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#### Energy production is divided into preproduction and production incentives

**Koplow 4** Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf

3. SUBSIDIES THROUGH THE FUEL CYCLE

Because no two fuel cycles are exactly the same, examining subsidies through the context of a generic fuel cycle is instructive in providing an overall framework from which to understand how common subsidization policies work. **Subsidies are grouped into preproduction** (e.g., R&D, resource location), **production** (e.g., extraction, conversion/generation, distribution, accident risks), **consumption, postproduction** (e.g., decommissioning, reclamation), **and externalities** (e.g., energy security, environmental, health and safety).¶ 3.1 Preproduction¶ **Preproduction activities include research into new technologies, improving existing technologies, and market assessments** to identify the location and quality of energy resources.¶ 3.1.1 Research and Development¶ R&D subsidies to energy are common worldwide,¶ generally through government-funded research or¶ tax breaks. Proponents of R&D subsidies argue that¶ because a portion of the financial returns from¶ successful innovations cannot be captured by the¶ innovator, the private sector will spend less than is¶ appropriate given the aggregate returns to society.¶ Empirical data assembled by Margolis and Kammen¶ supported this claim, suggesting average social¶ returns on R&D of 50% versus private returns of¶ only 20 to 30%.¶ However, the general concept masks several¶ potential concerns regarding energy R&D. First,¶ ideas near commercialization have much lower¶ spillover than does basic research, making subsidies¶ harder to justify. Second, politics is often an¶ important factor in R&D choices, especially regarding¶ how the research plans are structured and the¶ support for follow-on funding for existing projects.¶ Allocation bias is also a concern. Historical data¶ on energy R&D (Table III) demonstrate that R&D¶ spending has heavily favored nuclear and fossil¶ energy across many countries. Although efficiency, renewables, and conservation have captured a higher¶ share of public funds during recent years, the overall¶ support remains skewed to a degree that may well¶ have influenced the relative competitiveness of¶ energy technologies. Extensive public support for¶ energy R&D may also reduce the incentive for firms¶ to invest themselves. U.S. company spending on¶ R&D for the petroleum refining and extraction¶ sector was roughly one-third the multi-industry¶ average during the 1956–1998 period based on¶ survey data from the U.S. National Science Foundation.¶ For the electric, gas, and sanitary services¶ sector, the value was one-twentieth, albeit during the¶ more limited 1995–1998 period.¶ 3.1.2 Resource Location¶ Governments frequently conduct surveys to identify¶ the location and composition of energy resources.¶ Although these have addressed wind or geothermal¶ resources on occasion, they most often involve oil¶ and gas. Plant siting is another area where public¶ funds are used, primarily to assess risks from natural¶ disasters such as earthquakes for large hydroelectric¶ or nuclear installations. Survey information can be¶ important to evaluate energy security risks and to¶ support mineral leasing auctions, especially when¶ bidders do not operate competitively. However, costs¶ should be offset from lease sale revenues when¶ evaluating the public return on these sales. Similarly,¶ the costs of siting studies should be recovered from¶ the beneficiary industries.¶ 3.2 Production¶ **Energy production includes all stages from the point¶ of resource location through distribution to the final¶ consumers**. Specific items examined here include¶ resource extraction, resource conversion (including¶ electricity), the various distribution links to bring the¶ energy resource to the point of final use, and accident¶ risks.

**“FOR” is a limiting term**

**Clegg, 95** - J.D., 1981 Yale Law School; the author is vice president and general counsel of the National Legal

Center for the Public Interest. (Roger, “Reclaiming The Text of The Takings Clause,” 46 S.C. L. Rev. 531,

Summer, lexis)

Even if it made no sense to limit the clause to takings "**for public use**"--and, as discussed below, it might make very good sense--that is the way the clause reads. It **is not** at all **ambiguous**. **The prepositional phrase simply cannot be read as broadening rather than narrowing** the clause's scope. Indeed, **a prepositional phrase beginning with "for"** **appears twice more in the Fifth Amendment, and** in both cases **there is no doubt that the phrase is narrowing the scope of the Amendment**. n20

**Violation- The Aff is an incentive for preproduction, not production.**

**Vote negative**

**Limits—-there are endless obscure energy technologies the aff could develop—-overstretches our research burden and undermines preparedness for all debates—-err neg because the terms incentives and restrictions serve no limiting function**

**Ground- Allows them to claim indirect methods like making an existing technology more efficient or better. Also core negative CP ground for new technologies.**
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#### Transition from nuclear to renewables now – plan reverses this

Wasserman 12

Harvey Wasserman 12,Author, 'SOLARTOPIA! Our Green-Powered Earth' http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harvey-wasserman/post\_3127\_b\_1353253.html

In the wake of Fukushima, grassroots citizen action is shutting the worldwide nuclear power industry. A Solartopian tipping point is upon us in the U.S., Europe and Japan which will re-define how the human race gets its energy. States rights and local democracy are at the core of the battle. The definitive breaking point looms in Vermont. By mid-March a state board is likely to deny the Yankee reactor licenses to operate or to create radioactive waste. If that happens, a Vermont shutdown could mark a critical moment in establishing state power over an atomic reactor. A critical domino would fall -- as it has in Japan and Europe -- and we will begin taking down old reactors all across the U.S. Four new reactors barely under construction will go down with them, making inevitable the end America's age of atomic power. In Vermont, the New Orleans-based Entergy bought the Yankee reactor in 2002. Entergy agreed to shut it if the state's Public Service Board denied it a Certificate of Public Good to continue to operate and generate radioactive waste. That decision is due by March 21, the forty-year anniversary of the reactor's 1972 opening. Entergy has horrified many of its staunchest Green Mountain supporters. One of its cooling towers has simply collapsed from ancient rot and basic negligence. It has leaked tritium and other radioactive isotopes from pipes the company has said -- under oath -- do not exist. Entergy sued Vermont after the legislature voted (26 to 4) to shut the reactor. When its lawyers won in federal court, Entergy demanded the public pay it $4 million in legal fees. But the company miscalculated. It welcomed Federal Judge Garvan Murtha's ruling that the legislature could not shut Yankee (the state is appealing). But Murtha also upheld the right of the Public Service Board to deny Entergy those operating and waste production permits. So after lauding the decision, Entergy's lawyers now want Murtha to change it. Entergy has also asked the Public Service Board for a stay in its expected denial of the permits. The case is clearly headed to the corporate-owned U.S. Supreme Court. But for Entergy to win, the Roberts majority would have to rule that the company was temporarily insane when signed its agreements with the state, and that a state agency can be forced (against its will) to issue reactor operating and waste creating permits. The history of U.S. courts denying states the right to shut reactors dates back to the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. But deferral to the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission's bent for keeping rush-bucket reactors on line is rapidly eroding. The Commission granted Vermont Yankee a license extension one day before the Fukushima disaster. A state-mandated shut down could seriously impact the political calculus for an industry whose grassroots opposition has become a full-on tsunami. New York's Indian Point reactors are under assault from Governor Andrew Cuomo, whose father cut the 1988 deal that forced Long Island's Shoreham reactor to shut without ever achieving commercial operation. Cuomo is being pushed by a fierce grassroots anti-nuke groundswell. Entergy does need state permits that would let two remaining reactors at Indian Point (Unit One went down long ago) continue heating and irradiating the Hudson River. New York could demand Entergy build extremely expensive cooling towers,which may force it to shut down for economic reasons. Similar forces are at work in New Jersey and other states. In Florida, botched multi-billion dollar repairs to the Crystal River reactor near Tampa have forced a brutal grassroots battle over soaring electric rates which must be approved by increasingly beleaguered state regulators. It is highly likely that reactor will never operate again. At Pilgrim, Mass., is strongly intervening against a license extension. Both remaining reactors are currently shut at California's San Onofre (Unit One there also went down long ago), where grassroots activists -- including local surfers -- are in pitched battle against re-opening. Ohio's Davis-Besse is having its containment dome sliced for the fourth time. Two reactors in Nebraska are still recovering from major flooding. All across the country, dozens of rust-bucket nukes stagger on their last legs even as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hands them extended licenses in the face of escalating state and local opposition. Once the firewall against recourse from the states is breached, a flood of shutdowns could well follow. In Japan, utilities must have permits from a host prefecture to re-open after refueling or repairs. Of 54 licensed reactors nationwide, only two now operate. Both could be shut soon, rendering Japan nuke-free for the first time in four decades. Germany has shut eight reactors and will take down 11 more by 2012. Except for Great Britain and a number of eastern holdouts, the "nuclear renaissance" has been all but abandoned in Europe, with an escalating cascade of elderly nukes going cold and proposed new projects being abandoned. The accelerating revolution in renewables has allowed solar, wind and other green sources to outstrip atomic reactors in cost, time to build, ecological impact and safety. As billions pour into Solartopian sources, private investment in atomic energy has all but disappeared -- except where there are massive taxpayer subsidies. Even that's not enough. In 2011, President Obama handed $8.33 billion in federal loan guarantees to the builders of two reactors at Georgia's Vogtle. But Peach State ratepayers are already being soaked for billions more in pre-payments, and the cost of the project is soaring. A parallel financial disaster looms at the Robinson site in neighboring South Carolina. Though the industry assumes these four reactors will eventually be finished, economic realities may say otherwise. Cost estimates for new nukes have been soaring even before construction begins. Even with federal money, the builders still demand that state ratepayers foot the bill as the process proceeds, meaning consumers are on the hook for multiple billions even if the reactors never open. Pitched battles over this Construction Work in Progress scam have already been won by consumers in Missouri and are being fought in Iowa and elsewhere. As the years of building drag on, costs will escalate while renewables continue to become cheaper. Sooner or later, construction is likely to stop, as it did at numerous projects in the 1970s and 1980s which were never finished. Today the Department of Energy still sits on some $10 billion in available guarantees without a recipient ready to build a new nuke. For the first time since early in the George W. Bush years, there has been no executive request for additional reactor construction loan guarantees. In Finland and Flamanville, France, new reactor projects are years behind schedule and billions over budget. With new construction virtually abandoned, and the continued operation of old reactors under intense attack in Japan, Europe and the U.S., only China and India remain as likely sites for large numbers of new nukes. Russia is doing its best to peddle them throughout the Third World. South Korea wants to sell reactors to the United Arab Emirates. But grassroots resistance in India has been fierce. China is still mulling a post-Fukushima decision on whether to proceed with reactors already under construction. Signs of a popular uprising against rampant pollution -- including nuclear reactors -- indicate growing public opposition. But here in the U.S., we are at the fall-off-the-cliff moment for atomic energy, new and old. Entergy, says Deb Katz of the Citizens Awareness Network, has been "blinded by its arrogance and contempt for the state of Vermont." The company, she says, "is attempting to establish that corporations are more powerful than the states they operate in." If the citizens of Vermont can shut Yankee, a dam will be breached and the post-Fukushima power of a rising grassroots tsunami will be made tangible. Solartopia will be that much closer. And the grassroots No Nukes campaign will begin to take its place as one of history's most successful popular movements. Let's just make sure these shut-downs happen before the next Fukushima irradiates us all.

**Renewable energies are more effective in solving global warming – the AFF still emits CO2 through extraction and processing**

**NREL 12**

“Strengthening U.S. Leadership of International Clean Energy Cooperation,” December 2008, http://www.nrel.gov/international/pdfs/44261.pdf, accessed 6-20-2012

Greenhouse Gas Impacts **The primary environmental benefit of the U.S.-led global clean energy** market transformation **will be reduced greenhouse gas emissions of** 50-**80% by 2050**, **which scientists think will prevent catastrophic climate change impacts**—a large benefit **to the** U.S. and the **global community. Clean energy technologies will provide more than half of the reductions needed to achieve that goal** (Figure 3).4 Other Environmental **Benefits Significant local air quality and other environmental benefits will accompany the reductions in greenhouse gas emissio**ns. **Reduced air emissions translate to improved health, lower health care costs, improved visibility, and reduced impacts on natural ecosystems**. Increased use of clean energy also will reduce impacts from fossil fuel extraction and processing. **Increased access to clean energy in the poorest regions of the world will reduce the use of firewood, enabling cleaner indoor air quality and contributing to local sustainable development.**

**Warming is real, anthropogenic, and existential – vast international scientific evidence accumulates weekly**

**Deibel 7**

(Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, **there is one major existential threat** to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. **It is** the threat of **global warming** to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. **Scientists worldwide have been observing** the gathering of **this threat for three decades now**, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed **not one of more than 900 articles on climate change** published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 **doubted** that **anthropogenic warming is occurring**. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” **Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates** almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports **shows: an international panel predicts** “brutal **droughts, floods and** violent **storms** across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “**Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year**” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming**; the only debate is how much and how serious the effects will be.** As the newspaper stories quoted above show, **we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in** more violent **storms**, spread of **disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and** threatened **inundation of low**-lying **countries** like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But **the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback** from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “**humankind’s** continuing **enhancement of the** natural **greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life** support system. At worst, **says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University**, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then **everything will collapse**.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. **Global warming is the** post-Cold War era’s **equivalent of nuclear winter** at least as serious **and considerably better supported scientifically**. Over the long run **it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threa**t not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially **to the continued existence of life on this planet.**

### Off 2

#### CP text: the 50 States and all relevant Territories should enter into a compact on:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. **The Compact should collect revenue via a Clean Energy Community Finance Initiative. The Compact should also fund the C-Mod federal laboratory with relevant federal funding.**

#### Compacts solve faster than the federal government

Mountjoy ‘01

John is a policy analyst with the council of State Governments, “Interstate Compacts Make a Comeback,” Spring <http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/ncic/Comeback.pdf>

Some may question the need for interstate compacts to address multi-state policy issues. Why ¶ not leave such regulation to the feds? ¶ “Interstate compacts help us maintain state control,” said Gary McConnell, director of the ¶ Georgia Emergency Management Agency. ¶ During his 10 years as GEMA director, McConnell has played an instrumental role in developing ¶ and promoting a successful interstate compact —the Emergency Management Assistance ¶ Compact, or EMAC. EMAC allows state emergency management agencies to cooperate and ¶ share resources in the event of natural and man-made disasters. ¶ “We can go to the federal government for all kinds of help when natural disasters strike, but the ¶ states [cooperating under an interstate compact] can provide specific resources quicker, which ¶ are likely to be problem specific,” McConnell said. “It’s less bureaucratic, and it’s far cheaper. ¶ It’s easier for us under EMAC to obtain resources from surrounding states than it is to use ¶ federal assistance, which we’d end up having to pay more for anyway. I suspect this is the case ¶ with many other interstate compacts as well.” ¶ “States are rediscovering that they have the power to address their own problems better than the ¶ federal government,” said Rick Masters, The Council of State Governments’ legal counsel and ¶ special counsel for interstate compacts. ¶ CSG, which has tracked interstate compacts for more than 40 years, maintains a clearinghouse of ¶ compact information. More recently, CSG helps administer EMAC and is facilitating the update ¶ of the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and the Interstate Compact on ¶ Juveniles. Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution laid the legal foundation for interstate ¶ compacts: “No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep ¶ Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another ¶ State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent ¶ Danger as will not admit of delay.” Compacts actually preceded the Constitution, having been ¶ used in colonial times to resolve boundary disputes between colonies. ¶ Prior to the 1920s, interstate compacts were typically bi-state agreements, addressing boundary ¶ disputes and territorial claims. In fact, only 36 interstate compacts were formed between 1783 ¶ and 1920. It is only in this century that states have turned to interstate compacts to facilitate ¶ cooperative solutions to multi-state problems. ¶ After a lull in the late 1970s and early 1980s, interstate compacts are beginning to enjoy a ¶ resurgence. Since the early 1990s, states have initiated or updated several high-profile compacts. ¶ Examples include EMAC, the Interstate Compact on Industrialized/Modular Buildings and the ¶ Interstate Insurance Receivership Compact. Interstate compacts can set the framework for cooperative solutions to today’s cross-state ¶ challenges, from policing drugs to supplying energy or controlling sprawl. ¶ “Issues within the states are becoming more complex and aren’t confined by state boundaries. As ¶ a result, solutions are becoming multi-state as well. Compacts are the only tool that is truly ¶ adequate for addressing these multi-state issues,” said Bill Voit, senior project director at The ¶ Council of State Governments. ¶ An example is an interstate compact being considered to facilitate taxation of e-commerce. ¶ Opponents of Internet taxation claim that it would be virtually impossible for online vendors to ¶ comply with the complex, often confusing system of state and local sales and use taxes. Since ¶ Internet sales are expected to reach $184 billion annually by 2004, states have a vested interest in ¶ breaking down this and other barriers to taxing online transactions. ¶ Congress currently is considering the Internet Tax Moratorium Equity Act (S. 512) to help states ¶ simplify their sales and use taxes, in part by authorizing states to enter into an Interstate Sales ¶ and Use Tax Compact. The compact would create a “uniform, streamlined sales and use tax ¶ system,” convenient to remote sales. ¶ At least 18 states are considering the model streamlined sales tax legislation in 2001. Kentucky, ¶ South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming already have signed bills into law. ¶ Existing interstate compacts, many drafted in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, are ripe for ¶ amendment and revision. Technology and the Internet now make the sharing of information ¶ seamless and immediate, yet several interstate compacts are plagued by inadequate ¶ administration. ¶ “Not only do we see the development of new compacts, but we are seeing the re-examination of ¶ existing compacts…revising them to keep pace with our changing world,” Masters said. ¶ Developed in 1937, the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers is ¶ one example of a compact in need of update. Adopted by all 50 states, the compact regulates the ¶ movement of parolees and probationers across state lines. The burgeoning offender population ¶ and the ease with which offenders now can travel have created several problems for the compact, ¶ including: frequent violations of compact rules, inability to enforce compliance, difficulty in ¶ creating new rules and slow, unreliable exchange of case information. ¶ The antiquated compact needed a replacement that would provide states the authority, ¶ enforcement tools and resources to adequately track and ensure supervision of parolees and ¶ probationers. ¶ The new interstate compact, the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision, provides ¶ these solutions. The new compact includes mechanisms for enforcement, accountability, resource provision, information sharing and state-to-state cooperation. Currently, the compact ¶ has been introduced in 39 states and enacted in 18. ¶ Just as technology can smooth the operation of interstate compacts, alternative dispute resolution ¶ techniques can increase their self-sufficiency. Enforcement tools within interstate compacts need ¶ to utilize more of the mediation and arbitration services that have proven successful throughout ¶ state government. By developing additional self-contained enforcement mechanisms, compact ¶ members would not need to rely solely on the crowded docket of the U.S. Supreme Court. ¶ States should further utilize interstate compacts to address new problems and create new ¶ methods of interstate cooperation. If not, federal preemption in certain policy areas is a distinct ¶ possibility.
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**Their Representations of China make war inevitable**

Chengxin **Pan**, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Arts, at Deakin University, August **2004**, Discourses Of ‘China’ In International Relations: A Study in Western Theory as (IR) Practice, p. 43-44

Like the liberal construction of Other touched on above, **this** largely **realist framing** of Other **carries with it** some **profound implications in practice**. That is, **when the Other is depicted as a fixed geopolitical threat, waging a war** (or at least preparing for war) to destroy it often **becomes the only rational option to fulfilling the universal self**. In this regard, Robert Young notes that “**war constitutes the [Western] philosophical concept of being itself**. For **being is always defined as the appropriation of either difference into identity, or of identities into a greater order…. War**, then, **is another form of the appropriation of the other**….” In this context, not surprisingly, war has figured prominently in U.S. foreign relations: War is always violent, bloody, and destructive. But **American wars are fought for great and good ends, and they result in good for America**. The Revolution created freedom, independence, and democracy. The Civil War resulted in the expansion of freedom, the destruction of slavery, the growth of industrial might and wealth, and the formation of a unified, powerful nation. **Insofar as both liberal and realist framings of Other are derived from the same particular American self-construction, their different approaches to understanding** global politics in general and **China** in particular **are** basically mutually **complementary, rather than mutually exclusive**. Recently, this relationship of mutual complement is particularly striking in the emergence of a ‘two worlds’ theory, and its various incarnations such as the new imperialism, liberal imperialism, the New Wilsonianism, and neo-conservatism. As neoconservative commentators William Kristol and Robert Kagan put it, both ‘moral clarity’ and ‘military strength’ are essential if Americans are to continue to be proud of their leading role in world affairs

 **The Alternative: Vote Negative to Endorse the affirmative without the justification that China is a threat.**

Chengxin **Pan**, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Arts, at Deakin University, August **2004**, Discourses Of ‘China’ In International Relations: A Study in Western Theory as (IR) Practice, p. 259-260

**This is not to endorse an ‘anything goes’ attitude on studying China**’s foreign relations. Quite the opposite. For **the range of social meanings which can be attached to a certain thing is not limitless**, and under certain circumstances, it is obvious that some interpretations appear truer than others. Ultimately, **it is the different practical consequences associated with different interpretations that matter**. Thus, my point here is that **while different meaning-giving strategies could all have certain ‘real-world’ implications, some implications are more dangerous than others**. Therefore, **when we assign some particular meaning to China, we need to remind ourselves of its potential practical effect**, and incessantly bear in mind that **such effect,** if dangerous, **may** in some degree **be undone if a different, more constructive meaning is given**. In short, however tempting it might be, **we cannot** here **return to the kind of ‘Hobson’s choice’ between either a new fixed, definite solution or no alternative at all to the** continued reign of the **conventional meaning-giving regime**. Rather, **the choice lies in constantly recognising,** on the one hand, **the impossibility of having a detached, God’s-eye view of some fundamental truth, and on the other hand, the possibility of formulating nuanced, self-reflective, and responsible ways of seeing an inherently changing world. Such choice**, as I have demonstrated in this thesis, **is not only clearly possible but also imperative in the study of a complex China amid the volatility, danger, as well as vast potential of contemporary global politics. A ‘choice’ which might indeed hold the key to world peace in the decades to come.**
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**Hagel won’t be confirmed**

**Greenfield 1-1**

Daniel is a columnist for Front Page Mag, “Does Anyone Actually Want Hagel for Secretary of Defense,” <http://frontpagemag.com/2013/dgreenfield/does-anyone-actually-want-hagel-for-secretary-of-defense/>

In **the Senate, where it really** counts, Senator Tom **Coburn opposes Hagel** because he doesn’t think he has the experience to lead the military through Obama’s ruthless defense cuts. Senator **Rubio opposes Hagel** over Cuba. Senator **Cormyn will also oppose**. Senator **Schumer has refused to come out** for, **which means he’ll have to be bribed**. Senator Lieberman has predicted a tough confirmation. Other Senators have said similar things and **no one in the Senate appears to be particularly enthusiastic about him.¶** Like many turncoat Republicans, Hagel is not popular with either Democrats or Republicans. Traitors tend not to make many friends because neither side likes them or trusts them.¶ The Anti-Israel crowd has fastened on Hagel reflexively because the Pro-Israel crowd opposes him, the way that they fastened on Freeman, who had worked for two enemy governments and praised China’s restraint at Tienanmen Square. It’s become rather obvious that the Anti-Israel crowd would hysterically embrace anyone, no matter what else they did or believed, so long as they were occasionally critical of Israel.¶ The battle over Freeman, who had worked for China and Saudi Arabia, and endorsed China’s atrocities discredited the “Anyone Who Hates Israel” crowd. Bringing their endorsements to Hagel while shouting about the Jewish Lobby does Hagel no favors at all. But the battle over Hagel isn’t really about Israel. It’s about the broken relationships that Hagel left in his wake.¶ The lack of support for Hagel in the Senate shows how unqualified he is as a leader and as an influencer, skills that he would need in a top defense post. The coldness toward him in the Senate is not the fault of some Jewish conspiracy, but Hagel’s failures as a human being.¶ In a Senate where McCain and Kerry can get along swimmingly despite their dramatic differences on Vietnam, where Lieberman can bridge both sides of the aisle, and where there is a good deal of collegiality, no one has much fondness for Hagel. Kerry, for all his faults, is expected to be easily confirmed. Hagel, on the other hand, is despised. Both men have similar politics, but different personalities. Where most Senators have made friends, Hagel seems to have

#### Nuclear power has tons of political support.

Koplow, ‘11

[Doug, founder of Earth Track, Inc., has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for more than 20 years, mainly in the energy sector, holds a B.A. in economics from Wesleyan University, M.B.A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Union of Concerned Scientists, February, “Nuclear Power: Still Not Viable Without Subsidies,” http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_subsidies\_report.pdf]

The industry and its allies are now pressuring all levels of government for large new subsidies to support the construction and operation of a new generation of reactors and fuel-cycle facilities. The substantial political support the industry has attracted thus far rests largely on an uncritical acceptance of the industry’s economic claims and an incomplete understanding of the subsidies that made—and continue to make—the existing nuclear fleet possible.

**Capital’s key**

**Bloomberg 12-30**

“Obama’s Political, Policy, and Pentagon Position,” <http://www.bendbulletin.com/article/20121230/NEWS0107/212300381/>

President Barack **Obama faces a growing dilemma in** **his choice of a new defense secretary** to succeed Leon Panetta.¶ Having dropped U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice and named Massachusetts Democratic Sen. John Kerry to replace Hillary Clinton as secretary of state, **Obama runs the risk of appearing weak if he bows to political opposition again** and chooses someone other than former Nebraska Republican senator Chuck Hagel to lead the Pentagon.¶ **Picking another candidate would show for a second time “that the president’s important choices for personnel can be vetoed by two or three senators**," said Sean Kay, a professor of politics and government at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio, who specializes in U.S. foreign and defense policy. “**The White House will come out of this significantly weakened."¶ If Obama sticks with Hagel in the face of opposition from an ad hoc coalition of Republican advocates of muscular defense policies, Democratic supporters of Israel and gay rights activists, though**, **Obama might be forced to spend political capital** he needs for the bigger battle over the federal budget and deficit reduction.

**Hagel causes Israeli strike on Iran and Iranian Prolif**

**Dershowitz 12-21**

Alan is the Felix Frankfurter Professor of Law at Harvard, “Hagel: The Wrong Man,”

**Were** Chuck **Hagel to be nominated** as secretary of defense, **the Iranian mullahs would interpret** President **Obama’s decision as a signal that the military option was** now, effectively, **off the table. It would encourage them to proceed with their development of nuclear weapons** without fear of an attack from the United States. **It would tell them that if they can endure the pain of sanctions** and continue the charade of negotiations, they will ultimately be allowed to win the prize of a deliverable nuclear bomb.¶ H**agel’s nomination would also validate the fears of Israeli leaders who have never really believed that the United States would attack Iran’s nuclear program** even if that were the only way to stop it. **It would make an Israeli** **military attack more likely**.¶ President **Obama** himself has been clear that the policy of his administration is to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons rather than to “contain” a nuclear-armed Iran through deterrence. He **has made it clear that he would authorize the use of force i**f that were the only way **to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb. But Hagel’s position has been the exact opposite**. He was the softest senator with regard to the threat posed by Iran and its surrogates, and he would be seen as the softest secretary of defense. A lead editorial in the Washington Post aptly summarized Hagel’s views:¶ Mr. **Hagel** . . . **repeatedly voted against sanctions**, opposing even those aimed at the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, which at the time was orchestrating devastating bomb attacks against U.S. troops in Iraq. Mr. Hagel argued that direct negotiations, rather than sanctions, were the best means to alter Iran’s behavior. . . . Mr. Obama has said that his policy is to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and that containment is not an option. Mr. Hagel has taken a different view, writing in a 2008 book that “the genie of nuclear weapons is already out of the bottle, no matter what Iran does.”¶ Advertisement¶ It is true that Hagel has also talked about keeping all options on the table, but the thrust of his position, as it will surely be understood by the Iranians, suggests that if he were to become secretary of defense, he would strongly oppose the use of force against Iran’s nuclear program, even as a last resort.¶ Hagel’s appointment would send another disturbing message to the bigots of Tehran, who believe that the only people calling for military action against Iran are “the Jews.” Hagel speaks their language. He is the only mainstream American politician to talk openly about how “the Jewish lobby intimidates a lot of people.” Others refer to the “Israel lobby,” which includes Jews, Christians, and others. They understand that not all supporters of Israel are Jewish, and that not all Jews are part of the Israel lobby. But Hagel apparently sees things in terms of Jewish interests versus American interests.

**Israeli attack causes extinction- kills hege, economy, and trade**

**Reuveny ‘10**

(Rafael Reuveny is a professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. “Israel and Iran: a unilateral strike could trigger World War III” The Nation McClatchy-Tribune Information Services August 6, 2010)

A unilateral **Israeli strike on Iran'**s nuclear facilities **would** likely **have** dire consequences**,** including a **regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash**. For an **Israeli campaign to succeed, it must** be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so **overwhelming that Iran would not** dare to **respond in full force.** Such **an outcome is extremely unlikely** sincethe locations of some of **Iran's nuclear facilities are not** fully **known and** known facilities are **buried deep** underground.All of these widely spread **facilities are shielded by** elaborate **air defence** systems constructed not only by the Iranians, but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, **Iran has** alsobuilt **redundant command and control systems and** nuclear facilities, developed **early warning systems,** acquired **ballistic** and cruise **missiles and upgraded** and enlarged **its armed forces.** Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, **conventional Israeli** strike “or even numerous **strikes “could not destroy all of its capabilities,** giving Iran time to respond. Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear programme Israel destroyed in 1981, **Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of** Iranian, **Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas and**, perhaps, **Turkish forces**. **Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault,** turning a bad situation **into a regional war**. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon's shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel's numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. **After** years of futilely **fighting Palestinian** irregular armies, **Israel has lost** some of **its** perceived **superiority bolstering its enemies' resolve**. Despite Israel's touted defence systems, **Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces and terrorist attacks would** likelywreak havoc on its enemy**,** leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive US assistance**, Israel's military resources** may quickly **dwindle, forcing it to use** its alleged **nuclear weapons**, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack **would** likely **destroy most of Iran's capabilities, but** a crippled **Iran** and its **coalition could** still **attack neighbouring oil facilities,** unleash **global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf** and **impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean**. **Middle Eastern oil shipments would** likely **slow to a trickle as production declines** due to the warand **insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would** likely **stop selling oil to the U**nited **S**tates **and Europe.** From there, **things could deteriorate as** they did in **the 1930s. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens** might **fully turn on the U**nited **S**tates**,** immediately **requiring the deployment of** more **American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela** and maybeBrazil and Turkey “ all of **which** essentially **support Iran “ could be tempted to form an alliance and** openly **challenge the US hegemony**. **Russia and China might rearm** their injured **Iranian** protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel**, and** threaten to **intervene,** just as the USSR threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President **Obama's response would** likely **put US forces on nuclear alert**, replaying Nixon's nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head to head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran's response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force. While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. Ifattacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. **A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.**

### Solvency

#### Financial Incentives for fusion fail

Bishop 10-25

Robert is General Counsel of the Nuclear Energy Institute, “Interview with Robert Bishop,” <http://debateandtherealworld.com/article.php?id=4>

D+TRW: What is the current status of "fusion-based gigawatt generation" in the United States? What could the United States Federal Government be doing to advance fusion research and development? Is it even possible to provide loan guarantees or other financial incentives at this time for the generation of fusion power?¶ Bishop: There are no operating fusion reactors in the world. Initial funding to investigate the possible use of fusion to generate electricity began in the 1950s. Currently, a number of U.S. and international projects (e.g., the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, the Joint European Torus (JET) in the UK, and the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), located in France) are at various stages of construction and operation but the ability to achieve the temperatures and pressures required for fusion to occur (other than in a fusion nuclear weapon) and to be able to utilize the resultant energy to generate electricity remains elusive. Continued R&D funding of those projects will be necessary for further scientific progress to be made. Absent a technological breakthrough, the best estimate of developing the ability to achieve the conditions necessary for fusion to take place in a controlled environment and then be able to develop a way to harness that energy to generate electricity is at least decades away. Then a commercially viable design must be developed. At that time - a far distant future - financial incentives for the commercial development of fusion power might make sense, but, again, such incentives would provide no value now.

### Leadership

#### Bureaucratic and institutional constraints thump preclude energy leadership

NEI ’12

["Improved Policies for Commercial Nuclear Trade Will Create American Jobs," June, <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/policybrief/improved-policies-for-commercial-nuclear-trade-will-create-american-jobs?page=1~~>]

**While U.S. firms offer some of the most innovative and safest nuclear energy technologies, they are hampered by cumbersome trade regulations, lack of coordination among the federal agencies involved, an inefficient export licensing process, limited options for financing nuclear exports and the absence of an international liability regime**. These companies face intense competition from suppliers in nations with less restrictive policies and substantial government subsidies for their nuclear industries. **To facilitate a greater U.S. role in the global commercial nuclear market, government support must be integrated into a seamless mechanism that includes coordination of nuclear trade policy, creation of bilateral agreements, export control reform and enhanced export financing. It also is vital that the United States pursue the international adoption of effective civil nuclear liability regimes**.

#### Can’t export tech

Platts 10-1

[Platts is a leading global provider of energy, petrochemicals and metals information, and a premier source of benchmark price assessments for those commodity markets, “Export reform needed to increase US nuclear market share: NEI,” <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6666149>]

**Export controls on technology related to nuclear power should be reformed** to allow US companies to capture a larger share of growing international markets, the Nuclear Energy Institute said Monday. The US Department of Commerce estimates the world market for nuclear power technology, fuel and related services and equipment at "upwards of" $750 billion over the next 10 years, Richard Myers, vice president for policy development, planning and supplier programs at NEI, said at a press conference Monday in Washington to release a report the US nuclear power industry commissioned on the topic. "It is a myth that the US nuclear supply chain has disappeared," Myers said. Most manufacturing of large "heavy metal" components for nuclear power plants, such as reactor vessels, is now done in Asia, but many US firms manufacture "precision components" for the nuclear industry and would stand to benefit from increased ability to compete with other countries, Myers said. **US licensing and regulatory reviews of nuclear exports**, however, **are "unduly burdensome," have confusing "layers of jurisdiction" shared by at least four federal agencies, and typically take at least a year to complete, "months longer" than reviews in other exporter countries**, he said. As a result, **the US export control regime is "far more complex and more difficult to navigate ... than comparable regimes in other nations**," Myers said. The report prepared by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman for NEI said that "US agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger executive branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that US exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly 'level the playing field' for US exporters in the near term." Many such reforms can be accomplished "administratively," without the need for legislation, James Glasgow, a partner at Pillsbury who specializes in nuclear export law, said during the press conference. The US Department of Energy is currently amending some of its export regulations, known as the Part 810 rule, and reforming that rule could provide significant opportunities to US exporters, Glasgow said. Unfortunately**, some of DOE's proposed revisions to the rule go in the wrong direction, adding regulatory requirements and hurdles**, Myers said. **Some potential customers for US nuclear exports see DOE's Part 810 review as "the choke point" for an order, and "sometimes that's an evaluation criterion" for deciding whether to buy from a US firm**, Glasgow said. In such situations, delay in the review can be "the functional equivalence of denial" of permission for the export because the buyer looks elsewhere, he said.

### Plasma

**No impact to environmental collapse**

**Easterbrook ‘3**

(Gregg, senior fellow at The New Republic, July, Wired Magazine, “We’re All Gonna Die!” <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

**If we’re talking about** doomsday - **the end of human civilization - many scenarios** simply **don’t measure up.** A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. **Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering** that **the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn’t be the final curtain.** Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

#### No Disease Impact

**Galdwell ‘95**

(Malcolm, The New Republic, July 17 and 24, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, 1999, p. 31-32)

Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adapt a specific strategy but every strategy carries a corresponding cost and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all hut halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability its essential rigidity is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. AIDS is almost invariably lethal because it attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. Viruses are not superhuman. I could go on, but the point is obvious. **Any microbe capable of wiping us** all **out** **would have to be everything at once**: as contagious as flue, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. **But viruses** are not, well, superhuman. They **cannot do everything at once**. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of **alarmists** such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they **neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms**.

**Fast transition comparatively worse than slow transition to nanotech- the impacts are war, environmental destruction, terrorism, and economic collapse.**

**Treder 5**

(Mike, Executive Director of CRN and managing director of the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, “Breakthrough Development” http://crnano.typepad.com/crnblog/2005/07/breakthrough.html)

**Will development of advanced nanotechnology arrive as an incremental advance, perhaps in 20 or 30 years? Or will it arrive sooner, as a sudden unexpected breakthrough, perhaps in 15 years, 10 years, or even less?**¶ This is an extremely important question to answer. **In the latter scenario, we would have much less time to prepare, and if molecular manufacturing** (MM) **arrives suddenly, it might trigger panicked policy or some other drastic response. If development is slow in coming, on the other hand, that will provide many more years in which to create effective policy**. Moreover, **if MM does not arrive until, say, 2030 or 2040, then by that time other technologies almost certainly will have produced substantial effects on society and the environment, making MM's impact less disruptive.**¶ Let's take a closer look at some of the factors that make determining a reliable timeline for MM development so urgent.¶ The power of nanotechnology will greatly augment not only the products made, but also the manufacturing process itself. A nanofactory could build its own mass of product, including another factory, in a few hours. Materials are calculated to be at least one hundred times as strong, with machinery a million times as compact as in today's products. With all this power, as well as rapid prototyping and fast inexpensive general-purpose manufacturing, the technology will create unprecedented new challenges.¶ As noted above, a key factor in the disruptiveness of molecular manufacturing is the speed with which it potentially could be developed. Some development programs may plan to follow an incremental roadmap. However, a program based on recognition of the potential for rapid design could result in a sudden breakthrough. Product designs could be based on hierarchical modules, re-using and re-combining a few basic functional units so that a new product would not need any additional low-level design. Massively parallel factories, building from the molecules up, would be able to build finished products from new designs in hours. This would allow rapid testing and tweaking of designs. When finalized, products could almost instantly be built by the millions using exponentially manufactured nanofactories.¶ **Powerful, compact products designed rapidly and produced almost instantly: that's a recipe for both opportunity and trouble. Two hostile countries with this technology could find themselves in a breakneck arms race. Law enforcement would have serious trouble keeping up with new tools of crime**, including networked spy systems**. Rapid replacement of other forms of manufacturing** (as digital computers have taken over almost all tasks from analog electronics) **could cause massive economic disruption. The ease and speed with which planet-scale engineering could be carried out implies a need for environmental policy to avoid bad choices and overuse of easy but environmentally expensive luxuries**. These are only a few of the problems, but they raise the specter of another ominous problem: control-freak solutions. An early-achiever nation might want to take over the world in order to prevent subsequent threats — and the power of the technology could make such an attempt appear feasible. Likewise, police might opt for universal surveillance.

#### Terrorists won’t use bio weapons

Paranchi ‘1

(John, RAND Analyst, “Anthrax Attacks, Biological Terrorism and Preventive Responses,” Rand Testimony, Ct 186, http://www.rand.org/publications/CT/CT186/CT186.pdf nov.//)

The use of disease and biological material as a weapon is not a new method of warfare. What is surprising is how infrequently it is has been used. Biological agents may appeal to the new terrorist groups because they affect people indiscriminately and unnoticed, thereby sowing panic. A pattern is emerging that terrorists who perpetrate mass and indiscriminate attacks do not claim responsibility.5 In contrast to the turgid manifestos issued by terrorists in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, recent mass casualty terrorists have not claimed responsibility until they were imprisoned. Biological agents enable terrorists to preserve their anonymity because of their delayed impact and can be confused with natural disease outbreaks. Instead of the immediate gratification of seeing an explosion or the glory of claiming credit for disrupting society, the biological weapons terrorist may derive satisfaction from seeing society’s panicked response to their actions. If this is the case, this is a new motive for the mass casualty terrorist. There are a number of countervailing disincentives for states and terrorists to use biological weapons, which help explain why their use is so infrequent. The technical and operational challenges biological weapons pose are considerable. Acquiring the material, skills of production, knowledge of weaponization, and successfully delivering the weapon, to the target is difficult. In cases where the populations of the terrorist supporters and adversaries are mixed, biological weapons risk inadvertently hitting the same people for whom terrorists claim to fight. Terrorists may also hesitate in using biological weapons specifically because breaking the taboo on their use may evoke considerable retaliation. The use of disease as a weapon is widely recognized in most cultures as a means of killing that is beyond the bounds of a civilized society. From a psychological perspective, terrorists may be drawn to explosives as arsonists are drawn to fire. The immediate gratification of explosives and the thrill of the blast may meet a psychological need of terrorists that the delayed effects of biological weapons do not. Causing slow death of others may not offer the same psychic thrill achieved by killing with firearms or explosives. Perhaps the greatest alternative to using biological weapons is that terrorists can inflict (and have inflicted) many more fatalities and casualties with conventional explosives than with unconventional weapons. Biological weapons present technical and operational challenges that determined killers may not have the patience to overcome or they may simply concentrate their efforts on more readily available alternatives. Pg 11-12

#### ( ) Numerous constraints prevent protectionism

Rajiv Kumar, 11/12/08, Protectionism and Obama, p. http://www.mydigitalfc.com/opinion/protectionism-and-obama

President designate Obama, while he can, of course, take the protectionist route, is **unlikely to do so** for several reasons. First, he appears to be **strongly committed** to reversing the decline in US's global prestige and leadership that has happened during the Bush presidency, especially over the last four years. He cannot hope to achieve this by leading the US away from globalisation and turning his back to US’s long-standing commitment to free market for goods and services. This will seriously erode the legitimacy that Pax American enjoys at present. A protectionist move by Obama presidency must surely imply the beginning of the end of the US economic hegemony in the world and accelerate the shift away from the Atlantic basin to Asia. Second, US firms with overseas operations, especially in Asia, will for good reason, **resist these moves** as their competitiveness and **indeed survival** will be threatened. The loss of competitiveness and eventual shutting down of these firms will also result in job losses within the US. Third, any unilateral protectionist moves by the US will raise the spectre of competitive tariff escalation by its trading partners, which will surely exacerbate the current crisis and make a world-wide depression that much more possible. There are more than enough people within the US academia, and hopefully also within the administration, who can **hammer home the dangers inherent** in such an approach and thus **stop** the **Obama** administration from going ahead in the protectionist direction. Fourth and last, higher protection levels will imply ringing the death knell of the Doha Round and effectively also the near complete loss of World Trade Organisation's credibility and indeed legitimacy. I doubt if any US president can precipitate such an eventuality. These factors will hopefully **ensure** that while there will be **plenty of threats**, and perhaps even some calls from voluntary export restraints from the incoming administration, these will not be **carried forward to actual imposition** of higher tariff or non-tariff walls by the US.

#### The Unipolar Moment is over and can’t be recovered – 08 financial crash means the US can’t prevent competition

Rachman 11

(Gideon Rachman, Financial Times chief foreign affairs commentator, Zero-Sum Future, 2011, pp 3-4)

But the economic crisis that struck the world in 2008 has changed the logic of international relations. It is no longer obvious that globalization benefits all the world's major powers. It is no longer clear that the United States faces no serious international rivals. And it is increasingly apparent that the world is facing an array of truly global problems-such as climate change and nuclear proliferation-that are causing rivalry and division between nations. After a long period of international cooperation, competition and rivalry are returning to the international system. A win-win world is giving way to a zero-sum world. Both as individuals and as a nation, Americans have begun to question whether the "new world order" that emerged after the cold war still favors the United States. The rise of Asia is increasingly associated with job losses for ordinary Americans and with a challenge to American power from an increasingly confident China. The crash has heightened awareness of American economic vulnerability and the country's reliance on continued Chinese and Middle Eastern lending. Of course, even after the crash, the United States remains the most powerful country in the world-with its largest economy, its most powerful military, and its leading universities. But the United States will never recover the unchallenged superiority of the "unipolar moment" that began with the collapse of the Soviet Union

#### Entitlement spending makes hege collapse inevitable

Cohen ‘12

[Michael A. Cohen is a regular columnist for Foreign Policy's Election 2012 Channel and a fellow at the Century Foundation. <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out?page=full> ETB]

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -- and ignores domestic inputs -- is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be.

### CMod

#### Xao only says could- not that they have a drive to build bombs, conventional deterrence outwieghs

#### No chance for super computers

Cho 12-21-12

Adrian <http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2012/12/new-form-of-quantum-computation-.html>

So **have physicists outpaced a classical computer? Not even close**. The current experiments use such a small number of photons that it would take a standard laptop a fraction of a second to make the same calculation. In contrast, the experiments themselves can still take hours. But if the work can be scaled up to about 25 photons and 400 channels then the classical computer should start to fall behind the experiment, **Walther estimates. "In 10 years or so you may be able to use existing technology** and resources **to outperform a conventional computer**," he says.¶ **However, it's not clear that such an effort will work, says** John **Preskill, a theorist at the California Institute of Technology** in Pasadena. **A bigger optical circuit would be more susceptible to effects such as the absorption of photons** **within the circuit and optical noise that could distort the results**, Preskill notes. Ironically, accounting for those imperfections could make modeling the circuits easier, not harder, and allow the computer to keep up, Preskill says.¶ As for the computation of permanents—the only problem this approach solves—it probably does not have any application beyond these experiments. Still, if boson sampling can be shown to be faster than ordinary computation, it would be worth looking for other applications, says Edward Farhi, a theoretical physicist at MIT. "Maybe it's not universal, but perhaps there's another problem that's more interesting that you can map on to it."¶ The real value of the problem is that it gives researchers a chance to show that a quantum computer can do something a classical computer can't, Preskill says. "That's kind of the core of what quantum computing is about," he says. "Of course, **these guys have only three photons going in and coming out. So they've got a way.**