Medical researchers were not laughing: bears, too, are essential to human medicine. Bear bile yields ursodeoxycholic acid, now used in treating complications during pregnancy, gallstones, and severe liver disease. Denning bears enter a period of lethargy during the winter and recycle body wastes in a process unique in mammals; this process is studied for insights in treating osteoporosis, renal disease, diabetes, and obesity. If species are crucial to medicine, ecosystems are indispensable to the health of the planet. Ecosystems provide the most basic provisioning services— food, firewood, and medicines—along with the so- called regulating services of a fully functional environment, which include cleaning the air, purifying water, controlling floods and erosion, storing carbon, and detoxifying pollutants in soils. When ecosystems are lost, as they have been through felling of forests and conversion of landscape to agriculture on a vast scale, havoc ensues, triggering human and natural catastrophe on an unprecedented scale.

# Russia Nat Gas

#### Collapse inevitable

Brinded 1-25

Lianna, “WEF Paints Bleak Outlook for Russia's Economy,” <http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/articles/427882/20130125/wef-russia-report-oil-energy-vladimir-putin.htm>

In WEF's benchmark Scenarios for the Russian Federation report, the group outlined three scenarios for the Russian economy, which all paint a bleak outlook unless significant changes in its domestic institutional environment are made as the country's GDP is so closely tied to oil prices. Russia has enjoyed record growth rates and a dramatic rise in living standards for much of its urban population after the spectacular rise in oil prices from 2000 to 2008, in tandem with economic reforms of the early 2000s, fostered a more stable environment [Figure 1]. Despite being hit hard by the global economic crisis in 2008 and 2009, the country even managed to rebound from an 8 percent drop in the economy, within a couple of years. But as IBTimes UK detailed in December last year, Russia faces a drop in 2013 GDP to 2.5 percent, from 3.4 percent in 2012. Forecasts also detail a 1.6 percent rise in inflation to reach 6.7 percent by the end of this year for Russia. Supporting this, WEF says that this growth trajectory is not sustainable and significant challenges remain, particularly in reducing the country's strong reliance on its oil and gas exports and in revitalising the economy [Figure 2] "The price of oil and gas on global and regional markets, and developments in the global energy landscape more generally, are critical to Russia's future economic development. For the most part, Russia is a price-taker and cannot mould the global energy environment in which it operates nor the energy prices that ensue," says the report. "Yet a thorough analysis of the dynamics within the global energy landscape is important for Russia to maximise benefits while this external context is favourable, and prepare for less auspicious times in the future," it adds. (Pic: WEF Scenarios for the Russian Federation report) In each of its Three Scenarios for Russia [Figure 3], WEF identifies potential hazards for the country and says they can "be used to form new policies, new strategies and forging new connections, by freeing thought from past constraints." In one of the scenarios, WEF warns that "a sudden and sustained drop in oil prices creates a crisis in Russia's economic foundations that threatens the country's social stability. Paralysed by the threat of popular resistance to cutbacks in entitlements and social spending, the government is compelled to strengthen its hold on the economy, using state companies as vectors of social spending. "While compromising its fiscal position, Russia preserves at least the illusion of economic stability for most of its population. Eventually the sustainability of these measures comes into question and opens a range of uncertainties about the country's long-term economic future," it adds. However, WEF adds that if Russia does not reform its institutions and finances in times of growth, doing so will be near impossible at a time of crisis.

#### Their internal link card – the newest card in the 1NC – is a massive non-unique card – it says Russian energy is over because of the massive shale gas revolution

Tucker, their newest 1NC author, Assistant Director of the Energy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin, 1/9/2013

(Aviezer, take a look at the full article title… “The New Power Map: World Politics After the Boom in Unconventional Energy,” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138597/aviezer-tucker/the-new-power-map?page=show)

[Start of article]

The energy map of the world is being redrawn -- and the global geopolitical order is adrift in consequence. **We are moving away from a world dominated by** a few **energy** mega-**supplier**s, such as **Russia**, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela, and toward one in which **most countries have some domestic resources to meet their energy needs** and can import the balance from suppliers in their own neighborhood. This new world will feature considerably lower energy prices, and in turn, **geopolitics will hinge less on** oil and **gas**. Within the next five to ten years, regimes that are dependent on energy exports will see their power diminished. No longer able to raise massive sums from energy sales to distribute patronage and project power abroad, they will have to tax their citizens.

**The revolution in unconventional energy production results from technologies that make drilling and extraction from underground shale formations increasingly easy and cheap**. One cutting-edge procedure, hydraulic fracturing, involves injecting a mixture of sand, chemicals, and either water, gel, or liquefied greenhouse gases into shale rock formations to extract hydrocarbons. Although the technique was first conceptualized in 1948, only recently have other technologies arrived to make it commercially viable. (One such procedure, horizontal drilling, allows operators to tap into shallow but broad deposits with remarkable precision.)

Hydraulic fracturing has been used widely for only about the past five years. But the result -- **a staggering glut of natural gas in the** United **S**tates -- **is already clear**. The price of natural gas in the country has plunged to a quarter of what it was in 2008. The low price has prompted changes throughout the U.S. economy, including the projected retirement of one-sixth of U.S. coal power generation capacity by 2020, the conversion of hundreds of thousands of vehicles from gasoline to compressed gas, and the construction and repatriation from China of chemical, plastic, and fertilizer factories that use natural gas as both raw material and fuel. By 2025, the professional services firm PricewaterhouseCoopers predicts, energy-intensive industries will create a million new U.S. jobs.

Meanwhile, the United States is using innovative energy technologies ever more frequently to extract shale oil, tight oil, and methane from coal beds. Accordingly, the share of U.S. oil consumption that is imported from abroad has fallen sharply, from about 60 percent in 2005 to less than 45 percent this year. It will likely continue to decrease until the country, or at least North America, is energy self-sufficient.

**The economic and geopolitical shockwaves will be felt worldwide**. **Decreasing demand in the U**nited **S**tates for liquid natural gas, oil imports, and domestic coal **is already reducing global prices for these commodities**. As a result, European countries have a stronger position in negotiations over natural gas imports with Russia, from which they receive a quarter of their supply. The newfound leverage might have emboldened the European Union to open an investigation in September into a possible price-fixing scheme by Gazprom, the Russian energy giant. In addition, European countries have been negotiating fewer long-term gas contracts with Russia in which the agreed-upon price for the gas is pegged to that of oil -- the kind that Gazprom favors. Instead, they are opting for spot purchases -- short-term acquisitions based on market prices -- in the expectation of rising supplies and falling prices. Russia has already granted some countries roughly ten percent discounts on existing contracts.

[Their card starts]

Until recently, Gazprom was in denial about the shale gas revolution, claiming that unconventional gas technology was not commercially viable, and that it posed severe risks to the environment. Given that Russia raises most of its federal revenue from energy exports -- about 60 percent, according to most estimates -- a reduction in natural gas sales would be politically catastrophic. Both the collapse of the Soviet Union and the downfall of former Russian President Boris Yeltsin in the late 1990s coincided with periods of low energy prices; Vladimir Putin, the current president, knows this history all too well.

The problem is that all of his options in a world awash with cheap energy are bad. His regime could try to maintain Russia's market share in Europe by continuing to reduce prices, but that would mean accepting drastically smaller revenues. To make matters worse, Gazprom's profit margins are low. Given that it sells 60 percent of its gas domestically at a loss, Gazprom must obtain wide profit margins from its European exports to stay afloat. (Currently, it sells gas in Europe at about a 66 percent profit margin.)

[Their card ends]

On its exports to Europe, Gazprom needs to earn $12 per thousand cubic feet of natural gas just to break even. (**The price of natural gas in the U**nited **S**tates **today is below $3** per thousand cubic feet.) Part of the reason for this is that the state and the elite siphon billions from the politicized, inefficient, and opaque monopoly. Such plain corruption coincides with geopolitical maneuvering in large pipeline projects: just as neighboring Alaska has its infamous bridge, Russia has pipelines to nowhere.

Consider, for example, Nord Stream, the undersea natural gas pipeline that connects Russia directly to Germany, bypassing both Ukraine and Poland. The project had no economic rationale; it would have been far cheaper for Moscow to come to terms with Kiev over transit fees. But Russia was unwilling to do so. As usual, corruption played a role, too: Arkady Rotenberg, the owner of the company that laid the pipelines, is Putin's childhood friend, and the Russian government paid him an exorbitant fee -- amounting to a profit margin of 30 percent -- for his work. Now, Gazprom is planning another pipeline folly, South Stream, which will again bypass Ukraine by traveling under the Black Sea to southern Europe.

Such outrageous infrastructure projects might become even more routine if Gazprom attempts to recoup its falling revenues in Europe by upping its sales to China. To do that, it would have to build long pipelines across unforgiving Siberian terrain. That task would pale in comparison to the challenge of convincing China to pay anything close to what Russia currently charges European countries -- not only because the Chinese are tough negotiators but also because China possesses the largest deposits of shale gas of any country in the world (886 trillion cubic feet compared with the United States' 750 trillion, the world's second-largest deposits). Although China is just beginning to tap its gas deposits, by the time any Sino-Russian pipeline project could be completed, it might be churning out enough unconventional gas to be energy self-sufficient. According to Chinese government estimates, the country has enough natural gas to provide for its domestic needs for up to two centuries. The only hope for Gazprom is that Chinese shale rock formations will not respond well to the new technologies -- but there is no reason to believe that this will be the case.

For now, Russia has been attempting to protect its market share by simply preventing unconventional energy technologies from spreading. For its part, the United States, through its 2010 Unconventional Gas Technical Engagement Program, transfers technologies to nations that it would like to see become more energy independent, such as India, Jordan, Poland, and Ukraine. Countries that achieve greater energy independence, Washington assumes, will be less susceptible to bullying from unfriendly petro-states.

Russia, meanwhile, is attempting to block or at least slow the process. One of Moscow's favorite tactics involves pressuring companies that want to do business in Russia not to explore for shale gas elsewhere. For example, Moscow might have pressed ExxonMobil to pull out of Poland, which could have the largest shale gas deposits in all of Europe, in exchange for a cooperation agreement with Rosneft. As always in the free market, however, when one company exits, another rushes to fill the void. The U.S. company Chevron has commenced shale gas and oil exploration throughout the region between the Baltic and Black Seas. The financier George Soros, moreover, has already invested $500 million in unconventional energy projects in Poland.

A more effective Russian tactic involves financing environmentalist groups to lobby against shale gas. So far, there is no credible scientific evidence that hydraulic fracturing has adverse effects on either air or water. Several studies, including ones conducted by the Royal Society, the U.S. Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, and the International Energy Agency, have concluded that hydraulic fracturing is reasonably safe when properly regulated. Yet, following a swell of environmentalist protests, both Bulgaria and the Czech Republic recently imposed moratoria on the use of the technology. The mark of outside influence is clear: In Bulgaria, there are rarely demonstrations of any kind, and in the Czech Republic, environmentalist groups have remained mum on other major issues, namely, the planned expansions of the nuclear power station in Temelín.

The former members of the Soviet bloc -- such as Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Poland, and Ukraine -- still purchase all or most of their natural gas from Gazprom. Poland and Ukraine have enough potential shale deposits to free themselves entirely from this dependency. Although Bulgaria and the Czech Republic are not so blessed, even modest domestic production can challenge Gazprom's monopoly power and reduce the price of imported natural gas.

Some analysts have predicted that Asian demand for energy is virtually endless, and thus that energy prices are unlikely to fall substantially. But as the Morgan Stanley analyst Ruchir Sharma has argued, **Asian economic growth is slowing and might soon flatten**. **Meanwhile**, **with ever-growing energy supplies from unconventional sources**, **newly discovered undersea gas fields off the coast of East Africa and Israel**, **and increased drilling in the Arctic**, **the world may soon enjoy an energy glut**. At the very least, **an era of lower global energy prices appears inevitable**.

For Russia, the best scenario is that the energy glut will force structural reforms akin to those that Estonia and Poland underwent in the 1990s and that Russia started but never completed. Such changes could eventually lead to the establishment of real democracy and the rule of law there. In the coming years, sheer economic necessity and looming bankruptcy will force Russia to reform. But throughout Russian history, modernization has not normally resulted in liberalization; and there is little evidence that this time will be any different.

Nevertheless, unconventional energy technology has not only arrived -- it is here to stay. As new lines are drawn on the energy map of the world, many of the oldest and most stable geopolitical truths will be turned on their heads. **It would be prudent for the tyrants who depend on revenues from energy exports to start planning for retirement**.

[End of article]

### 2AC No Impact

#### Econ decline won’t change Russia’s foreign policy or cause domestic unrest – empirically denied

Blackwill 9

(Robert Blackwill 2009; former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning; RAND, "The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution", http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Now on to Russia. Again, fi ve years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it aff ect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary infl uence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western efforts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

# Add On

### Readiness Add On

#### SMRs key to sustain military deployment.

Pfeffer and Macon 1

(Robert A, physical scientist at the Army Nuclear and Chemical Agency in Springfield, Virginia, working on nuclear weapons effects. He is a graduate of Trinity University and has a master's degree in physics from The Johns Hopkins University, William A, a project manager at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. He was formerly the acting Army Reactor Program Manager at the Army Nuclear and Chemical Agency. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and has a master's degree in nuclear engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, “Nuclear Power: An Option for the Army's Future” <http://www.almc.army.mil/alog/issues/SepOct01/MS684.htm>, SEH)

Military Realities¶ Today, the military faces several post-Cold War realities. First, the threat has changed. Second, regional conflicts are more probable than all-out war. Third, the United States will participate in joint and coalition operations that could take our forces anywhere in the world for undetermined periods of time. Finally, the U.S. military must operate with a smaller budget and force structure. These realities already are forcing substantial changes on the Army.¶ So, as we consider future Army energy sources, we foresee a more mobile Army that must deploy rapidly and sustain itself indefinitely anywhere in the world as part of a coalition force. In addition, this future Army will have to depend on other nations to provide at least some critical logistics support. An example of such a cooperative effort was Operation Desert Storm, where coalition forces (including the United States) relied on some countries to supply potable water and other countries to provide fuel. This arrangement allowed U.S. cargo ships to concentrate on delivering weapon systems and ammunition.¶ But consider the following scenario. The U.S. military is called on to suppress armed conflict in a far-off region. The coalition forces consist of the United States and several Third World countries in the region that have a vested interest in the outcome of the conflict. Our other allies are either unwilling or unable to support the regional action, either financially or militarily. The military effort will be a challenge to support over time, especially with such basic supplies as fuel and water. How can the United States sustain its forces?¶ One way to minimize the logistics challenge is for the Army to produce fuel and potable water in, or close to, the theater. Small nuclear power plants could convert seawater into hydrogen fuel and potable water where needed, with less impact on the environment than caused by the current production, transportation, and use of carbon-based fuels.¶ Seawater: The Ultimate Energy Source¶ Industrial nations are seeing severe energy crises occur more frequently worldwide, and, as world population increases and continues to demand a higher standard of living, carbon-based fuels will be depleted even more rapidly. Alternative energy sources must be developed. Ideally, these sources should be readily available worldwide with minimum processing and be nonpolluting. Current options include wind, solar, hydroelectric, and nuclear energy, but by themselves they cannot satisfy the energy demands of both large, industrial facilities and small, mobile equipment. While each alternative energy source is useful, none provides the complete range of options currently offered by oil. It is here that thinking "outside the box" is needed.¶ As difficult as the problem seems, there is one energy source that is essentially infinite, is readily available worldwide, and produces no carbon byproducts. The source of that energy is seawater, and the method by which seawater is converted to a more direct fuel for use by commercial and military equipment is simple. The same conversion process generates potable water.¶ Seawater Conversion Process¶ Temperatures greater than 1,000 degrees Celsius, as found in the cores of nuclear reactors, combined with a thermochemical water-splitting process, is probably the most efficient means of breaking down water into its component parts: molecular hydrogen and oxygen. The minerals and salts in seawater would have to be removed by a desalination process before the water-splitting process and then burned or returned to the sea.¶ Sodium iodide (NaI) and other compounds are being investigated as possible catalysts for high-temperature chemical reactions with water to release the hydrogen, which then can be contained and used as fuel. When burned, hydrogen combines with oxygen and produces only water and energy; no atmospheric pollutants are created using this cycle.¶ Burning coal or oil to generate electricity for production of hydrogen by electrolysis would be wasteful and counterproductive. Nuclear power plants, on the other hand, can provide safe, efficient, and clean power for converting large quantities of seawater into usable hydrogen fuel.¶ For the military, a small nuclear power plant could fit on a barge and be deployed to a remote theater, where it could produce both hydrogen fuel and potable water for use by U.S. and coalition forces in time of conflict. In peacetime, these same portable plants could be deployed for humanitarian or disaster relief operations to generate electricity and to produce hydrogen fuel and potable water as necessary. Such dual usage (hydrogen fuel for equipment and potable water for human consumption) could help peacekeepers maintain a fragile peace. These dual roles make nuclear-generated products equally attractive to both industry and the military, and that could foster joint programs to develop modern nuclear power sources for use in the 21st century.

#### Key to readiness

Anderson 11

(Steven M. Anderson, a retired Army brigadier general, is a senior mentor with the Army’s Battle Command Training Program, “Save Energy, Save Our Troops” Opinion Page of New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/13/opinion/13anderson.html?_r=2k>, SEH)

A NATO oil tanker truck was blown up by insurgents at the Pakistan-Afghanistan border last week, and while no one was injured, the incident temporarily closed the Khyber Pass, the main supply artery for Western troops in the Afghan theater. This has become an all-too-routine occurrence; in the last nine years some 1,000 Americans have been killed on fuel-related missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ Until the Defense Department develops battlefield policies recognizing that energy efficiency contributes to military effectiveness, more blood will be shed, billions of dollars will be wasted, our enemies will have thousands of vulnerable fuel trucks for targets and our commanders will continue to be distracted by the task of overseeing fuel convoys.¶ As the military’s senior logistician in Iraq for 15 months in 2006 and 2007, I tracked the tremendous amounts of fuel needed to power the generators providing electricity for air-conditioning and other essential uses in shelters hastily constructed of canvas, plywood and sheet metal. Today our troops in Afghanistan are furiously building more of the same. Nine years into that war, they are living more or less as Alexander the Great’s men did 23 centuries ago — in often dangerous and always inefficient tents and shacks.¶ For many in the military, improving the situation isn’t a priority. “To hell with efficiency, effectiveness is all I care about,” a finger-wagging superior once told me in Iraq. But keeping our bases and units supplied with fuel endangers not just the lives of many soldiers manning the tanker convoys, it also drains $24 billion a year from the Pentagon budget. The solution: a Defense Department policy requiring all structures in the combat zone be energy-efficient.¶ Upgrading the efficiency at our bases and outposts would not require any new technology. Watch almost any home renovation show and you’ll see spray foam being used to cut energy use significantly. Cured spray foam is nontoxic, fire-resistant and waterproof. (Disclosure: until last month, I was the chief operating officer of an energy consulting company, but I have no financial stake in the issue.)¶ In 2007, an Army study found that spraying foam insulation on the exterior of inefficient structures would reduce their energy requirements by over 80 percent and improve the quality of life for the troops living in them. Accordingly, we obtained the necessary safety, fire and disposal certifications and began a $95 million effort in Iraq; a study last year confirmed this initiative was saving about $1 billion a year and taking more than 11,000 fuel trucks off the road.¶ Yet, despite three years of quantitative proof that insulated structures in extreme climates tremendously reduce fuel requirements, there has been little effort to broaden the scope of the initiative.¶ An across-the-board Pentagon efficiency mandate would have many benefits. First, it would save many lives: there are casualties in one out of every 24 fuel supply convoys in Afghanistan; 47 drivers were killed there last year. It would save money; it costs taxpayers about $66 million a day for air-conditioning in the war zones.¶ It would also reduce opportunities for the enemy. Some soldiers jokingly call the fuel trucks “Taliban targets,” and for good reason — they are a high-payoff quarry for insurgents using nothing but homemade bombs. In addition, having fewer fuel shipments would allow NATO to take highly trained troops off convoy duty and use them in combat or, even better, send them home.¶ Why has the Defense Department dragged its feet on energy efficiency? Chalk it up to the impediments to change found in any large organization: passive leadership, lack of accountability, competing priorities. In this case, add skepticism over the data, calls for additional studies and unfounded environmental concerns.¶ But strong leadership can overcome these obstacles, as Secretary of Defense Robert Gates demonstrated in 2008 when he oversaw the acquisition and deployment in Iraq of a new generation of mine-resistant, ambush-protected fighting vehicles, which brought about a decline of up to 90 percent in the deaths of American troops from roadside bombs.¶ A new energy efficiency policy would not only save lives and cut costs, it would make a powerful statement regarding the Pentagon’s commitment to lowering our dependence on foreign oil. We have the finest troops in history; improving the insulation in their structures would not only keep them more comfortable, it would also go a long way to bringing more of them home safely.

#### Readiness prevents nuclear war

Spencer 2k

(Jack - policy analyst for defense and national security at the Heritage Foundation, The Facts About Military Readiness, p. <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness>, SEH)

U.S. military readiness cannot be gauged by comparing America's armed forces with other nations' militaries. Instead, the capability of U.S. forces to support America's national security requirements should be the measure of U.S. military readiness. Such a standard is necessary because America may confront threats from many different nations at once. America's national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has little saliency. The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames."4 According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6 Military readiness is **vital** because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be **more likely to lash out** against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from **acting aggressively in regions** of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.