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#### Nuclear production locks in productionism through obsession with finance, competitiveness and technological solutions

**Maciejewska and Marszalek ’11** (Malgorzata, institute of Sociology and Faculty of Social Sciences at Wroclaw University, and Marcin, Wroclaw University (Poland), “Lack of power or lack of democracy: the case of the projected nuclear power plant in Poland,” Economic and Environmental Studies Vol. 11, No.3 (19/2011), 235-248, Sept. 2011, AM)

The mainstream discourse on nuclear power rarely takes up the question of how the global energy industry is organized. In the modern economy the production of energy around the world, which is supposed to be a kind of public good and to guarantee sustainable development, is planned and arranged under free market conditions. As a part of the global chain of extraction, production and trading, it is subordinated to the neoliberal logic on terms of which the society and economy is governed as a business enterprise with the logic of maximum interest and minimum loss. This imposes on different actors (from the international corporations to individual households) the discipline of competitiveness and profitability, resulting in the growth of existing inequalities as ‘the invisible hand’ of the free market economy legitimizes those subjects which are already in power. The modern global economy is based on irrational production and social inequalities where one can observe the processes of work intensification and the cheapening of labor. The markets are dominated by the unproductive virtual economy (See Peterson, 2002) where the major players are the financial institutions which, by means of sophisticated financial tools, buy and sell virtual products (currencies, stocks, insurances, debts and its derivatives). In effect, the major actors in the capitalist economy are the international investors who have the capability of financial liquidity, and operate with those sophisticated financial tools on the global stock market. Even when they lose those capacities because of indebtedness, the states and international organizations seem often to be willing to repair the damage by transferring the taxes paid by citizens. (This is actually happening now, during the financial crisis, when southern and western European countries are subjected to shock therapy under which governments introduce austerity measures.) The praxis of nuclear power producers and the discourse which legitimizes it is therefore reduced to one goal – increasing financial revenues. The Polish plan to build the atomic power plant seems to be another element of the competitiveness strategy. In the authorities’ mind set it could put Poland into the position of more a competitive, more dynamic economy, as expected by the European Union and international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank. The welfare of Poland’s or Niger’s society does not fit into that picture. The nuclear establishment does not take into account the most important aspect of sustainable development: the overall reduction of energy consumption and therefore of energy production. Such a policy could bring a wide range of profits to the societies, the ecosystem, as well as the economy. On the contrary, the increase of power production and power use is one of the core concepts of pro-atomic discourse. This dogmatic belief draws the ideological line indicated at the beginning: the question of energy use and the ideas for solving this problem are seen only as a matter of technological challenges and the amount of financial and material means which have to be invested in them, but not as an effort to re-organize and restructure the modern economy.

#### The system’s nsustainable – debt, offshoring, financialization, eco – only shift from EMPIRE to MULTITUDES averts extinction

Shor 10

<http://www.stateofnature.org/locatingTheContemporary.html>

Fran Shor teaches in the History Department at Wayne State University. He is the author of Dying Empire: US Imperialism and Global Resistance (Routledge 2010).

Attributing the debilitation of the U.S. economy to a mortgage crisis or the collapse of the housing market misses the truly epochal crisis in the world economy and, indeed, in capitalism itself. As economist Michael Hudson contends, "the financial 'wealth creation' game is over. Economies emerged from World War II relatively free of debt, but the 60-year global run-up has run its course. Financial capitalism is in a state of collapse, and marginal palliatives cannot revive it." According to Hudson, among those palliatives is an ironic variant of the IMF strategies imposed on developing nations. "The new twist is a variant on the IMF 'stabilization' plans that lend money to central banks to support their currencies - for long enough to enable local oligarchs and foreign investors to move their savings and investments offshore at a good exchange rate." The continuity between these IMF plans and even the Obama administration's fealty to Wall Street can be seen in the person of Lawrence Summers, now the chief economic advisor to Obama. As further noted by Hudson, "the Obama bank bailout is arranged much like an IMF loan to support the exchange rate of foreign currency, but with the Treasury supporting financial asset prices for U.S. banks and other financial institutions ... Private-sector debt will be moved onto the U.S. Government balance sheet, where "taxpayers" will bear losses." [4] So, here we have another variation of the working poor getting sapped by the economic elite! In fact, one estimate of U.S. federal government support to the elite financial institutions is in the range of $10 trillion dollars, a heist of unimaginable proportions. [5] Given the massive indebtedness of the United States, its reliance of foreign support of that debt by countries like China, which has close to $2 trillion tied up in treasury bills and other investments, a long-term crisis of profitability, overproduction, and offshoring of essential manufacturing, it does not appear that the United States and, perhaps, even the capitalist system can avoid collapse. Certainly, there are Marxist economists and world-systems analysts who are convinced that the collapse is inevitable, albeit it may take several generations to complete. The question becomes whether a dying system can be resuscitated or, if something else can be put in its place. One of the most prominent world systems scholars, Immanuel Wallerstein, puts the long-term crisis of capitalism and the alternatives in the following perspective: Because the system we have known for 500 years is no longer able to guarantee long-term prospects of capital accumulation, we have entered a period of world chaos. Wild (and largely uncontrollable) swings in the economic, political, and military situations are leading to a systemic bifurcation, that is, to a world collective choice about the kind of new system the world will construct over the next fifty years. The new system will not be a capitalist system, but it could be one of two kinds: a different system that is equally or more hierarchical and inequalitarian, or one that is substantially democratic and equalitarian. [6] What Wallerstein overlooks is the possibility that a global crisis of capitalism with its continuous overexploitation and maldistribution of essential resources, such as water, could lead to a planetary catastrophe. [7] While Wallerstein and many of the Marxist critics of capitalism correctly identify the long-term structural crisis of capitalism and offer important insights into the need for more democratic and equalitarian systems, they often fail to realize other critical predicaments that have plagued human societies in the past and persist in even more life-threatening ways today. Among those predicaments are the power trips of civilization and environmental destructiveness. Such power trips can be seen through the sedimentation of power-over in the reign of patriarchal systems and an evolutionary selection for that power-over which contaminates society and social relationships. Certainly, many of those predicaments can also be attributed to a 5000 year history of the intersection of empire and civilization. Anthropologist Kajsa Ekholm Friedman analyzes that intersection and its impact in the Bronze Age as an "imperialist project..., dependent upon trade and ultimately upon war." [8] However, over the long rule of empire and especially within the last 500 years of the global aspirations of various empires, "no state or empire," observes historian Eric Hobsbawm, "has been large, rich, or powerful enough to maintain hegemony over the political world, let alone to establish political and military supremacy over the globe." [9] While war and trade still remain key components of the imperial project today and pretensions for global supremacy persist in the United States, what is just as threatening to the world as we know it is the overexploitation and abuse of environmental resources. Jared Diamond brilliantly reveals how habituated attitudes and values precluded the necessary recognition of environmental degradation which, in turn, led to the collapse of vastly different civilizations, societies, and cultures throughout recorded history. [10] He identifies twelve contemporary environmental challenges which pose grave dangers to the planet and its inhabitants. Among these are the destruction of natural habitats (rainforests, wetlands, etc.); species extinction; soil erosion; depletion of fossil fuels and underground water aquifers; toxic pollution; and climate change, especially attributable to the use of fossil fuels. [11] U.S. economic imperialism has played a direct role in environmental degradation, whether in McDonald's resource destruction of rainforests in Latin America, Coca-Cola's exploitation of underground water aquifers in India, or Union Carbide's toxic pollution in India. Beyond the links between empire and environmental destruction, unless we also clearly understand and combat the connections between empire and unending growth with its attendant "accumulation by dispossession", we may very well doom ourselves to extinction. According to James Gustave Speth, Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, the macro obsession with growth is also intimately related to our micro habituated ways of living. "Parallel to transcending our growth fetish," Speth argues, "we must move beyond our consumerism and hyperventilating lifestyles ... This reluctance to challenge consumption has been a big mistake, given the mounting environmental and social costs of American "affluenza," extravagance and wastefulness." [12] Of course, there are significant class and ethnic/racial differences in consumerism and lifestyle in the United States. However, even more vast differences and inequities obtain between the U.S. and the developing world. It is those inequities that lead Eduardo Galeano to conclude that "consumer society is a booby trap. Those at the controls feign ignorance, but anybody with eyes in his head can see that the great majority of people necessarily must consume not much, very little, or nothing at all in order to save the bit of nature we have left." [13] Finally, from Vandana Shiva's perspective, "unless worldviews and lifestyles are restructured ecologically, peace and justice will continue to be violated and, ultimately, the very survival of humanity will be threatened." [14] For Shiva and other global agents of resistance, the ecological and peace and justice imperatives require us to act in the here and now. Her vision of "Earth Democracy" with its emphasis on balancing authentic needs with a local ecology provides an essential guidepost to what we all can do to stop the ravaging of the environment and to salvage the planet. As she insists, "Earth Democracy is not just about the next protest or next World Social Forum; it is about what we do in between. It addresses the global in our everyday lives, our everyday realities, and creates change globally by making change locally." [15] The local, national, and transnational struggles and visions of change are further evidence that the imperial project is not only being contested but also being transformed on a daily basis. According to Mark Engler, "The powerful will abandon their strategies of control only when it grows too costly for them to do otherwise. It is the concerted efforts of people coming together in local communities and in movements spanning borders that will raise the costs. Empire becomes unsustainable ... when the people of the world resist." [16] Whether in the rural villages of Brazil or India, the jungles of Mexico or Ecuador, the city squares of Cochabama or Genoa, the streets of Seattle or Soweto, there has been, and continues to be, resistance around the globe to the imperial project. If the ruling elite and many of the citizens of the United States have not yet accepted the fact that the empire is dying and with it the concentric circles of economic, political, environmental, and civilizational crises, the global multitudes have been busy at work, digging its future grave and planting the seeds for another possible world. [17]

#### Reject the aff’s productionist ideology

#### Energy debates should focus on CRITIQUE of broad structures INSTEAD of producitivist fixes. Our ROLE OF THE BALLOT is best EVEN IF they win some truth claims – we must SHIFT THE FRAME

Zehner 12
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Since this book represents a critique of alternative energy, it may seem an unlikely manual for alternative-energy proponents. But it is. Building alternative-energy infrastructure atop America's present economic, social, and cultural landscape is akin to building a sandcastle in a rising tide. A taller sand castle won't help. The first steps in this book sketch a partial blueprint for making alternative-energy technologies relevant into the future. Technological development alone will do little to bring about a durable alternative-energy future. Reimagining the social conditions of energy use will. Ultimately, we have to ask ourselves if environmentalists should be involved in the business of energy production (of any sort) while so many more important issues remain vastly underserved. Over the next several decades, it's quite likely that our power production cocktail will look very much like the mix of today, save for a few adjustments in market share. Wind and biofuel generation will become more prevalent and the stage is set for nuclear power as well, despite recent catastrophes. Nevertheless, these changes will occur over time—they will seem slow. Every power production mechanism has side effects and limitations of its own, and a global shift to new forms of power production simply means that humanity will have to deal with new side effects and limitations in the future. This simple observation seems to have gotten lost in the cheerleading for alternative-energy technologies. The mainstream environmental movement should throw down the green energy pom-poms and pull out the bifocals. It is entirely reasonable for environmentalists to criticize fossil-fuel industries for the harms they instigate. It is, however, entirely unreasonable for environmentalists to become spokespeople for the next round of ecological disaster machines such as solar cells, ethanol, and battery-powered vehicles. Environmentalists pack the largest punch when they instead act as power production watchdogs (regardless of the production method); past environmentalist pressures have cleaned the air and made previously polluted waterways swimmable. This watchdog role will be vital in the future as biofuels, nuclear plants, alternative fossil fuels, solar cells, and other energy technologies import new harms and risks. Beyond a watchdog role, environmentalists yield the greatest progress when addressing our social fundamentals, whether by supporting human rights, cleaning up elections, imagining new economic structures, strengthening communities, revitalizing democracy, or imagining more prosperous modes of consumption. Unsustainable energy use is a symptom of suboptimal social conditions. Energy use will come down when we improve these conditions: consumption patterns that lead to debt and depression; commercials aimed at children; lonely seniors stuck in their homes because they can no longer drive; kids left to fend for themselves when it comes to mobility or sexuality; corporate influence trumping citizen representation; measurements of the nation's health in dollars rather than well-being; a media concerned with advertising over insight, and so on. These may not seem like environmental issues, and they certainly don't seem like energy policy issues, but in reality they are the most important energy and environmental issues of our day. Addressing them won't require sacrifice or social engineering. They are congruent with the interests of many Americans, which will make them easier to initiate and fulfill. They are entirely realistic (as many are already enjoyed by other societies on the planet). They are, in a sense, boring. In fact, the only thing shocking about them is the degree to which they have been underappreciated in contemporary environmental thought, sidelined in the media, and ignored by politicians. Even though these first steps don't represent a grand solution, they are necessary preconditions if we intend to democratically design and implement more comprehensive solutions in the future. Ultimately, clean energy is less energy. Alternative-energy alchemy has so greatly consumed the public imagination over recent decades that the most vital and durable environmental essentials remain overlooked and underfunded. Today energy executives hiss silver-tongued fairy tales about clean-coal technologies, safe nuclear reactors, and renewable sources such as solar, wind, and biofuels to quench growing energy demands, fostering the illusion that we can maintain our expanding patterns of energy consumption without consequence. At the same time, they claim that these technologies can be made environmentally, socially, and politically sound while ignoring a history that has repeatedly shown otherwise. If we give in to accepting their conceptual frames, such as those pitting production versus production, or if we parrot their terms such as clean coal, bridge fuels, peacetime atom, smart growth, and clean energy, then we have already lost. We forfeit our right to critical democratic engagement and instead allow the powers that be to regurgitate their own terms of debate into our open upstretched mouths. Alternative-energy technologies don't clean the air. They don't clean the water. They don't protect wildlife. They don't support human rights. They don't improve neighborhoods. They don't strengthen democracy. They don't regulate themselves. They don't lower atmospheric carbon dioxide. They don't reduce consumption. They produce power. That power can lead to durable benefits, but only given the appropriate context. Ultimately, it's not a question of whether American society possesses the technological prowess to construct an alternative-energy nation. The real question is the reverse. Do we have a society capable of being powered by alternative energy? The answer today is clearly no. But we can change that. Future environmentalists will drop solar, wind, biofuels, nuclear, hydrogen, and hybrids to focus instead on women's rights, consumer culture, walkable neighborhoods, military spending, zoning, health care, wealth disparities, citizen governance, economic reform, and democratic institutions. As environmentalists and global citizens, it's not enough to say that we would benefit by shifting our focus. Our very relevance depends on it.

## off

#### HTGRs cause massive spikes in helium demand

Mark Haynes 12, President, Concordia Power, 7/20/12, “Helium: Supply Shortages Impacting our Economy, National Defense and Manufacturing,” Congressional Documents and Publications, p. lexis

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Mark Haynes, I am President of Concordia Power, a small company that works with the NGNP Industry Alliance. The NGNP Industry Alliance is comprised of a number of major companies including Dow Chemical, ConocoPhilips, Entergy, AREVA, Westinghouse, SGL Group, Graftech, Mersen, Toyo Tanso, Ultra-Safe Nuclear, Technology Insights and the Petroleum Technology Alliance Canada.

Our Alliance’s purpose is to help ensure the commercialization of High Temperature Gas Cooled Reactors (HTGRs) as an extremely important energy option for the future. HTGRs, which are helium cooled, are unique in both their very high outlet temperatures and their intrinsic safety characteristics. Although these reactors will include multiple safety features, they will require no active or passive safety systems or operator intervention to ensure the safety of the public. Taken together, these characteristics make HTGRs not only very desirable electric power generators with extraordinarily high efficiency and safety, but they also allow HTGRs to be co-located with major industrial and extraction facilities where their high temperature output can substitute for the very large amounts of fossil fuels these facilities currently consume in the production of process heat.

In addition, HTGRs can also play an unmatched role in greatly improving the efficiency and environmental performance of converting coal or other indigenous carbon sources to liquid fuels with an extremely small carbon footprint. As explained in more detail later in this testimony, a relatively conservative estimate is that in North America, there is a market for 600 or more HTGR modules in this century. To the point of this hearing, the unique characteristics of helium are key to making this technology possible.

I believe it’s correct to say that our invitation to testify here today does not relate to any particular expertise we might have with regard to either the Federal Helium Reserve or the current helium markets. Rather, our presence here relates more to the fact that HTGRs are a unique and important example of an emerging energy technology that is very dependent on a reliable and affordable supply of helium in the future.

Why Helium is Important to HTGRs

Helium coolant is a key element of HTGR design. Helium has four characteristics that make it a superior reactor coolant:

- It is chemically inert in the HTGR process. Hence, during reactor operations, extraordinary event or interruption by natural cause (as a flood or earthquake) or a human error or equipment event that affects the plant normal operations, it does not corrode reactor internals nor does it contribute to the spread of significant amounts of radioactive particles around the plant or the environment;

- It is itself “invisible” to radiation: it does not become radioactive in the course of cooling the reactor core and the reactivity of the core is not impacted by its presence or non-presence. This second characteristic is an important added safety feature in the event of even its complete loss from the reactor core in an accident; and

- It is always in a gaseous phase at any temperature in the core. This ensures that in an extraordinary accident event there is no extreme pressure conditions created, such as can occur in a light water reactor where the flashing of coolant water into steam requires a very robust containment in the event of a loss of coolant.

- It is an efficient heat transport fluid. This allows a more economical design and efficient plant operation. It is also important to note that the other materials (graphite and ceramic coated fuel) are also non-corrosive and very chemically compatible with helium. This combination of materials is stable at extremely high temperatures. So, in a worst-case scenario loss of helium accident, the reactor core structure remains stable and the fuel stays well within its design limits. This is additional insurance that a Fukushima-type scenario cannot happen with an HTGR.

Helium Use and HTGRs

Although it is difficult to predict with precision how much helium will be required in the future for HTGRs, our Alliance, in concert with the Idaho National Laboratory estimates that in North America, there could be a future demand for several hundred 600 Megawatt thermal modules. This includes meeting needs in petrochemical production, refining, liquid fuel production, electric power generation and other markets.

Each reactor module in a fleet of HTGRs would require an initial inventory of helium when it enters service as well as replenishment helium during subsequent years of operation for the helium consumed each year in the supporting auxiliary equipment. The initial operating inventory for each of these 600 MWt modules would be approximately 2000 kg of helium. The annual need for makeup helium is assumed to be 10% of the operating inventory which is the upper design limit. So the annual helium requirement for a whole fleet of HTGRs is the total of the initial inventory required for new modules going into service plus the makeup supply for the existing modules already in service. As the first HTGRs are deployed, the initial inventory requirement governs the HTGR fleet helium consumption. But as the fleet grows, the makeup supply for the existing fleet quickly dominates the helium demand.

#### Supply’s on the brink now---no excess global capacity

Walter Nelson 12, Director, Helium Sourcing and Supply Chain Air Products and Chemicals, Inc, 7/20/12, Helium: Supply Shortages Impacting our Economy, National Defense and Manufacturing, Congressional Documents & Publications, p. lexis

There have been planned and unplanned maintenance outages at natural gas processing plants, as well as continuing pipeline allocations on the BLM system during well maintenance that have restricted the supply of crude helium to the U.S. refiners. In Algeria and Qatar, production of helium has decreased due to the fragile worldwide economy, as well as maintenance work at gas palnts. In addition, new helium refining projects have been slow to develop. The delayed start-up of one particular plant in Wyoming has postponed access to major new supplies of helium. Combined, these issues have reduced the global helium supply by as much as 5% to 10%.

On top of this, the industry will experience an unprecedented helium shortage this summer. Beyond the developments cited above, there are currently three US plant outages or curtailments that are severely limiting the short-term supply of helium today. First, one company reduced its helium production in Wyoming by approximately 20% beginning early June while performing critical maintenance activities. Full production is not expected to resume until sometime later this summer. The impact of this curtailment is almost five percent of global supply capacity. Second, the crude helium enrichment plant that supplies the BLM pipeline system was shut down July 15th for a planned 10 day safety critical outage. During this outage helium deliveries are limited to pipeline inventory reducing global supply capacity by an additional 25%. Third, a nautral gas plant in Kansas experienced an unplanned helium equipment outage at the end of June and that outage continued through this week. The impact of this outage was another five percent reduction in global supply capacity. In helium circles this has been "the perfect storm."

The combination of these issues has resulted in a significant short-term reduction in global helium supply capacity over the summer months. Global inventories would have normally served as a buffer during short-term outage events, minimizing the supply impacts. Unfortunately that's not the case this time. Air Products has had to allocate our customers and I suspect that all helium suppliers have had to do the same. We are caught in a cruch not of our making.

We expect some relief soon. Most of the maintenance outages will be completed within weeks, in the U.S. and abroad.That said, it will most probably take months for the global helium supply chains to recover from these summer outages.

Helium supplies will continue to remain tight through 2012 and into 2013, when new helium production is expected in Wyoming and Qatar. The Wyoming project is expected to add four percent helium capacity and the Qatar II project may add up to 18% capacity. Only after these two new plants are operational in 2013 and existing plants are running back at full output will the global supply begin to fully stabilize.

#### Helium supply constraints destroy U.S. leadership in basic scientific discovery

Phuan Ong 12, the Eugene Higgins Professor of Physics Director, Princeton Center for Complex Materials Department of Physics Princeton University, 7/20/12, Helium: Supply Shortages Impacting our Economy, National Defense and Manufacturing, Congressional Documents & Publications, p. lexis

The 2 main reasons why liquid helium is vital for research are:

1) Helium is the only fluid available for cooling samples to temperatures close to absolute zero. All objects follow the universal laws of quantum mechanics. However, at room temperature, large thermal agitations of molecules and atoms largely obscure or destroy the manifestations of quantum physics. Hence quantum behavior seems bizarre and unfamiliar to all of us. Cooling a sample suppresses the thermal agitations, allowing the quantum phenomena to become apparent. Put more directly, liquid helium is the "royal road" to discovery.

2) Helium is used to cool the superconducting wires in superconducting magnets. At present, superconducting magnets using niobium-tin (and tentatively high-Tc cuprates) provide the only known means for producing intense magnetic fields over human-sized volumes. They have to be cooled to 4 Kelvin above absolute zero to remain superconducting. With increasing demands worldwide (in research, MRI machines and in future transport), the demand for liquid helium is expected to rise sharply.

To mix metaphors, we may say that liquid helium is the vital "oxygen" that nourishes the large, dynamic U.S. research community. Disrupting this vital flow will deliver a crippling body blow to a large segment of the community, and jeopardize the leadership role of the U.S. in the coming decades. Increasingly, the pre-eminence of the U.S. in this field of physics has come under stiff challenges from groups in Germany, Japan, Netherlands, China and S. Korea. These countries have steeply increased their investments in these areas and "grown" a new generation of physicists, mostly trained in the U.S. The investment stems from the universal consensus that, in contrast to many other fundamental scientific areas, the results here underpin important future technologies.

In an increasingly flat world, it is prudent for the U.S. to safeguard the availability of this valuable national resource. From the RandD viewpoint, strong fluctuations in the price of helium or in the supply would be very harmful to the U.S. national interest.

#### Science leadership’s key to the sustainability and perceived legitimacy of U.S. hegemony---it blunts resentment of the power gap

Damon Coletta 9, Professor of Political Science at the United States Air Force Academy, September 2009, “Science, Technology, and the Quest for International Influence,” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA536133&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf

Less appreciated is how scientific progress facilitates diplomatic strategy in the long run, how it contributes to Joseph Nye‘s soft power, which translates to staying power in the international arena. One possible escape from the geopolitical forces depicted in Thucydides‘ history for all time is for the current hegemon to maintain its lead in science, conceived as a national program and as an enterprise belonging to all mankind.

Beyond the new technologies for projecting military or economic power, the scientific ethos conditions the hegemon‘s approach to social-political problems. It effects how the leader organizes itself and other states to address well-springs of discontent—material inequity, religious or ethnic oppression, and environmental degradation. The scientific mantle attracts others‘ admiration, which softens or at least complicates other societies‘ resentment of power disparity. Finally, for certain global problems—nuclear proliferation, climate change, and financial crisis—the scientific lead ensures robust representation in transnational epistemic communities that can shepherd intergovernmental negotiations onto a conservative, or secular, path in terms of preserving international order.

In today‘s order, U.S. hegemony is yet in doubt even though military and economic indicators confirm its status as the world‘s lone superpower. America possesses the material wherewithal to maintain its lead in the sciences, but it also desires to bear the standard for freedom and democracy. Unfortunately, patronage of basic science does not automatically flourish with liberal democracy.

The free market and the mass public impose demands on science that tend to move research out of the basic and into applied realms. Absent the lead in basic discovery, no country can hope to pioneer humanity‘s quest to know Nature. There is a real danger U.S. state and society could permanently confuse sponsorship of technology with patronage of science, thereby delivering a self-inflicted blow to U.S. leadership among nations.
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#### Immigration will pass now—Obama’s capital determines success

Bill Keller, NYTimes, 2/3/13, Selling Amnesty, www.nytimes.com/2013/02/04/opinion/keller-selling-amnesty.html?pagewanted=print

Let’s assume that President Obama and the Democrats sincerely want an immigration bill, that this is not a trick to trap Republicans into an anti-immigrant vote that will alienate Hispanic voters and secure Democratic advantage for a generation. The Senate seems to be hospitable territory. Four Republicans — including the ascendant Marco Rubio — have joined four Democrats in embracing the politically difficult principles at the heart of the matter. Some advocates of immigration reform talk confidently of mustering 70 Senate votes, which would represent an astonishing reversal of fortunes for an issue that has long been mired in demagogy. The House, where many Republicans fear getting creamed by Tea Party challengers in a primary next year, is more problematic. The fear is that the House will balk or will break immigration into little pieces, pass the parts that crack down on undocumented workers and kill any effort to legalize the 11 million already here. That pessimism is natural; the House is the place where ideas go to die**. But it needn’t happen this time**. **If** President **Obama** and Congressional leaders play their cards right**, as they are doing** so far, immigration reform — **real immigration reform** — **can** clear Congress **this year**. **Selling the measure to the Republican House will require** close attention to **substance, marketing and** legislative tactics**.**

New nuclear production causes massive political backlash and saps capital – any evidence pre 2011 is irrelevant

Alex Trembath, Policy Fellow in AEL’s New Energy Leaders Project, 11 [“Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy,” Lead Energy, Feb 4, http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/]

Nuclear power is unique among clean energy technologies in that Democrats tend to be more hesitant towards its production than Republicans. Indeed, it has a reputation for its appeal to conservatives -Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman included provisions for nuclear technology in their ultimately unsuccessful American Power Act (APA) with the ostensible goal of courting Republican support. The urgency with which Democrats feel we must spark an energy revolution may find a perfect partner with Republicans who support nuclear power. But is there anything more than speculative political evidence towards its bipartisan viability?¶ If there is one field of the energy sector for which **certainty of political will** **and government policy is essential**, it is nuclear power. High up front costs for the private industry, extreme regulatory oversight and public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology. In a new report on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy. The report, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,” makes the case for political certainty:¶ “It is difficult for energy producers and users to estimate the relative price for nuclear-generated energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives (e.g. natural gas)–an essential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for decades.”¶ Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to supply-side “push” policies, or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power.¶ One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill included provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship.¶ But **that was last year. The** **changing of the guard in Congress makes this a whole different game**, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times piece in the aftermath of the elections forecast **a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy**, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees.¶ Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably Lindsey Graham and Richard Lugar, would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS.¶ Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined “innovation hawks,” among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been particularly outspoken in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.”¶ The extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post reports that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct Section 48C of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing.¶ Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what **nuclear energy** needs moving forward. It **will require an aggressive push from the White House**, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one.

#### That kills Obama’s immigration push

Amy Harder, National Journal, 2/6/13, In Washington, Energy and Climate Issues Get Shoved in the Closet, www.nationaljournal.com/columns/power-play/in-washington-energy-and-climate-issues-get-shoved-in-the-closet-20130206

At a news conference where TV cameras in the back were nearly stacked on top of each other, an influential bipartisan group of five senators introduced legislation late last month to overhaul the nation’s immigration system. The room was so crowded that no open seats or standing room could be found. A week later, one senator, Republican Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, was standing at the podium in the same room to unveil her energy-policy blueprint. There were several open seats and just a few cameras. At least one reporter was there to ask the senator about her position on President Obama’s choice for Defense secretary, former Republican Sen. Chuck Hagel. “I’m doing energy right now,” Murkowski responded. “I’m focused on that.” Almost everyone else on Capitol Hill is focused on something else. Aside from the broad fiscal issues, **Congress and the president are** galvanizing around immigration reform. Four years ago, the White House prioritized health care reform above comprehensive climate-change legislation. The former will go down in history as one of Obama’s most significant accomplishments. The latter is in the perpetual position of second fiddle. “**To everything**,” **Murkowski interjected** fervently **when asked** by National Journal Daily **whether energy** and climate policy **was second to other policies** in Washington’s pecking order. Murkowski, ranking member of the Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee, said she hoped the Super Bowl blackout would help the public understand the importance of energy policy. “This issue of **immigration**: Why are we all **focused on that**? Well, it’s because the Republicans lost the election because in part we did not have the Hispanic community behind us,” Murkowski said this week. “What is it that brings about that motivation? Maybe it could be something like a gap in the Super Bowl causes the focus on energy that we need to have. I can only hope.” It will take more than hope. Elections have consequences, but so far the only kind of electoral consequence climate and energy policy has instigated is one that helped some lawmakers who supported cap-and-trade legislation to lose their seats in the 2010 midterm elections. For the pendulum to swing the other way—for lawmakers to lose their seats over not acting on climate and energy policy—seems almost unfathomable right now. Billions of dollars are invested in the fossil-fuel power plants, refineries, and pipelines that the country depends on today. The companies that own this infrastructure have a business interest in keeping things the way they are. Immigration reform doesn’t face such formidable interests invested in the status quo. “They [businesses] have employees—real, visible people—who they value and who they want to make legal as soon as possible,” said Chris Miller, who until earlier this year was the top energy and environment adviser to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev. On energy and climate-change policy, Miller added, “You’re probably never going to have anything like the fence in the Southwest or the border-control issue that **push**es action and debate **on immigration**, because climate-change impacts will likely continue to be more abstract in the public's mind until those impacts are so crystal-clear it’s too late for us to do anything.” Another, tactical reason helps build momentum on immigration and not on other issues. **Obama can capitalize on immigration** as it becomes more of a wedge issue within the GOP. On energy and climate policy, Obama faces a unified Republican Party. “The president has cracked the code on how to push his agenda items through. He learned from his victories on the payroll tax and the fiscal cliff that the key is to stake out the political high ground on issues that poll in his favor while exploiting the divisions within the GOP,” said a former Republican leadership aide who would speak only on the condition of anonymity. “With this in mind, the next logical place for him to go is immigration. Unlike issues like energy or tax reform where the GOP is united, he can claim a big win on immigration reform while striking a political blow to Republicans.”

#### Reform key to remittances

Oppenheimer, writer for the Miami Herald, 1/19/2013

(Andres, “Andres Oppenheimer: Obama may help Latin America - without trying,” <http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/01/19/3189668/obama-may-help-latin-america-without.html#storylink=cpy>)

Let’s start with the obvious: Obama doesn’t have a history of special interest in Latin America.

When I interviewed him for the first time in 2007, he had never set foot in the region. And during his first term, unlike most of his predecessors, he didn’t come up with any grand plan for Latin America — granted, he had to focus on resurrecting the U.S. economy — and instead stated that his top foreign policy priority is Asia’s Pacific rim.

Still, he may end up being great for Latin America, for reasons that have very little to do with Latin America.

First, there are better-than-even chances that — emboldened by his 71-27 victory margin among Latino voters in the 2012 elections — Obama will be able to pass an immigration reform plan that could legalize many of the estimated 11 million undocumented residents in the United States.

That would be a godsend to the economies of Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, Colombia and Ecuador. **Most experts agree that once undocumented workers get legal status**, **they get better jobs and can send more money to their relatives back home**.

#### Remittances from the U.S. key to Indian econ

Khan, Adjunct Professor Business and Law – Edith Cowan University, ‘9

(Amir Ullah, “NRIs remittances going up,” <http://www.thomex.com/article/resources_details.aspx?ID=R_2007060414180&catid=C_200903101421&flag=1>, date at <http://www.free-press-release.com/news/200905/1243487071.html>)

[Note: NRI = Non-Resident Indian]

The Reserve Bank of India has announced that NRI repatriation to India has already crossed $39 billion mark during the first nine months of 2008. This means that the total for 2008 will easily be more than 40 billion dollars and even close to 50 billion dollars. If 39 billion dollars have been received during the period January to September 2008, the last quarter would have received at least 20 per cent of the total which would take the total close to 50 billion dollars. The World Bank had projected that India would receive 30 billion dollars from NRIs in 2008. This higher figure of at least 40 million dollars in 2008 will mean that NRIs would have sent money that is **more than 5 per cent of the GDP of the country**. It is followed by Maharashtra. The increase in remittance is not surprising given the fact that the rupee has been depreciating in value against almost all foreign currencies. In addition, Indian banks now offer very high interest rates and have been allowed to offer the same high interest returns to Foreign Currency Non Resident accounts and the nonresident rupee accounts. Two years ago, Non Resident Indians left Non Resident Chinese in the second position when in 2006; NRIs sent back 27 billion dollars and the nonresident Chinese contributed 23 billion dollars to the Chinese economy. What is important to note is that there are at least twice as many nonresident Chinese in the world as non resident Indians. Of the total 20 million Indian abroad, it is estimated that about 8 million NRIs worldwide send money back home. While West Asia constitutes most of the volumes in terms of the number of transactions, **the US leads in terms of absolute value**. The obvious questions is that with IT and allied sectors being hit by the crisis, would many people still go abroad and would they still send as much money back home? The answer is a clear ‘Yes’ due to a variety of reasons: people will always migrate for better opportunities; the dollar is at a high and is expected to be so for a while; Indian banks are considered much ‘safer’ options to keep money since the recent crisis; interest rates overseas are abysmally low coupled with the fact that the RBI too had increased NRE deposit rates, making it more sensible to park the money in India. Also, even though the share market and real estate markets in India have taken beatings of late, the valuations are at such amazing levels that any investor would find it an extremely lucrative option to enter. A combination of the last two points would mean that there would probably be a short term shift from the equity and realty markets to risk-free, capital guaranteed deposits in India. Remittance of funds by expatriates to their home country depends principally on the origin factors and destination factors. Non-resident Indians are, in some cases, big earners and in most cases inclined towards savings. These have resulted in India taking the leadership position in inward remittances from its expatriates. The US economy is passing through a recessionary phase which in turn is affecting most countries in the world. The financial sector is in turmoil with major banks and financial institutions (FIs) in a bad shape. These events have caused loss of jobs. NRIs too are affected by this. However, there are many Indians abroad who will be in jobs. Compared to the major developed countries, **the Indian economy is still on rails and** is **likely to sustain** a **7% GDP growth** in the current fiscal year. The **banks** and financial institutions in India **are** in a much better and **stable** shape. Notwithstanding the volatile situation in the stock market, there are good investment opportunities in the country. The increase in the exchange rate of the dollar makes the situation attractive. While loss of jobs and consequent loss of income will somewhat reduce the momentum but this will also see NRIs returning to India. This will again result in a shift of their funds back to the country. The regular remittances, for family maintenance and festivals will anyhow continue.

#### Collapses causes Asian war

**Garten 95** (Jeffrey E., Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade Development, “U.S. Policy Toward South Asia”, Federal News Service, 3-7, Lexis)

For example, Lyndon Johnson launched the Indo-American Foundation to help stimulate education and consequently growth in India. He did so at a major black-tie dinner in Washington attended by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. She accepted the offer -- which was later withdrawn -- with great grace and hope. In her remarks she presaged why the relationship between our two peoples was so important. She cited the special role of the United States in the world. Then she went on to say, "India's problems today are her own, but they are also the world's problems. India has a position in Asia which is an explosive position. India, if it is stable, united, democratic, I think can serve a great purpose. If India is not stable, or if there is chaos, if India fails, I think it is a failure of the whole democratic system. It is a failure of many of the values which you and we hold dear."

Just a few years later, Pakistan came apart, India invaded what would later become Bangladesh, and the United States was contemplating intervention against the Indians. Indira Gandhi formalized India's relationship with the Soviet Union and exploded an atomic bomb. Later, Nixon and Kissinger would come to view these events and American actions as critical turning points of Cold War realpolitik. This situation wasn't helped when the United States moved even closer to Pakistan, nor when it normalized relations with China, thereby erasing the notion that India could be our counterfoil against the other Asian giant.

Let historians debate whether the Cold War rifts between our two great nations were the result of genuine divergence of national interests which could not be avoided, or whether diplomacy failed -- or both. But today we can all be forgiven if we conclude that our obsession with the "great game" of our time, the global successor to Kipling's "great game" for South Asia, took an unnecessary toll on a relationship that deserved more than periodic infatuations.

Now, of course, the Cold War is behind us. The Soviet Union no longer exists. India, too, has changed, embarking on a bold course of economic reforms that are having the effect of opening the enormous Indian market for the very first time. American businesspeople recognize the value of any market that size, but they also see the promise of India within Asia -- one of the two "elephants" among the tigers. By the year 2025, for instance, India is likely to be the world's most populous nation in the world's fastest growing region.

The Foundation for Strong Indo-U.S. Ties

The artificial barriers and discoloring lenses of Cold War politics now have fallen away. And our self-interest has motivated us to reexamine the relationship. There is nothing wrong with self- interest, of course. It helps both parties to define and to understand a relationship -- and it is more reliable than infatuation.

But, when viewed in this new light -- this more honest, more revealing light we can see that there is a basis -- a very strong basis -- for a natural bond between us.

India is, after all, the world's largest democracy. America is among the oldest.

India will, within the next decade or so, become one of the worlds biggest and most important emerging markets. The United States will remain the world's most important and mature market.

India and the United States are linked by many cultural values. We share a common language. We share the historical legacy of having been a colony of Britain. But that's not all. Ralph Waldo Emerson, the great American writer, was heavily influenced by the Bhagavad- gita, the great Hindu poem written sometime between 400 B.C. and 400 A.D. In 1947, Indian officials studied the American Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights before drafting their first constitution. These are but two of many examples of shared values in our societies.

Both of our countries are multicultural crucibles, struggling with the tensions cultural differences bring, but revelling in the richness they offer.

We are both revolutionary societies, founded on disobedience to tyranny. In fact, one of the events leading to our struggle for independence, the Boston Tea Party, was a revolt against the tax which the British imposed on American imports of Indian tea!

We are both preoccupied with the development of human resources in our countries -- including those who are living below the poverty level, those struggling to make a decent living, and those already possessing the most advanced scientific and technical skills.

We both recognize the importance of traditional values in a time of change, but we face the challenge of not using these values as an excuse to resist change.

We will both play a major role in the world, and are struggling to define that role.

We both need one another in the new era ahead, where commercial ties and commercial enlargement will be at the core of our bilateral and global interests.

A New Vision

Recently, India's distinguished Ambassador, Siddhartha Shankar Ray, spoke of the U.S.-Indian relationship. He acknowledged that it would be fair to characterize our joint history to date as an era of "missed opportunities." But, knowing and admiring him as I do, I believe that he would be the first to underscore that what is missed is not necessarily forsaken.

When Prime Minister Rao visited the U.S. last year, a new spirit was born. President Clinton in his remarks to the Prime Minister and in private remarks within the Administration has repeatedly emphasized that he hoped that we were entering a new era in our relationship, one in. which we were motivated by our great mutual interests to forge new, closer ties.

Paramount among those interests are the commercial opportunities that are increasingly at the heart of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy. But it is impossible to separate those commercial interests from our broader interests. Economic reforms enable our companies to take advantage of the opportunities within the Indian market and enable Indian companies to better enter the global marketplace. Economic growth in India is a powerful stabilizing force in a region of the world where stability is of supreme.importance. Stability and growth in India are of enormous importance through southern Asia, from the Middle East to Indochina. Peace and prosperity in that part of the world are essential to the peace and prosperity of the world.

The survival of Indian democracy is an important message to those who doubt the value of democracy, particularly in large, complex, emerging societies. India is a regional powerhouse. Home of the world's fourth largest navy. Home of a burgeoning space program. It would be hard to describe a nation that could be more central to our interests in the century ahead -- or one with whom the promise of cooperation and friendship is greater.

#### Nuclear war

Landy, National Security Expert @ Knight Ridder, 3/10/’2K

(Jonathan, Knight Ridder, lexis)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster.” In an effort to cool the region’s tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger all will hopscotch Asia’s capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. While Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia \_ with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources \_ indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.
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#### DOE battery Manhattan-project will work now—sustained funding is key

Carl Franzen, TPM, 11/30/12, Energy Department Launches ‘Battery Hub,’ For Battery Manhattan Project, idealab.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/11/energy-department-launches-battery-hub-for-battery-manhattan-project.php

Think of it as a Manhattan Project, except instead of secret nuclear bombs, the end result is much better batteries for devices, electric vehicles and the power grid. That’s at least one of the analogies used by the U.S. Department of Energy on Friday when it announced the launch of a new advanced research “Battery Hub,” to the tune of a $120 million, five-year government grant. The Battery Hub, as most of those involved refer to it — officially named the Joint Center for Energy Storage Research (JCESR, pronounced “J Cesar”) — will be led by scientists at Argonne National Laboratory in Lemont, Illinois (outside Chicago), will include actually include top researchers from a wide swath of some of the most prestigious institutions around the country, among them Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, and other universities throughout the state and the Midwest. “We wanted to have an aspirational and ambitious, but concrete, goal,” said Jeff Chamberlain, an Argonne chemist and the Battery Hub’s deputy director. “That goes back to Bell Labs and the Apollo Mission and the Manhattan Project. We set the goal as high as we possibly could.” Specifically, Argonne wants the Battery Hub to be able to make a battery with five times the energy storage capacity as the upper limit of current technologies, at one-fifth the cost, within five years, the so-called “5-5-5” plan. “This is an extremely difficult bill to achieve,” Chamberlain emphasized. “We recognize that.” But Chamberlain was confident that the Hub had assembled all of the right institutions and the right people to make the best possible attempt at attaining such a technological breakthrough in such a tight time frame. Key to this is the fact that the Battery Hub isn’t conducting open-ended research for purely exploratory purposes — rather, the roughly 120 full-time equivalent scientists and engineers involved are working with performance standards that will allocate the Energy Department’s funding toward those projects that demonstrate success, while “de-emphasizing” in Chamberlain’s words, those technologies that don’t produce rapid or demonstrable progress. “The question is: How do we drive toward development of these technologies so that scientists have the freedom to explore and discover but do so toward a specific goal?” Chamberlain asked rhetorically. “And the answer is through performance-based standards.” Indeed, even getting the $120 million grant was based on a competitive process: The Energy Department selected Argonne’s proposal among several other candidates. Argonne’s, and thus the Hub’s focus, is on three specific types of new battery technologies: Multivalent battery systems, chemical transformation of battery reactions, and “flow batteries.” Multivalent battery systems are those that use a different primary material than the common lithium found in lithium ion batteries to carry a charge. Although lithium can only transport one electron in every interaction, other materials, such as magnesium and aluminum, can transport two or three, respectively, dramatically increasing the energy density of the battery. The challenge is that these materials are reactive — in the case of aluminum metal anodes, even explosive — and so no practical commercial batteries have yet been developed from them. Meanwhile, another route that the Battery Hub will be pursuing is employing a completely different way of deriving energy from a battery. Instead of using intercalation — sandwiching molecules between each other in the batteries’ electrodes, this method would rely on “extracting energy through creation and destruction of chemical bonds,” as Chamberlain explained it to TPM. This, too, hasn’t yet been achieved on any significantly stable scale. But while those two methods would be the best ways to optimize electric vehicle batteries or device batteries, Argonne is also pursuing the concept of batteries that could link into the power grid and better support the intermittent nature of renewable energy sources such as solar and wind, which aren’t always available per weather conditions. Flow batteries separate the components of a battery cell into separate tanks, making them unattractive options for mobile power sources. Argonne notably did not include a target goal for improving the commonly used lithium-ion battery found in most electronics around the globe, from smartphones to tablets to laptops, because, as Chamberlain explained, there is already much work being done in this space by other capable teams, including other researchers at Argonne, and the Battery Hub wants to develop a more futuristic successor to that technology. “We explicitly left lithium ion out of the proposal, there’s a lot of good work going around on lithium ion right now,” Chamberlain explained. “The innovation channel is already filled with lithium ion projects, and we think many will succeed. What’s missing is the front end, what’s next after lithium ion. That’s what we’ve set up with our objectives.” Aside from the academic and government labs involved, the Battery Hub also includes partners from the private sector: Dow Chemical Company, Applied Materials, Inc, Johnson Controls, Inc., and Clean Energy Trust, each of which has made an agreement to support 20 percent of the cost of the specific projects they’re involved in with the Hub, or “skin in the game,” as Chamberlain put it. Ultimately, Chamberlain said that scientists want the center to not only produce new technologies, but new products, jobs and whole spin-off companies. The Hub even has a whole intellectual property pool designed to deal with the patented technologies that it expects to come out of its work. Still, Chamberlain noted that the center’s $120 million grant over five years is subject to continued appropriations from the Energy Department, and thus Congress, which must renew the budget every year, though the state of Illinois has also committed to some $5 million upfront to build a new headquarters for the center at Argonne’s campus, and another $30 million down the road, all on top the federal funding.

#### Plan trades off

Mark Muro, Brookings INstitute Metropolitan Policy Senior Fellow and Policy Director, 2/16/11, Around the Halls: 'Cut to Invest' at the Department of Energy , [www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2011/02/16-budget-energy-muro](http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2011/02/16-budget-energy-muro)

The Obama administration’s FY 2012 budget is all about arguing--perhaps somewhat rhetorically given political realities--the role of investments in growth despite the imperative for austerity. Such tradeoffs are everywhere in the budget. And yet, in no domain are those twin stances more sharply visible than in the Energy Department (DOE) outline, which proposes a classic “cut-to-invest” strategy to maintain progress on key imperatives when retrenchment appears likely. Overall, the new budget request proposes growing the DOE budget (see a detailed press release and Sec. Chu’s presentation and PowerPoint here and here) by a substantial 12 percent over FY 2010 spending levels, and it would importantly continue the Obama administration’s push to bolster the nation’s inadequate research, development, and deployment investments in clean energy. On this front, R&D accounts would increase by fully one-third (to about $8 billion), driven by a series of robust moves. For example, the outline would increase funding of the DOE’s Office of Science to $5.4 billion, on course to meet the President’s long-term commitment to double the budgets of key research agencies. It would also double the funding of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E), which has already begun to produce disruptive innovations, to $550 million. And in addition, the new budget calls for creating three more Energy Innovation Hubs (focused on batteries, smart grid, and critical materials) for fomenting technological collaboration among universities, the private sector, and government labs to solve big challenges in critical areas at a cost of roughly $66 million. These institutes somewhat reflect a concept developed by the Metro Program in a major 2009 paper, and would bring to six the number of the nation’s portfolio of hubs. Beyond these innovation investments, the administration is looking to increase spending for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs at DOE by nearly $1 billion, or 44 percent, over FY 2010 levels. Likewise, the budget proposes to spend $588 million for advanced vehicle technologies--an increase of 88 percent above current funding levels. This would include an interesting new effort to reward communities that invest in electric vehicles and infrastructure and remove regulatory barriers through a $200 million grant program, modeled after the Education Department’s successful Race to the Top program. So where will the money come from for these new efforts? It comes from the “cut” part of the “cut-to-invest” playbook, which seeks to finance needed new investments by slashing lower-priority or retrograde current spending. (The budget’s cuts are detailed here). Along these lines, the 2012 budget would raise more than $4 billion a year by slashing the budget of the DOE’s Office of Fossil Energy and cutting billions of dollars’ worth of questionable subsidies of fossil fuels. Some $418 million would come from reducing the fossil fuel office’s budget by 45 percent. Meanwhile, some $3.6 billion would result from phasing out illogical credits and deductions for various oil, gas, and coal activities in accordance with President Obama’s agreement at the G-20 Summit in Pittsburgh to phase out subsidies for fossil fuels so that the country can transition to a 21st century energy economy. The net effect: By cutting hundreds of millions of dollars of provisions that in effect subsidize dirty energy the nation will be able to discipline the growth of the Energy Department budget while paying for significant new investments to make clean energy cheap. In that sense, the 2012 DOE budget proposal stands out as an indicator of where energy department budget policy needs to go in the absence of new revenue from a comprehensive carbon pricing system. Without said revenue, whether from a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade system, the costs of essential investments will need to be “internalized” on the energy sector. And that will require reform of DOE and the subsidy system.

#### Key to survival

Farhad Manjoo, 6/21/11, Better Batteries Will Save the World, www.slate.com/articles/technology/technology/2011/06/better\_batteries\_will\_save\_the\_world.single.html

This is how it goes in the battery business. As Seth Fletcher, a senior editor at Popular Science, recounts in his engaging new book Bottled Lightning: Superbatteries, Electric Cars, and the New Lithium Economy, scientists have been trying to build a better battery since before the days of Thomas Edison (who was a major battery tinkerer himself). (Disclosure: Fletcher and I share the same literary agent.) If we had batteries that matched the price and performance of fossil fuels, we would not only have cleaner cars, but we might be able to remake much of the rest of the nation's energy infrastructure, too. Wind and solar power are generated intermittently—sometimes the wind doesn't blow and the sun doesn't shine—and batteries can moderate that volatility. Stores of batteries placed in the electric grid could collect energy when the sun shines or when the wind blows and then discharge it when we need it. Not to put too fine a point on it, but you might say that the future of the world depends on better batteries—a better battery would alter geopolitics, mitigate the disasters of climate change, and spur a new economic boom.
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The Fifty States should substantially increase its high-temperature nitrogen cooled reactor energy production funding through public-private partnerships in the United States.

#### Solves the aff

BEES ‘8

(Board of Energy and Environmental Systems, National Academies Press, Review of DOE's Nuclear Energy Research and Development Program, <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=11998&page=35>)

The NGNP program is authorized under EPAct05at total funding of $1.25 billion for Phase I, which extends to 2011. During this phase, fundamental R&D would be carried out for the associated technologies and components. This includes the reactor and its fuel, the energy conversion system, materials, and hydrogen generation technologies. In addition, certain fundamental decisions are to be made, including selection of the mission of the NGNP (efficient electricity production, process heat, hydrogen generation, or a combination of these) and the specific hydrogen generation technology. EPAct05 also discusses Phase II, which extends from 2012 to 2021 and wherein a detailed design should be competitively developed, a license should be obtained from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC), and the plant should be constructed and commissioned. According to EPAct05, the program will be based on the R&D activities of the Generation IV program, the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) will be the lead national laboratory, and the NGNP demonstration will be sited at INL. INL is charged to organize a consortium of industrial partners to cost-share the project. The NGNP project is to maximize technical exchange and transfer from other relevant sources, including other industries and international Generation IV partners. The overall program has been estimated to cost approximately $2.3 billion, which means that **significant cost share** (roughly 50 percent) will be needed from collaborative private sector partners, in the form of **actual funding** or work in kind and transfer of already developed intellectual property. INL has formed program plans for the basic NGNP program, and a complementary private sector initiative has been started to form a public/private partnership for bringing end users, industrial suppliers, technology developers, and national laboratories together with DOE for the development and demonstration of NGNP on a commercial scale. Potential end users might include the petroleum industry, industrial gas producers, the transportation industry, the coal industry and their associates who are interested in gasification and liquefaction applications, and traditional electric power companies. The potential end users represent the broad range of applications for high-temperature process heat; some of them will also need economic bulk hydrogen in the future. This partnership is being formed to show Congress that there is genuine interest in this technology for the intended purposes and to attract the needed cost-share funding to **accomplish the goals of the program without asking for more public sector funding**, which might be difficult to obtain. This approach is consistent with the R&D model recommended by Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and INL, which proposed substantial industry contributions for nearer-term R&D, with the government maintaining primary but not sole responsibility for funding longer-term R&D (Modeen, 2006).

## algae

No HTGR commercialization - we control empirics

Thomas 11

Steve Thomas, professor of energy studies at the University of Greenwich, in London, Energy Policy, January 26, 2011, "The Pebble Bed Modular Reactor: An obituary", http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0301421511000826/1-s2.0-S0301421511000826-main.pdf?\_tid=7151dbfd244423b0a3fe0758968e5d30&acdnat=1345472561\_21893edaacae6a996d944ea9aab1086d

1.2. History of the HTGR Up to 1990, four major nuclear design countries had had major programmes to commercialize HTGR technology: Germany, USA, UK and France. All of these programmes came to nothing. Subsequently Japan, China and Russia, as well as South Africa, have shown an interest in the HTGR. It was the German technology that was taken up by South Africa and China. 1.2.1. Germany Germany has a long history of HTGR development using Pebble Bed technology. In 1959, Germany ordered the AVR plant (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Versuchsreaktor) built at the Julich govern- ¨ ment nuclear research centre. This 15 MW (e) plant, ﬁnanced by the government, was supplied by a group led by the Brown Boveri and Krupp companies. It went critical in 1966, generating electricity a year later and continuing in service until 1989. It was based on the pebble bed concept under which the fuel and graphite moderator are in the form of tennis-ball size ‘pebbles’. These are continuously fed into the top of the reactor column and are continuously removed from the bottom. A pebble is expected to be used up to ten times before it would be too depleted to use. The design and dimensions of the fuel pebbles were the essentially the same for all successor Pebble Bed designs. AVR had a good reputation as a prototype, although, as argued later, this reputation is now in question. Its successor, THTR-300 (300 MW (e)) also used the pebble bed concept and was ordered in 1970. This too was subsidised by the government but also involved utility funding. The industrial grouping behind it, HRB, again centred on Brown Boveri but with support from General Atomic a US company that had built high temperature reactors but not of the Pebble Bed design in the USA. Subsequently, Siemens produced a modular design of HTGR using the pebble bed concept, but none were built. THTR-300 went critical in September 1983, but was only connected to the grid in November 1985 and was declared commercial 6 in June 1987. From June until October of that year, it operated at about two-thirds full-power, suffering a range of problems including difﬁculties with the fuel circulation system. It restarted in January 1988 for a couple of months, running at about two-thirds of its full power rating, until more repairs were necessary to the fuel circulation and collection system. It ran for another ﬁve months but was shut down due to damage in the gas ducts. Repairs were completed in February 1989. However, the plant remained closed on the orders of the safety regulator because of concerns about safety and the unwillingness of the various owners of the plant, including the federal government, to continue to provide subsidies to operate the plant. 7 THTR-300 suffered from a substantial number of other technical problems, some of which were speciﬁc to the pebble bed design (e.g. 18,000 damaged fuel pebbles, graphite dust formation, thermal insulation failure in the core bottom by overheating). In September 1989, the plant was permanently closed and, since 1997, has been in a state of ‘safe enclosure’, at least until 2027. Decommissioning is intended to be ﬁnished by 2080. 8 Siemens and ABB (the successor company to Brown Boveri after it merged with ASEA) pooled their expertise on HTGRs in 1988 at the instigation of the German government to form a new company called HTR GmbH, which developed the 200 MW (th) HTR-Modul reactor which was expected to produce about 80 MW (e). With little realistic prospect of sales in Europe, their strategy appears to have been to license the technology to countries such as the then Soviet Union, China, Japan and South Africa. 1.2.2. USA US development of HTGRs has been based on designs in which the fuel is prismatic, rather than in the form of pebbles. The USA was the ﬁrst country to generate electricity using an HTGR power plant, Peach Bottom 1, completed in 1967, which produced about 40 MW of electricity and operated until 1974. By the time it was complete, a demonstration plant had already been ordered, Fort St. Vrain, which produced 330 MW of power and went critical in 1974. Again the next phase got ahead of completion of the previous phase and orders for eight full-size plants of the HTGR design, for the ﬁrst time without any government subsidy, were placed from 1971 to 1974. Four of these were for units of 770 MW and four for units of 1160 MW, but little progress on these plants was made and all were cancelled in 1974–1975. General Atomic, the vendor, withdrew the design from the market because the orders would not have been proﬁtable and it had to compensate the customers. For example, General Atomic agreed to pay Delmarva Power & Light US$125 million to terminate contracts for the construction of two 770 MW reactors. 9 Experience with Fort St. Vrain was poor. Although it went critical in 1974, it did not produce power till 1976 and was not declared commercial until 1979. Over its ten years of commercial service till 1989, its average load factor (power produced as a percentage of theoretical output had the plant operated uninterrupted at full power) was 15 per cent, almost the lowest lifetime load factor ever achieved by a commercial nuclear power plant. 10 It was then retired, the site decommissioned and the plant replaced by a conventional gas-ﬁred generation plant. Work continues on the HTGR in the USA, for example, through part of the US government’s Generation IV research effort, the Next Generation Nuclear Plant (NGNP) programme, 11 which, optimistically, has an objective to have a prototype plant in operation by 2021. The main US private company throughout most of this period has been, and continues to be, General Atomic. In May 2010, Westinghouse, one of the partners in PBMR Ltd., which had won contracts under the NGNP programme, withdrew from the programme. 1.2.3. UK The UK was a pioneer of gas-cooled nuclear technology using graphite as moderator, but carbon dioxide gas as the coolant. This technology was used in the 11 commercial ‘Magnox’ power plants 12 and the seven commercial Advanced Gas-cooled Reactor power plants. Carbon dioxide is cheaper than helium but is not as efﬁcient and is corrosive. A working reactor using helium as coolant, the Dragon HTGR research reactor, was ordered in 1957, completed in 1964, and operated until 1974. It produced 20 MW of heat but did not have an electricity generation circuit. However, since 1964, HTGRs have not been the subject of serious consideration for orders in Britain. 1.2.4. France France’s initial commercial orders were also for carbon dioxide cooled, graphite moderated reactors. Five commercial-size units were built, with the expectation that helium would replace carbon dioxide in future orders. However, in 1968 American PWR technology was chosen to replace the existing designs as a result of strong pressure from the utility, and HTGR technology has not been seriously considered as an option for commercial orders since then. 1.2.5. Japan HTGR development of Japanese design has been underway at a slow pace since about 1990. A prototype reactor (HTTR) producing 30 MW thermal power but no electricity was completed in 1998, three years later than scheduled. There are no speciﬁc plans to build further HTGRs. 1.2.6. China In 1989, China signed a licensing deal with HTR GmbH to develop HTGRs in China using the pebble bed design and links with South Africa have been forged (see below). While there are plans to build a demonstration plant based on the PBMR design, these have continually slipped. In 2005, it was expected that a demonstration plant would be in service by 2010 13 but by 2009, the expected completion date was 2013. 14 Breeder reactors now seem the priority for reactor design development. 15 An experimental reactor, HTR-10 (10 MW of heat), based on the HTRModul concept, has been in operation since 2003.

Regulatory and tech barriers

Chapin et al 04

Doug Chapin, Scott Kiffer, Jim Nestell, MPR Associates, Inc, Engineering firm, June 2004, " The Very High Temperature Reactor: A Technical Summary", http://www.mpr.com/uploads/news/very-high-temperature-reactor.pdf

3.5 MODELING, ANALYSIS, AND LICENSING ISSUES The VHTR also requires significant effort to resolve the licensing issues necessary to demonstrate safe and reliable commercial operation. The licensing of advanced nuclear reactors does not have the benefit of thousands of reactor-years operating experience, which existing LWRs have. This creates an immense burden to demonstrate safety and reliability through testing and analysis. As mentioned elsewhere, the VHTR will require development of analytical models and computer codes. These will include models and codes for fuel failure, fission product release, material behavior, and overall reactor system operation. In order to support licensing, these models and codes will require significant amounts of testing for verification and validation, in order to compensate for the lack of operational experience.

Nuclear’s too expensive

Folbre, professor of economics – University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 3/26/’12

(Nancy, “The Nurture of Nuclear Power,” <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/the-nurture-of-nuclear-power/>)

Remember the brouhaha about $563 million in Obama administration loan guarantees to Solyndra, the solar panel manufacturer that went belly up last fall? Neither President Obama nor Republicans in Congress have voiced opposition to an expected $8.3 billion Energy Department guarantee to help the Southern Company, a utility giant, build nuclear reactors in Georgia. Pressed to respond to the comparison, Representative Cliff Stearns, Republican of Florida and chairman of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee on oversight and investigations, explained that the loan guarantee for nuclear power plant construction was for a “proven industry that has been successful and has established a record.” The nuclear power industry has certainly established a record – for terrifying accidents. Most recently, the Fukushima Daiichi disaster in Japan led to the evacuation of 90,000 residents who have yet to return home and to the resignation of the prime minister. It prompted the German government to begin phasing out all nuclear generation of electricity by 2022. Yet the industry has proved remarkably successful at garnering public support in the United States, ranging from public insurance against accident liability to loan guarantees. An article last year in The Wall Street Journal observed that subsidies per kilowatt hour during its initial stages of development far exceeded those provided to solar and wind energy technologies. According to a detailed report published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, subsidies to the nuclear fuel cycle have often exceeded the value of the power produced. Buying power on the open market and giving it away for free would have been less costly. Heightened concerns about safety have driven recent cost estimates even higher, scaring off most private investors. Travis Hoium, an analyst who has written extensively about the industry on the investment Web site The Motley Fool, calls nuclear power a dying business. In an article, “Warren Buffett Wants a Subsidy From You,” he clearly explains recent efforts to shift risk from investors to ratepayers by allowing utilities to charge for construction in advance. Investor interest in nuclear-generated electricity has declined partly as a result of the boom in shale gas extraction. But energy sources that don’t increase carbon emissions are also playing a major role, with wind, hydropower and other renewables projected to provide about 30 percent of expected additions to power generation capacity in the United States between 2010 and 2035.

#### Sequestration inevitable

Clark Murdock, CSIS defense and national security group senior adviser, May 2012, Planning for a Deep Defense: Drawdown—Part I, http://csis.org/files/publication/120522\_DD\_Interim\_Report.pdf

Although some are still in denial about the imposition of the bipartisan BCA cuts,28 the post- 9/11 drawdown will both be deeper and steeper than DoD (and its supporters) clearly hope. As discussed in Appendix B, the sequester cuts alone would reduce the defense budget by another 9 percent. Although gaming the post-November 2012 "Taxmageddon" scenario -- the end of CY2012 brings an end to the Bush tax cuts and the Obama payroll tax cut, in addition to triggering the budget deficit reduction sequester mechanism -- has become a cottage industry in Washington, the likelihood that DoD will escape further reductions seems quite small. Preventing the imposition of sequester or, more likely, lifting the sequester once it's triggered will require a "grand bargain" deal on deficit reduction that consists of entitlement cuts and tax increases (sometimes called revenue enhancements). The defense budget, which constitutes 54 percent of discretionary spending, will be part of the solution, given Democratic aversion to entitlement cuts and Republican antipathy to tax increases. Optimistic (from DoD's perspective) scenarios are for a total drawdown of $800-900B, which would be a 15-17 percent cut from the FY 2012 FYDP. Pessimistic (again from DoD's perspective) estimates run from a $1.5T decrease (28 percent) and above. This author's best guess -- $1.2-1.5T (23-28 percent) depending on how Republicans and Democrats fare in the presidential and congressional races. If President Obama wins re-election, the Democrats retain control of the Senate, and the GOP loses strength in the House, DoD is likely to take a bigger hit ($1.5T). If Republicans take the presidency and control both houses of Congress, they might prefer to exempt DoD altogether from the contraction in government spending (see footnote 28 and statements by candidate Mitt Romney), but Democratic strength in Senate (and their likely ability to prevent cloture by denying the GOP 60-vote margins) will, in the author’s view, keep DoD at the drawdown table.

#### Collapses hegemony—swamps the aff links

O'Hanlon 12

Michael O'Hanlon, director of research on foreign policy – Brookings, 2/24/12, The specter of sequestration, globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/02/24/the-specter-of-sequestration/

This budget can cannot be kicked down the road. The two of us disagree about the advisability of the first round of budget cuts, as reflected in the new Obama budget. But there is widespread agreement among defense analysts that **sequestration would be a nightmare**. The implications of yet another round of 10 percent reductions in the military - coming on top of the 10 percent reductions resulting from the August stipulations of the Budget Control Act, yet another 8 to 10 percent that former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates had put in place during the first two years of the Obama administration, and another 20 percent resulting from the gradual winding down of the nation’s wars - would be **enormous and dangerous.**

Simply put, the cuts already baked into the cake and the sequestration that will happen without specific action to reverse it will make it nigh on impossible for the administration to maintain what it rightly considers irreducible strategic requirements for simultaneous military presence, crisis response and warfighting capability in both the Western Pacific/East Asia region as well as the broader Persian Gulf and Middle East.

#### Airpower fails

Clodfelter 6 (Mark, professor of military history at the National War College, “The limits of air power: the American bombing of North Vietnam”, Google Books, Page xi)

Unfortunately, precision bombing may not be the answer. Despite being several technological generations ahead of the capability displayed in Vietnam, smart munitions still do not guarantee zero collateral damage. Many of the precision air attacks against insurgent leaders have produced claims by insurgents—as well as by Iraqis who do not support the insurgency—that Iraqi civilians have been killed in the raids. Whether true or not, such accusations grab headlines in the Islamic press and on Al Jazeera, providing the perception among many in the Muslim world that such attacks display a callous disregard for Muslim civilian lives. In the type of war that America now faces, those perceptions have become reality to many opposing the United States**. In such conflicts, even with such advantages as Predator drones and Hellfire missiles, the long-term harm of applying lethal air power is likely to eclipse its short-term benefit**. As long as negative political goals remain substantial, the limits of air power displayed in Vietnam will continue to restrict its utility in the twenty-first century.

No money means no new modernization

Murdoch 12, senior advisor, Sayler, and Crotty, research associates – CSIS, 10/18/’12

(Clark, Kelley, and Ryan, “The Defense Budget’s Double Whammy: Drawing Down While Hollowing Out from Within,” <http://csis.org/files/publication/121018_Murdoch_DefenseBudget_Commentary.pdf>)

Thus, this drawdown will be **much more serious** than those of years past. Why? Because the aggregate impact of inflation in the cost of personnel, health care, operations and maintenance (O&M), and acquisitions results in a defense dollar that “buys” less and less capability.

This internal cost inflation is driving DoD toward a **zero-sum trade-off between personnel end-strength and modernization** (see Figure 2).

Among the largest contributors to internal cost inflation is the military personnel (including health care) account. As DoD’s own “Defense Budget Priorities and Choices: January 2012” has noted, “the cost of military personnel has grown at an unsustainable rate over the last decade…Within the base budget alone…personnel costs increased by nearly 90 percent or about 30 percent above inflation [since 2001], while the number of military personnel has increased by only about 3 percent.”

Operations and maintenance (O&M) costs have similarly ballooned over the past few decades. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reports in “Long-Term Implications of the 2012 Future Years Defense Program” that O&M costs per active-duty service member doubled from $55,000 to $105,000 (in constant 2012 dollars) between 1980 and 2001. These costs rose to $147,000 in DoD’s 2012 base-budget request and were projected to “grow at more than one and one-half times the historical (pre-2001) rate through the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) period, reaching $161,000 in 2016.” While the rate of growth is expected to slow beyond 2016, CBO expects per capita O&M costs to reach $209,000 by 2030.

In combination, **inflation in these accounts will squeeze out** all funding **for** modernization (**procurement** and **research**, **development, test, and evaluation** [RDT&E]) in 2020, as depicted in Figure 2, if current trends are allowed to continue. This will, in the absence of extensive reform, force DoD to choose between sustaining end-strength and sustaining modernization. It cannot do both.

The Zero-Sum Trade-Off

The CSIS study team calculates that restoring modernization’s share of the FY2021 defense budget to 32 percent (the level of effort in the FY2001 budget) would require cutting end-strength by 455,000 active-duty service members, leaving the services with an end-strength of 845,000 (see Figure 3). This zero-sum trade-off will produce far more severe and disruptive consequences than is generally recognized by the department, requiring, at the very least, a wholesale recalibration of U.S. defense strategy and force posture.

The Squeeze on Discretionary Spending

This choice between modernization and end-strength will almost certainly remain even if sequestration is averted by congressional action. This is because discretionary spending tradespace (for both defense and nondefense accounts) is being squeezed out by mandatory spending—which includes spending on veteran benefits, income security, social security, Medicare, and Medicaid—and interest payments. And given Democratic aversion to entitlement cuts and Republican antipathy to tax increases, the defense budget, which constitutes 54 percent of discretionary spending, will likely be forced to absorb additional reductions under any scenario. (Estimates of the scale of alternatives to sequestration range from a total of $1 trillion to $1.5 trillion. Senate Armed Services Committee chairman Carl Levin has suggested that an additional $100 billion reduction over 10 years would be “realistic”.)

Regardless of the distribution of any cuts, however, mandatory spending and interest payments are expected to consume the entirety of the U.S. budget by 2036, leaving no discretionary tradespace for either defense or nondefense accounts (see Figure 4).

Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### 6 degree warming inevitable

**AP 9** (Associated Press, Six Degree Temperature Rise by 2100 is Inevitable: UNEP, September 24, <http://www.speedy-fit.co.uk/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=168>)

Earth's temperature is likely to jump six degrees between now and the end of the century even if every country cuts greenhouse gas emissions as proposed, according to a United Nations update. Scientists looked at emission plans from 192 nations and calculated what would happen to global warming. The projections take into account 80 percent emission cuts from the U.S. and Europe by 2050, which are not sure things. The U.S. figure is based on a bill that passed the House of Representatives but is running into resistance in the Senate, where debate has been delayed by health care reform efforts. Carbon dioxide, mostly from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, is the main cause of global warming, trapping the sun's energy in the atmosphere. The world's average temperature has already risen 1.4 degrees since the 19th century. Much of projected rise in temperature is because of developing nations, which aren't talking much about cutting their emissions, scientists said at a United Nations press conference Thursday. China alone adds nearly 2 degrees to the projections. "We are headed toward very serious changes in our planet," said Achim Steiner, head of the U.N.'s environment program, which issued the update on Thursday. The review looked at some 400 peer-reviewed papers on climate over the last three years. Even if the developed world cuts its emissions by 80 percent and the developing world cuts theirs in half by 2050, as some experts propose, the world is still facing a 3-degree increase by the end of the century, said Robert Corell, a prominent U.S. climate scientist who helped oversee the update. Corell said the most likely agreement out of the international climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December still translates into a nearly 5-degree increase in world temperature by the end of the century. European leaders and the Obama White House have set a goal to limit warming to just a couple degrees. The U.N.'s environment program unveiled the update on peer-reviewed climate change science to tell diplomats how hot the planet is getting. The last big report from the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out more than two years ago and is based on science that is at least three to four years old, Steiner said. Global warming is speeding up, especially in the Arctic, and that means that some top-level science projections from 2007 are already out of date and overly optimistic. Corell, who headed an assessment of warming in the Arctic, said global warming "is accelerating in ways that we are not anticipating." Because Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets are melting far faster than thought, it looks like the seas will rise twice as fast as projected just three years ago, Corell said. He said seas should rise about a foot every 20 to 25 years.

**No extinction**

Easterbrook 3(Gregg, senior fellow at the New Republic, “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.

#### Algae global phosphate supply

OECD, 12

(“Green Growth and the Future of Aviation,” 1/23, http://www.oecd.org/sd-roundtable/papersandpublications/49482790.pdf)

Third, algae is presently extremely expensive – as of 2006, costs were estimated at over USD 1 000 per barrel (Sheehan, 2011). Reducing costs to any reasonable levels require a series of technological breakthroughs, including extremely high rates of reproduction and simple oil extraction. 85. Finally, it should be noted that **increased biofuel production could also lead to large increases in use** of nitrogen and **phosphorus — even algae need large quantities of nitrogen.** Nitrogen is a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and water pollution, and **there are concerns that phosphorus supplies are limited and so should be husbanded for food production.**

#### Turns food – try or die

Thompson, 12/17

(12/17/12, Columnist-Ecos Magazine, “Peak phosphorus and what we can do about it,” http://www.ecosmagazine.com/view/journals/ECOS\_Print\_Fulltext.cfm?f=EC12505)

‘A world without phosphorus is like a world without oxygen, or carbon, or water – **life wouldn’t exist as we know it.’** Cordell and her team at the Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF), who won a 2012 Eureka Prize for their research, began looking into the global phosphorus situation back in 2005. One of their key pieces of work was an analysis to determine when, in a similar way to oil, the production of mined phosphate rock would peak. Earlier estimates have indicated a phosphorus production peak sometime around 2033, but Cordell points out that new estimates of global phosphate reserves by industry mean that researchers need to continually update the ‘peak phosphorus’ horizon. ‘While those new studies indicate that there might potentially (but not conclusively) be more phosphate rock than previously thought in the ground, all that does is shift the peak phosphorus timeline by a few decades. It **doesn’t change the underlying problem** and doesn’t change the likelihood of peak phosphorus before the turn of the century, which is of great concern when you’re trying to feed 9 billion people,’ says Cordell. Phosphorus is an element found in the earth’s crust and in all living things. It’s essential to plant growth and basic human functions – it’s in our cell walls and helps transport energy to the brain. Without it, animals can’t be fed, food can’t be produced and **life on earth cannot survive**.

## fertilizer

Food shortage doesn’t cause war – best studies

Allouche 11, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

#### No food scarcity

**Jalsevac 4** (Paul, Life site news a division of Interim Publishing, “The Inherent Racism of Population Control”, <http://www.lifesite.net/waronfamily/Population_Control/Inherentracism.pdf>)

The pattern continues today. Economist Dennis Avery explained in 1995 that, food production was more than keeping pace with population growth since the world had, “more than doubled world food output in the past 30 years. We have raised food supplies per person by 25 percent in the populous Third World.”4 The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO) also dispelled fears of shortages in the food supply when, in preparation for the World Food Summit in Rome in November of 1995 it reported that, “Globally food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years…at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand.”5 The UNFAO also later estimated that, simply with the present available technologies fully employed, the world could feed 30 to 35 billion people, i.e. roughly six times the present world population.6 It also reported that the number of people considered malnourished has declined from 36 percent in 1961-1970 to 20 percent in 1988-90 and later proclaimed that “earlier fears of chronic food shortages over much of the world proved unfounded.”7 The World Bank joined in to predict in 1993 that the improvement in the world food supply would continue, while pointing out that in developing countries grain production has grown at a faster rate than population since 1985. Grain production has slowed in the United States, but that is because stocks have grown so large that additional production could not be stored.8 A further wealth of evidence is available to remove any concerns about resource shortage in the modern world.

No risk of protectionism

Kim 13

Soo Yeon Kim, of the National University of Singapore, associate professor of music at Nazareth College of Rochester, New York, Fellow of the Transatlantic Academy, based at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, The Monkey Cage, January 30, 2013, " Protectionism During Recessions: Is This Time Different?", http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2013/01/30/protectionism-during-recessions-is-this-time-different/

The Great Recession of 2008: Who Resisted Protectionism?

There is widespread agreement regarding the critical role of international institutions as “firewalls” against protectionism during this recession. Economic and non-economic international institutions have served as conveyors of information and mechanisms of commitment and socialization. Their informational function enhances the transparency and accountability of states’ trade policies, and they mitigate uncertainty when it is running high. Specialized international institutions devoted to trade, such as the WTO and preferential trade agreements (PTAs), also lock in commitments to liberal trade through legal obligations that make defections costly, thus creating accountability in the actions of its members. Equally important, international institutions are also arenas of socialization that help propagate important norms such as the commitment to the liberal trading system and cooperative economic behavior. In this connection, the degree to which a particular country was embedded in the global network of economic and non-economic international institutions has been found to be strongly correlated with fewer instances of protectionist trade measures.

Information provided to date by international institutions, with the exception of the GTA project, largely agree that states have not resorted to large-scale protectionism during this recession, in spite of the fact that the “great trade collapse” at the beginning of the current crisis was steeper and more sudden than that of its Great Depression predecessor. The WTO Secretariat, in addition to its regular individual reports on members’ trade policies under the Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM), has issued more than a dozen reports on member states’ trade policies during the crisis. At the request of the G-20 countries, which pledged not to adopt protectionist trade measures at the onset of the crisis in 2008, the WTO, the OECD, and UNCTAD have produced joint reports on the trade and investment measures of the world’s largest trading states. They, too, find that G-20 countries had largely adhered to their commitment not to raise trade and investment barriers. In the World Bank’s Temporary Trade Barriers (TTB) project, an important and unique data collection that includes information on pre-crisis and crisis trade policy behavior, Bown finds that temporary trade barriers such as safeguards, countervailing and antidumping duties saw only a slight increase of usage by developed countries, in the neighborhood of 4%. In contrast, emerging market economies were the heavy users of TTBs, whose usage rose by almost 40% between 2008 and 2009.

As scholarly insights accumulate on the current recession and its impact on protectionism (or lack thereof), two questions emerge for further research.  First, to what extent have governments employed policy substitutes that have the same effect as trade protectionism? International institutions may appear to have been successful in preventing protectionism, but governments may well have looked elsewhere to defend national economies. This question can be seen in the broader context of the “open economy trilemma,” in which governments may achieve only two of three macroeconomic policy objectives: stable exchange rates, stable prices, and open trade. Irwin argues that governments that abandoned the gold standard during the Great Depression were less protectionist, and their economies also suffered less from the recession. Existing scholarship also indicates that governments are likely to employ policy substitutes, opting for monetary autonomy when facing trade policy constraints, for example, due to membership in a preferential trade agreement.  Moreover, at the time of writing, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has announced that it has dropped its objections to capital controls, albeit cautiously and only under certain conditions, thus potentially providing another policy alternative for governments to achieve economic stability during this crisis. Future research may further extend the application to policy substitutes that are deployed during economic downturns.

Finally, why did firms not push for more protection? Protectionist policies are not adopted by governments in a political vacuum. In order to adopt trade defense measures such as anti-dumping duties, governments first conduct investigations to assess the extent of injury. Such investigations are initiated when firms apply for them through the domestic political process. If indeed governments did not appeal extensively or unusually to protectionist trade policies, the explanation to a significant degree lies in firm behavior. A distinguished body of research exists in this area that is due for a revisit in the age of extensive international supply chains, from Schattschneider’s classic examination of the domestic pressures that led to the Smoot-Hawley Act to Helen Milner’s study of export-dependent firms that resisted protectionism during the crisis of the 1920s and the 1970s. Milner rightly pointed out that “firms are central,” and over the years the export-dependent, multinational firm has evolved in tandem with the increasing complexity of the international supply chain. Today’s firm is not only heavily export-dependent but equally import-dependent in its reliance on intermediate inputs, whether through intra-firm trade or from foreign firms. The extensive international supply chain thus often puts exporting and importing firms on the same side of the political debate, especially when they are members of large multinational firms. Moreover, the study of firm-level behavior must extend beyond the developed world to consider firms in emerging market economies, which have been the heavy users of trade defense measures during the current recession. How the internationalization of production, driven by investment and trade in intermediate goods, restrained multinational firms from pushing for more protection remains an important question for further research.

#### No impact to failed states – star this card!

Patrick, senior fellow, director – program on international institutions and global governance @ CFR, 4/15/’11

(Stewart M, “Why Failed States Shouldn’t Be Our Biggest National Security Fear,” <http://www.cfr.org/international-peace-and-security/why-failed-states-shouldnt-our-biggest-national-security-fear/p24689>)

In truth, while failed states may be worthy of America's attention on humanitarian and development grounds, most of them are irrelevant to U.S. national security. The risks they pose are mainly to their own inhabitants. Sweeping claims to the contrary are not only inaccurate but distracting and unhelpful, providing little guidance to policymakers seeking to prioritize scarce attention and resources.

In 2008, I collaborated with Brookings Institution senior fellow Susan E. Rice, now President Obama's permanent representative to the United Nations, on an index of state weakness in developing countries. The study ranked all 141 developing nations on 20 indicators of state strength, such as the government's ability to provide basic services. More recently, I've examined whether these rankings reveal anything about each nation's role in major global threats: transnational terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international crime and infectious disease.

The findings are startlingly clear. Only a handful of the world's failed states pose security concerns to the United States. Far greater dangers emerge from stronger developing countries that may suffer from corruption and lack of government accountability but come nowhere near qualifying as failed states.

The link between failed states and transnational terrorism, for instance, is tenuous. Al-Qaeda franchises are concentrated in South Asia, North Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia but are markedly absent in most failed states, including in sub-Saharan Africa. Why? From a terrorist's perspective, the notion of finding haven in a failed state is an oxymoron. Al-Qaeda discovered this in the 1990s when seeking a foothold in anarchic Somalia. In intercepted cables, operatives bemoaned the insuperable difficulties of working under chaos, given their need for security and for access to the global financial and communications infrastructure. Al-Qaeda has generally found it easier to maneuver in corrupt but functional states, such as Kenya, where sovereignty provides some protection from outside interdiction.

Pakistan and Yemen became sanctuaries for terrorism not only because they are weak but because their governments lack the will to launch sustained counterterrorism operations against militants whom they value for other purposes. Terrorists also need support from local power brokers and populations. Along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, al-Qaeda finds succor in the Pashtun code of pashtunwali, which requires hospitality to strangers, and in the severe brand of Sunni Islam practiced locally. Likewise in Yemen, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula has found sympathetic tribal hosts who have long welcomed mujaheddin back from jihadist struggles.

Al-Qaeda has met less success in northern Africa's Sahel region, where a moderate, Sufi version of Islam dominates. But as the organization evolves from a centrally directed network to a diffuse movement with autonomous cells in dozens of countries, it is as likely to find haven in the banlieues of Paris or high-rises of Minneapolis as in remote Pakistani valleys.

What about failed states and weapons of mass destruction? Many U.S. analysts worry that poorly governed countries will pursue nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological weapons; be unable to control existing weapons; or decide to share WMD materials.

These fears are misplaced. With two notable exceptions — North Korea and Pakistan — the world's weakest states pose minimal proliferation risks, since they have limited stocks of fissile or other WMD material and are unlikely to pursue them. Far more threatening are capable countries (say, Iran and Syria) intent on pursuing WMD, corrupt nations (such as Russia) that possess loosely secured nuclear arsenals and poorly policed nations (try Georgia) through which proliferators can smuggle illicit materials or weapons.

When it comes to crime, the story is more complex. Failed states do dominate production of some narcotics: Afghanistan cultivates the lion's share of global opium, and war-torn Colombia rules coca production. The tiny African failed state of Guinea-Bissau has become a transshipment point for cocaine bound for Europe. (At one point, the contraband transiting through the country each month was equal to the nation's gross domestic product.) And Somalia, of course, has seen an explosion of maritime piracy. Yet failed states have little or no connection with other categories of transnational crime, from human trafficking to money laundering, intellectual property theft, cyber-crime or counterfeiting of manufactured goods.

Criminal networks typically prefer operating in functional countries that provide baseline political order as well as opportunities to corrupt authorities. They also accept higher risks to work in nations straddling major commercial routes. Thus narco-trafficking has exploded in Mexico, which has far stronger institutions than many developing nations but borders the United States. South Africa presents its own advantages. It is a country where “the first and the developing worlds exist side by side,” author Misha Glenny writes. “The first world provides good roads, 728 airports . . . the largest cargo port in Africa, and an efficient banking system. . . . The developing world accounts for the low tax revenue, overstretched social services, high levels of corruption throughout the administration, and 7,600 kilometers of land and sea borders that have more holes than a second-hand dartboard.” Weak and failing African states, such as Niger, simply cannot compete.

Nor do failed states pose the greatest threats of pandemic disease. Over the past decade, outbreaks of SARS, avian influenza and swine flu have raised the specter that fast-moving pandemics could kill tens of millions worldwide. Failed states, in this regard, might seem easy incubators of deadly viruses. In fact, recent fast-onset pandemics have bypassed most failed states, which are relatively isolated from the global trade and transportation links needed to spread disease rapidly.

Certainly, the world's weakest states — particularly in sub-Saharan Africa — suffer disproportionately from disease, with infection rates higher than in the rest of the world. But their principal health challenges are endemic diseases with local effects, such as malaria, measles and tuberculosis. While U.S. national security officials and Hollywood screenwriters obsess over the gruesome Ebola and Marburg viruses, outbreaks of these hemorrhagic fevers are rare and self-contained.

I do not counsel complacency. The world's richest nations have a moral obligation to bolster health systems in Africa, as the Obama administration is doing through its Global Health Initiative. And they have a duty to ameliorate the challenges posed by HIV/AIDS, which continues to ravage many of the world's weakest states. But poor performance by developing countries in preventing, detecting and responding to infectious disease is often shaped less by budgetary and infrastructure constraints than by conscious decisions by unaccountable or unresponsive regimes. Such deliberate inaction has occurred not only in the world's weakest states but also in stronger developing countries, even in promising democracies. The list is long. It includes Nigeria's feckless response to a 2003-05 polio epidemic, China's lack of candor about the 2003 SARS outbreak, Indonesia's obstructionist attitude to addressing bird flu in 2008 and South Africa's denial for many years about the causes of HIV/AIDS.

Unfortunately, misperceptions about the dangers of failed states have transformed budgets and bureaucracies. U.S. intelligence agencies are mapping the world's “ungoverned spaces.” The Pentagon has turned its regional Combatant Commands into platforms to head off state failure and address its spillover effects. The new Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review completed by the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development depicts fragile and conflict-riddled states as epicenters of terrorism, proliferation, crime and disease.

Yet such preoccupations reflect more hype than analysis. U.S. national security officials would be better served — and would serve all of us better — if they turned their strategic lens toward stronger developing countries, from which transnational threats are more likely to emanate.

# 2NC

## fertilizer no key

Seriously they don’t solve food prices—tons of things overcome

First, warming

Damian **Carrington 11**, head environment reporter at the Guardian, “Food prices driven up by global warming, study shows”, May 5, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/may/05/food-prices-global-warming>

Global warming has already harmed the world's food production and has driven up food prices by as much as 20% over recent decades, new research has revealed. The drop in the productivity of crop plants around the world was not caused by changes in rainfall but was because higher temperatures can cause dehydration, prevent pollination and lead to slowed photosynthesis. Lester Brown, president of the Earth Policy Institute, Washington DC, said the findings indicate a turning point: "Agriculture as it exists today evolved over 11,000 years of reasonably stable climate, but that climate system is no more." Adaptation is difficult because our knowledge of the future is not strong enough to drive new investments, he said, "so we just keep going, hoping for the best." The scientists say their work shows how crucial it is to find ways to adapt farming to a warmer world, to ensure that rises in global population are matched by rising food production. "It is vital," said Wolfram Schlenker, at Columbia University in New York and one of the research team. "If we continue to have the same seed varieties and temperatures continue to rise, then food prices will rise further. [Addressing] that is the big question." The new research joins a small number of studies in which the fingerprint of climate change has been separated from natural variations in weather and other factors, demonstrating that the effects of warming have already been felt in the world. Scientists have shown that the chance of the severe heatwave that killed thousands in Europe in 2003 was made twice as likely by global warming, while other work showed that the floods that caused £3.5bn of damage in England in 2000 were made two to three times more likely.

And weather

Tim **Schooley 11**, Pittsburgh Business Times, “Oil prices, bad weather send food prices skyward”, May 6, <http://www.bizjournals.com/pittsburgh/print-edition/2011/05/06/oil-prices-weather-food-proces-skyward.html>

Along with fast-rising fuel prices, weather-induced crop shortfalls also are affecting food prices. Those in the food and restaurant industries say they haven’t seen the kind of business challenges they are now since the gas price spike and credit crisis of 2008. “I don’t think the weather instability has ever been as hostile in the last 100 years as it was in the last 12 months,” wrote Jeremy Grantham, chief investment officer of GMO Capital, an investment management firm, in a recent report. “If you were to read a one-paragraph summary of almost any agricultural commodity, you would see weather listed as one of the causes of the price rising.” The U.S. Department of AgriculturebizWatch U.S. Department of Agriculture Latest from The Business Journals Federal aid available for fire-damaged homes, communitiesHare Wynn secures 0M settlement in rice caseTwo DeKalb DFCS workers guilty of fraud Follow this company projects rising prices for a host of food commodities: Beef, up 6 percent to 8 percent; pork, up 7.5 percent. Corn prices have doubled since last year, and wheat prices remain at near record highs.

#### Alt-cause – environment

VOA, 1/17/11

[Voice of America, “World Food Prices Expected to Stay High or Keep Rising,” <http://www.voanews.com/learningenglish/home/agriculture/Economists-Express-Concern-about-World-Food-Prices-113880179.html>]

Economists across the world are expressing concern about rising food prices. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization recently released its Food Price Index. The list showed that a number of foods cost more than during the world food crisis of two thousand eight. The index is at its highest level since it began in nineteen ninety. Demonstrations and deadly food riots have broken out this month, as they did in two thousand eight. The FAO predicts that world market prices for rice, wheat, barley, sugar and meat will stay high or continue rising. One reason for this is the threat of shortages caused by bad weather. Current and recent weather disasters have harmed agriculture and affected prices in several parts of the world. For example, the current flooding in Australia has done great damage to crops in the usually fertile Queensland area. Chickpea, wheat, sorghum and corn are among the crops affected. Floods also have harmed other vegetables and fruits. Local agricultural producers report that standing water could destroy up to half of next year’s sugar crop. And economists say prices for the fruits and vegetables could likely increase over the next six months. The effects on prices from floods last year in Pakistan and China are still being felt. Last week, Russia extended an earlier ban on wheat exports. Russia acted after heat, drought and wildfires destroyed about a third of its wheat crop last summer. The ban was placed to make sure Russians have enough wheat. The first ban caused worldwide wheat prices to climb last year by almost fifty percent.

## resource wars

No resource wars – empirics

Salehyan 7

[Idean, assistant professor of political science - University of North Texas, “The new myth about climate change,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922]

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

## 2NC - Empirics (General No Solve)

Best Case Study - South Africa subsidized the reactor and didn't get a single investor in 12 years

Thomas 11

Steve Thomas, professor of energy studies at the University of Greenwich, in London, Energy Policy, January 26, 2011, "The Pebble Bed Modular Reactor: An obituary", http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0301421511000826/1-s2.0-S0301421511000826-main.pdf?\_tid=7151dbfd244423b0a3fe0758968e5d30&acdnat=1345472561\_21893edaacae6a996d944ea9aab1086d

Like the fast reactor, the High Temperature Gas-cooled Reactor (HTGR), using helium as the coolant and graphite as the moderator, has exerted a peculiar attraction over nuclear engineers. Despite many unsuccessful attempts over half a century to develop it as a commercial power reactor, there is still a strong belief that a highly successful HTGR technology will emerge. Indeed, the Very High Temperature Reactor (VHTR), which would be developed from existing HTGR designs, is one of six reactor designs that was designated in 2001 by ten leading nuclear power nations as one of the six most promising reactor designs to form a fourth generation of nuclear designs (existing designs are designated Generation III or earlier). 1 The most determined recent attempt to commercialize this technology came with South Africa’s programme, started in earnest in 1998, to develop a type of HTGR known as the Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR). The decision in March 2010 by the South African government, foreshadowed a year previously by the Treasury Minister, not to provide further funds seemed to be the death knell for this latest attempt. In June 2010, all bar a skeleton staff to protect intellectual property were offered redundancy. 2 Finally, in September 2010, the South Africa Minister at the Department of Public Enterprises announced to the South African Parliament the abandonment of the programme (Department of Public Enterprises, 2010). By 2010, the programme was running decades late and the costs were many times over the original budget. No customers had been won, no foreign investors were contributing and Eskom, the owner of the company developing the technology (PBMR Ltd.) estimated it would be at least a further 20 years before the technology could be offered as a commercial product (McKune, 2010). The decision to stop public funding relegates the PBMR to the status of one of a long list of reactor technologies that have theoretical attractions but which are still decades away from commercial application. This article reviews this latest attempt to commercialize an HTGR identifying what issues have led to its failure and what lessons can be learnt from this experience.

Fails in the US too

Makhijani 01

Arjun Makhijani, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, IEER, August 9, 2001, "The Pebble Bed Modular Reactor", http://www.ieer.org/comments/energy/chny-pbr.html

The PBMR seems the latest nuclear industry attempt to sell new, improved, "inherently safe" reactors. This is an inherently misleading term. No commercial PBMR has actually been built and operated. A small German pilot reactor operated for 21 years and operated at 70 per capacity factor, according to the promoters of the PBMR (http://www.pbmr.co.za/2\_about\_the\_pbmr/2\_8background\_to\_the\_pbmr.htm). The experience with HTGRs is decidedly mixed. The one large HTGR in the United States, the Fort St. Vrain reactor, had quite a lot of problems and was prematurely shut. PBMRs were proposed in the 1990s as possible reactors to use for waste transmutation. (See Science for Democratic Action vol. 8 no. 3, May 2000, for a description of IEER's transmutation study.)

Their authors are hacks – ignore case after case of failure

Thomas 11

Steve Thomas, professor of energy studies at the University of Greenwich, in London, Energy Policy, January 26, 2011, "The Pebble Bed Modular Reactor: An obituary", http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0301421511000826/1-s2.0-S0301421511000826-main.pdf?\_tid=7151dbfd244423b0a3fe0758968e5d30&acdnat=1345472561\_21893edaacae6a996d944ea9aab1086d

HTGR technology clearly has a powerful attraction to nuclear scientists and engineers because of its intrinsic properties. Any criticism of the technology is met with vitriolic criticism by its proponents. 53 However, the failure of yet another attempt to produce a commercially viable design suggests any further attempts to commercialise HTGRs must be based on a clear understanding of why earlier attempts have failed and with a high level of conﬁdence that the earlier problems have been fully overcome. South Africa was all to credulous to the belief that it had uncovered an ‘uncut diamond’ that just needed polishing and a large world market open up to it. The new democratic South African government was keen to have an opportunity to show how strong South Africa’s technological capability was. Problems with German prototypes and demonstration plants were ignored and the abandonment of the German programme written off as a hysterical reaction to the Chernobyl disaster. Real technical issues, for example, the problem of high temperatures in the fuel, which the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission uncovered very quickly when it began to review the design, were swept under the carpet. Indeed, the South African nuclear safety regulator, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) gave approval in 2003 for the design in principle with no mention whatsoever of the fuel temperature problems. A senior ofﬁcial at the NNR merely stated: ‘‘we see no reason why the reactor would not meet our requirements.’’ 54 The VHTR was portrayed as the most credible and closest to commercial deployment of the Generation IV designs. The failure of the PBMR project and its withdrawal from the US NGNP programme damages the reputation of the VHTR and the time when Generation IV designs can be deployed is likely to have been pushed back signiﬁcantly.

It would take 50 to 100 years to build

**MIT 10**, interdisciplinary study by MIT professors, “The Future of Nuclear Fuel Cycles”, http://web.mit.edu/mitei/docs/spotlights/nuclear-fuel-cycle.pdf

To understand the implications of alternative fuel cycles for the United States, we created a dynamic model of the nuclear energy system through the year 2100 . Dynamic modeling is a method to follow in time the consequences of deployment of alternative fuel cycles for different sets of assumptions. Such comprehensive mathematical models of fuel cycles have only been developed in the last few years. Several alternative futures were examined. p Nuclear growth scenarios. Three nuclear growth scenarios were considered: 1% per year (low), 2.5% per year (medium), and 4% per year (high). Fuel cycle choices partly depend upon nuclear growth rates. At low growth rates continuation of today’s open fuel cycle is the preferred choice. At high growth rates there are incentives for improved utilization of the energy potential of mined uranium and for reduction of the long-term burden of SNF, but technical constraints exist and incentives may change depending upon the available technology and economics. p Fuel cycles. Three fuel cycles were modeled in detail: today’s once-through fuel cycle with LWRs, a partly-closed LWR fuel cycle with recycle of plutonium from LWR SNF back into LWRs and direct disposal of the recycle SNF, and a closed fuel cycle with LWRs and fast reactors. In the closed fuel cycle, LWR SNF is reprocessed and the transuranic elements including plutonium are used to start up fast reactors. The SNF uranium and transuranics from discharged fuel of fast reactors are recycled back to the fast reactors. p Fast reactors. Our analysis of closed fuel cycles included three classes of fast reactors with different goals. In the first scenario the goal was to destroy actinides; thus, the fast reactors had a conversion ratio of 0.75. In the second scenario the goal was a self-sustaining fuel cycle; thus, the fast reactors had a conversion ratio of 1.0. In the third scenario the goal was to rapidly expand the availability of fissile fuel for fast reactors; thus the fast reactors had a conversion ratio of 1.23 with the excess transuranics used to start added fast reactors. Results from the models under the stated assumptions indicate that: p The transition from a system dominated by one fuel cycle to another requires 50 to 100 years. p For medium and high growth scenarios, there were relatively small differences in the total transuranic (plutonium, americium, etc.) inventories between different fuel cycles in this century. – The primary differences were in the locations of those inventories. In a once-through fuel cycle the inventories were in repositories whereas in partly and fully closed fuel cycles the inventories were in reactors and SNF storage facilities. – For scenarios where the goal was burning of long-lived transuranics (conversion ratio of 0.75), only a small fraction of the transuranics will be burnt in this century. p There are relatively small differences between fuel cycles in the total uranium mined within this century for any given nuclear power growth rate. Mined uranium savings would be 25% at most. p For medium and high growth scenarios, fast reactors started on plutonium fuel require construction of many LWRs and deployment of large capacity reprocessing and fuel fabrication facilities throughout the century in order to supply the initial cores.

Empirics only go Neg

Thomas 09

Steve Thomas is professor of energy policy at the University of Greenwich. Previously he was a senior research fellow at the Energy Policy Programme at the Science and Technology Policy Research program at the University of Sussex. He was a member of a panel of experts appointed by the South African government to evaluate the pebble bed modular reactor, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, June 22, 2009, "The demise of the pebble bed modular reactor", http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-demise-of-the-pebble-bed-modular-reactor

All the major countries involved in designing reactors, including the United States, Germany, France, Japan, and Britain, have put serious time and effort into developing high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors such as the PBMR. Despite more than 50 years of trying, however, no commercial-scale design has been produced. Yet China and South Africa have found the allure of pebble bed technology irresistible, as if it were an "unpolished gem" waiting to be developed, regardless of the consistent engineering problems it has had since the beginning.

## 2nc no nukes

Incentives are insufficient

Maize, contributing editor – POWER Magazine, 7/1/’12

(Kennedy, “Fukushima Disaster Continues to Cloud Nuclear Outlook,” POWERnews)

J. Frank Russell, senior vice president at Concentric Energy Advisors, described the ambiguous status of nuclear power today from a U.S. perspective. By many counts, he said, “this should be a year of celebration for ‘new nuclear’ in the U.S.” because Southern Co. is building Vogtle Units 3 and 4, and Scana Corp. has a green light from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for the two new units at its V.C. Summer station. In contrast to what could be justified optimism, “the reality is different,” Russell said. “The pipeline is empty, with other proposed units stalled or delayed by the sponsors.” The promise of “up to a dozen” new units that was common in the industry a few years ago “has mostly gone away,” and the industry has awakened to a less-friendly environment. Many reasons account for faded nuclear dreams in the U.S., Russell said. The 2008 recession lowered demand for power and reduced financial markets’ appetite for risk. The collapse of natural gas prices as a result of the shale gas revolution undercut the economics. So did the federal government’s failure to put a price on carbon emissions. Fukushima also played a role. But the key factor dogging the U.S. nuclear sector has been the high and growing cost of nuclear power plants. “While many of these issues may be considered temporary,” said Russell, “the sheer total cost of large-scale new nuclear units is just too large for many companies to bear.” Few companies have the capitalization and appetite for risk to take on a project that could cost $10 billion, the current estimate for a new nuclear unit in the U.S. For a merchant generator, finding the equity capital for such an undertaking is problematic. “Even with a loan guarantee,” he said, “the equity may be impossible to raise.”What will it take for a real U.S. nuclear turnaround? Russell offered a list, with each item necessary to achieving rebirth but none sufficient in itself. He said that demand growth will have to return and that the current generating capacity surplus must decline. Natural gas prices will have to double to at least $4/million cubic feet. A carbon price also must be put in place. The Vogtle and Summer units must come in on schedule and must meet budget targets (an outcome already put in doubt by cost increases recently announced at Vogtle). And policy makers and the public must be positive and supportive.

## sequester xt

#### No way to implement without collapsing defense

Anthony Cordesman, CSIS Burke Chair in Strategy, 7/28/12, Ending the Threat of Sequestration and the National Game of "Chicken", csis.org/publication/ending-threat-sequestration-and-national-game-chicken

The Obama administration is now refusing to plan for this sequestration in an effort to force the Congress to take action to halt such cuts. This means the cuts to the FY2013 budget might well come under conditions where deciding how to actually implement them on a program-by-program basis would take additional months. This would deprive whatever administration is elected in November of much of its flexibility in making cuts where they do the least damage, forcing it to cut the “softest” programs with the lowest cancellation costs wherever possible and regardless of their relative merit.

Massive cuts in the federal budget would have to take place regardless of the economic crisis in Europe, the slowdown in China, the state of the U.S. economy as it entered 2013, and the significant political and psychological impact on the global economy. It would mean cutting key aspects of national security in spite of the war in Afghanistan and tensions with Iran and North Korea, and it would send the worst possible message to the world at a critical time.

This outcome would make the normal game of chicken—played by two drunken, semi-suicidal teenage drivers—seem almost wise and balanced by comparison. Instead of two cars hurtling down the highway and risking death if the more rational player does not suddenly turn aside, the United States now has two political parties rushing toward sequestration. Rather than risking a head-on collision between cars, sequestration risks a head-on rush toward another round of recession and the crippling of key aspects of defense.

## 2nc no modernization

Military will run out of cash—means zero new platforms or programs

Spring, research fellow in national security – Heritage, 12/21/’11

(Baker, “An Unacceptable Squeeze on Defense Modernization”)

Following the enactment of the Budget Control Act earlier this year, the budget for the core defense program is already operating under stringent spending caps. At the same time, per capita expenditures for paying military personnel and operating the force are high and growing rapidly. Under these circumstances, funding for the procurement of new weapons and equipment and for research and development on new defense technologies will be squeezed to a dangerous degree.

A Looming Disaster for the Military and U.S. Security

Both the Obama Administration and Congress will be tempted to leave the defense spending caps in place—if not to go to even lower caps—now that the sequestration process could be applied to the defense budget under the Budget Control Act. This is a result of the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction (“super committee”) to agree on an alternative deficit-reduction plan and adopt a policy of “people over platforms” in slicing up the defense budget pie. Given the uncertainties in the application of the sequestration process, it is impossible to calculate precisely how much more the modernization accounts will be squeezed if that process kicks in. Suffice it to say that the problem is likely to become dramatically worse.

The implications of the coming squeeze on defense modernization under the existing spending caps should cause **great alarm** for all concerned, particularly since it comes on the heels of the “procurement holiday” of the 1990s. The result will be a military that lacks the modern weapons and equipment it needs, loses its technological edge over future enemies, and finds itself dependent on a seriously eroded defense industrial base.

Congress will have to take two essential steps to avoid a disastrous outcome for the military and U.S. security. First, it will have to increase the existing caps on spending for the core defense program and find savings elsewhere in the federal budget to offset this change, in accordance with Heritage’s December 5 recommendations.[1] Second, it will have to take steps to constrain per capita growth in the cost of compensating military personnel.

The Sources of the Modernization Squeeze

There are two sources of the squeeze on military modernization. First, the Budget Control Act has established caps on spending for national security and discretionary spending over the next 10 years that translate into inadequate defense budgets under any circumstance. These caps will constitute top-down pressure on the modernization accounts (procurement and research and development) within the defense budget.

This top-down pressure will be accompanied by significant pressure from underneath by growth in both the overall and per capita costs of compensating military personnel. These increasing costs are largely driven by the array of defined benefits offered by the Department of Defense to military service members and their dependents, which fall mostly in the areas of military retirement and health care. These would be more effective and efficient if they were converted to defined-contribution plans.

According to the Department of Defense (DOD), its overall military manpower costs will rise from roughly $148 billion today to more than $160 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2016. This increase will come in spite of proposed reductions in the number of people serving in the active-duty military. Although the number of active-duty military personnel is projected to drop by about 5 percent from FY 2012 through FY 2016, military personnel spending will rise, thanks to growing per capita compensation costs. Per capita compensation for active-duty personnel is projected to rise by more than 13 percent during the same five-year period.

The reduction in the number of active-duty military personnel, as currently projected by the Obama Administration, will create a force that is too small to defend the vital interests of the United States. The Heritage Foundation has recommended that this reduction not be imposed. Accordingly, DOD’s projection of total military manpower costs is well below what is prudent. It is also appropriate to point out that while, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the overall per capita costs for operation and maintenance will come down with the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq and Afghanistan, the per capita costs for operations and maintenance within the core defense program will continue to rise as well.

The Scope of the Modernization Squeeze

As a result of the twin pressures of the estimated spending caps on the core defense program derived from the Budget Control Act—which still excludes the more stringent caps that would result from the imposition of a partial or full sequestration under the Act—and the rising cost of military compensation, the level of funding for military modernization will necessarily fall to unacceptably low levels. (See chart.) Under this scenario, funding for defense modernization within the core defense program (defined as the sum of DOD’s procurement account and research, development, test, and evaluation account) could fall to roughly $145 billion in current dollars in FY 2016.

By way of comparison, $188.4 billion was to go to these accounts under President Obama’s original budget request for FY 2012. Thus, the level of modernization funding is estimated to decline by about $43 billion in current dollars, or 23 percent, over the four-year period. In terms of inflation-adjusted dollars, the decline will be roughly $54 billion (in FY 2012 dollars), or about 29 percent. In other words, President Obama’s original request for the core DOD budget would have devoted roughly 34 percent of that budget to modernization. By 2016, modernization funding could fall to about 26 percent of total DOD funding for its core program.

When these comparisons are expanded to provide a broader perspective, the situation becomes even more alarming. For example, the Department of Defense spent more than $226 billion on modernization in FY 1985 (in FY 2012 dollars). This was 39 percent of the total DOD budget. That means DOD could be on a path to cutting modernization’s share of its total budget to little more than one-half of what it was in FY 1985.

## no air force

#### Air force resilient---precision munitions—1nc

Air Force isn’t vulnerable to supply disruptions

Bartis, senior policy researcher – RAND, ‘12

(James T., “Promoting International Energy Security, Volume 1, Understanding Potential Air Force Roles,” RAND Project Air Force)

Coping with the Oil Market

In this chapter, we examine options available to the Air Force in its role as a purchaser (albeit

via the Defense Logistics Agency) and user of fuel. On average, DoD uses about 340,000 bpd

of liquid fuels annually.1 Of this amount, about 250,000 bpd is jet fuel. Most of the rest is

either naval distillate or diesel fuel. Roughly one-half of this fuel is purchased in the United

States. Foreign fuel purchases primarily serve the needs of military units based outside the

United States. Total Air Force liquid fuel consumption is about 160,000 bpd annually, nearly

all of which is jet fuel.

Since fuel and, in particular, jet fuel is so important to DoD’s ability to train, deploy,

and fight, questions have been raised about the prospects for the continued availability of

petroleum-based military fuel supplies (e.g., Parthemore and Nagl, 2010). Our analyses show

that there is no threat on the horizon to the availability of bulk supplies of military fuels. DoD

is among the world’s largest purchasers of petroleum but even so, accounts for only 0.4 percent

of worldwide petroleum production. Petroleum production in just the United States is

currently about 8 million bpd.2 Adding to these domestic supplies are the net 3 million bpd

of secure supplies imported annually from Canada and Mexico. With over 11 million bpd of

secure petroleum supplies, we find it inconceivable that the U.S. military would not be able to

access the fuels it requires to maintain readiness and perform its missions. In the unlikely event

that the market is not responsive to military needs, the Defense Production Act (P.L. 81-774)

contains provisions that would give the priority to the production and delivery of petroleum

products to DoD and it contractors.

Multiple safeguards stop price spikes

Bartis, senior policy researcher – RAND, ‘12

(James T., “Promoting International Energy Security, Volume 1, Understanding Potential Air Force Roles,” RAND Project Air Force)

Although our research did not address approaches for mitigating fuel price volatility,

we can say that a number of approaches are available. One approach would mimic what private

enterprises, such as commercial airlines, do to mitigate the adverse impacts of fuel price

increases: develop and implement a fuel hedging strategy. Such hedging strategies involve

transaction costs, however, which may be politically disadvantageous. Although commercial

airlines are willing to accept these transaction costs, they have potentially much more to lose

than the Air Force does from fuel price volatility (Defense Business Board, 2004).

A similar alternative would be for the Air Force (via Defense Logistics Agency Energy)

to execute fuel contracts for future delivery during the programming phase of the multiyear

Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System process. This would **lock in the**

**prices** that the service would pay in the execution year. This approach would change Defense

Logistics Agency’s standard fuel contracting approach, which includes provisions for adjusting

sale prices to accommodate variations in world prices. Large petroleum corporations, however,

may be unwilling to sign multiyear, fixed-price fuel contracts. Were fuel prices to drop, these

corporations would be in the politically embarrassing position of “overcharging” the federal

government.

Nonhedging options are also available to the Air Force and may be politically more

acceptable. These include requesting additional appropriations from Congress to cover fuel

price increases or establishing a working capital fund that would smooth out fuel price variations

(Defense Business Board, 2004; Bartis, Camm, and Ortiz, 2008).

At worst, it’s only 8% of the budget

Schwartz ‘12

Moshe, Specialist in Defense Acquisition Katherine Blakeley Research Associate Ronald O'Rourke Specialist in Naval Affairs, “Department of Defense Energy Initiatives: Background and Issues for Congress,” Congressional Research Service, AM

Air Force officials state that the Air Force’s energy initiatives are aimed at reducing the service’s energy costs (which accounted for 8.4% of the Air Force’s budget in FY2011) and at reducing the budgetary impact of volatility in fuel prices.92 More specifically, the Air Force states that its operational energy goals are the following: • Reduce consumption of aviation fuel 10% by 2015. • Be prepared to acquire 50% of the Air Force’s domestic aviation fuel requirement via an alternative fuel blend by 2016. • Test and certify all aircraft and systems on a 50:50 alternative fuel blend93 by 2012.94 The Air Force’s FY2013 budget submission requests $655 million for operational energy initiatives in FY2013, and programs a total of about $2.6 billion for energy initiatives across the FYDP. Table 2 lists what the Air Force describes as its major operational energy initiatives.

## 2NC Unique-Phosphate OK Now

#### Phosphate supply stable now, but err on the side of caution---excessive depletion risks huge shortages

Euractiv, 12

(European News Agency, 11/21, “Looming shortage of key crop nutrient pushes call for conservation,”

http://www.euractiv.com/specialreport-agriculture/looming-shortage-key-crop-nutrie-news-516151)

SPECIAL REPORT / Stepped-up farm production to feed a growing world could lead to shortages of a vital crop nutrient, phosphorus, prompting European officials to consider conservation and recycling measures to protect supplies. But it r**emains an open – and sometimes boisterous – debate how long reserves of the non-renewable nutrient will last,** with projections ranging from a few decades to hundreds of years. “Phosphorus is a major problem for Europe because it is only found in six or seven countries,” Gilberto Garuti of Neorurale, a rural development organisation in Milan, said at a recent European Parliament conference on farming. Garuti estimated that global demand will exceed supply by 2035, a figure that is in line with other assessments. The EU is dependent on imports for nearly all its phosphorus and the European Commission’s environment directorate has cited supply security of phosphorus and the need to consider more efficient use of the resource. European officials have raised concerns about the concentrations of supply in a handful of countries and food production pressures in developing countries that could crimp supplies in advanced nations. Phosphorus is one of the most abundant earth elements and is mined from phosphate rock. Consumption grew fourfold between 1960 and 2008, a period of rapid world food production, according to the International Fund for Agricultural Development. Experts have called for expanding research and technology to recover phosphorus from non-mining sources like sewage sludge, or regulatory measures like taxing consumption to reduce waste. Past estimates by the US Geological Survey put total global reserves at least 16 billion tonnes – one-third of it in Morocco. China, South Africa, Jordan, United States, Brazil, Russia, Israel and Syria also have significant reserves. Current production is more than 160 million tonnes per year. Supply concerns overstated Yet there is an enormous gulf in forecasts for how long stable supplies will last with the planet expected to feed 2 billion more mouths, up from 7 billion today, by mid-century. Researchers in the water and environmental studies research programme at Sweden’s Linköping University say phosphorous stocks will run out within 50 to 100 years. Earlier studies suggested supplies peaked more than 20 years ago, but new discoveries and rapid growth in phosphorus output in China dampened concerns about looming shortages. Other researchers say the projections are way off and point to new discoveries in countries including Iraq. “**There is no indication there is going to be a ‘peak phosphorus’ event within the next 20-25 years,”** says a study by the International Fertilizer Development Center (IFDC) in the United States, adding that “phosphate rock reserves to produce fertiliser will be available for 300-400 years.” Steven Van Kauwenbergh, a geologist who wrote the IFDC report, told EurActiv he estimates world reserves at 60 billion tonnes, a figure he contends is “very conservative” and doesn’t factor in known supplies that are more difficult to access. “In the Western United States there is another Morocco in terms of resources, it’s just imbedded and folded in contorted mountains,” he said by telephone from the IFDC headquarters in Muscle Shoals, Alabama. “If the price of rock gets up high enough, people will go back under ground for it.” Rising demand – and need What is certain is that prices for agricultural phosphorus and other crop fertilisers have risen and are likely to continue to do so – driven in part by production and shipping costs, but also growing food demand. Phosphate rock prices hit their highest mark this century in 2008, more than $400 per tonne, before plummeting to less than $100 in 2009. Prices topped $200 a year ago and stood at $185 per tonne last month, the InfoMine news service reported. Researchers at the Sydney University of Technology have also raised concerns about geopolitical consequences of supplies being concentrated in the hands of China, which has imposed steep tariffs on phosphorous exports, and in Morocco and the disputed Western Sahara region. “In 2008 China imposed a 135% export tariff to secure domestic supply for food production; a move which essentially halted exports from the region overnight," says a study by the university’s Institute for Sustainable Futures. “Morocco currently occupies Western Sahara and controls that region’s extensive reserves in defiance of UN resolutions,” it added, highlighting potential security concerns that could disrupt trade. Agreement on recovery Despite the differing takes on future supplies, there is broad agreement that recycling and more judicious application are important to supply security and reducing environmental hazards. The United Nations Environmental Programme contends that “major gains can be made through improving plant nutrient management and recycling phosphorus from waste streams,” including sewage sludge. The more efficient use of phosphorous fertilisers opens the door to better environmental stewardship, the UNEP also says.

#### Momentum now towards phosphorus conservation but rapid depletion is disastrous

White, 12

(Professor at University of Technology, Sydney, 3/1, Time for policy action on global phosphorus security, http://theconversation.edu.au/time-for-policy-action-on-global-phosphorus-security-5594)

People are becoming more aware of this serious global sustainability challenge. An 800% price spike in phosphate rock in 2008, driven by increased demand (including from increased use of animal products in diet, and biofuels) prior to the global financial crisis, certainly raised awareness. The price did not return to pre-2008 levels and is trending back upwards. Researchers are forming new global and national platforms, such as the Global Phosphorus Research Initiative and the Dutch Nutrient Platform. But no international body – not even the UN – is taking an active role in developing appropriate policies to make sure we can get phosphorus and grow food into the future. There are many areas of debate and lack of consensus. There isn’t agreement on how long global phosphate rock reserves will last; estimates range from decades to centuries. There is controversy over the ownership of vast phosphate rock reserves in Western Sahara (currently controlled by the Moroccan Royal Family), and even the magnitude of future phosphate demand. But regardless of these sticking points, we know there is a serious problem and we know we need to substantially increase phosphorus recycling and efficiency in the food system to avert a crisis for global phosphorus security. Some innovations exist. Some researchers are converting human excreta and wastewater to marketable phosphate fertilisers like struvite. Others are developing guidelines for efficient use of phosphorus in agriculture. But how do we make these innovations mainstream? How long will it take to see international and national policy responses to effectively implement these changes?

## Ext-Leads to Phosphate Shortage

#### Algae biomass requires huge inputs of phosphate---over 50 percent of yearly US use

Stolte, 12

(Columnist-Energy Intelligence Report by OilPrice.com, 11/12, “Algal Biofuel is Currently Unsustainable, but Technology can Change That,” http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Biofuels/Algal-Biofuel-is-Currently-Unsustainable-but-Technology-can-Change-That.html)

“Resource consumption is very dependent on which technology components you combine and how you combine them to constitute a biofuel production pathway that is both environmentally sustainable and economically viable,” he explains. To produce 10 billion gallons of algal biofuels, 6 million to 15 million metric tons of nitrogen and 1 million to 2 million metric tons of phosphorus would be needed each year if the nutrients are not recycled, the report says. **These requirements represent** 44 percent to 107 percent of the total nitrogen use and **20 percent to 51 percent of the total phosphorus use in the US.**

## Nitrogen Impact 2NC

Algae biofuels collapse nitrogen supply

#### Nitrogen depletion leads to extinction—that’s OECD and Stolte

Cullen, 12

(Research Fellow-Foundation for Economics of Stability, “The nitrogen cycle and health,” http://www.feasta.org/2012/04/02/the-nitrogen-cycle-and-health/)

Nitrogen is necessary for life on earth to continue and the nitrogen cycle is one of the most important nutrient cycles in terrestrial ecosystems [1]. **Everything that lives needs nitrogen**; it is required for the manufacture of complex molecules such as chlorophyll, proteins and DNA, and also for the production of enzymes necessary for growth, reproduction and other vital functions. However, when present in excess, nitrogen poses risks both to the environment and human health.

## Oxygen Impact 2NC

#### Algae fuel depletes oxygen

Helsingin Sanomat, 12

(5/7, largest daily subscription-based newspaper in Scandinavia, “Experts struggle to find ways to improve phosphorus recycling,”

http://www.hs.fi/english/article/Experts+struggle+to+find+ways+to+improve+phosphorus+recycling/1329104021311)

Securing sufficient phosphorus for agricultural production is one of the big challenges for the future. Supplies of phosphorus used in the production of fertiliser are dwindling, and deposits exist only in the territory of a few countries. At the same time, vast amounts of the valuable element are wasted. Only a fifth of the 16 million tons of phosphorus ends up in human nutrition. Most of it flows into rivers, lakes and seas, where it causes serious environmental damage; phosphorus is also a fertiliser for algae, which **depletes oxygen supplies** **when used to excess.**

## AT: Russia – US War

No escalation – disagreements remain limited

Weitz 11 (Richard, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor 9/27/2011, “Global Insights: Putin not a Game-Changer for U.S.-Russia Ties,” <http://www.scribd.com/doc/66579517/Global-Insights-Putin-not-a-Game-Changer-for-U-S-Russia-Ties>)

Fifth, there will inevitably be areas of conflict between Russia and the United States regardless of who is in the Kremlin. Putin and his entourage can never be happy with having NATO be Europe's most powerful security institution, since Moscow is not a member and cannot become one. Similarly, the Russians will always object to NATO's missile defense efforts since they can neither match them nor join them in any meaningful way. In the case of Iran, Russian officials genuinely perceive less of a threat from Tehran than do most Americans, and Russia has more to lose from a cessation of economic ties with Iran -- as well as from an Iranian-Western reconciliation. On the other hand, these conflicts can be managed, since they will likely **remain limited and compartmentalized**. Russia and the West **do not have fundamentally conflicting vital interests of the kind countries would go to war over**. And as the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a great pacifier under such conditions. Another novel development is that Russia is much more integrated into the international economy and global society than the Soviet Union was, and Putin's popularity depends heavily on his economic track record. Beyond that, there are objective criteria, such as the smaller size of the Russian population and economy as well as the difficulty of controlling modern means of social communication, that will constrain whoever is in charge of Russia.

No nuclear strike

Graham 7 (Thomas Graham, senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, 2007, "Russia in Global Affairs” The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

Conflicts will never go nuclear – prefer Russian generals

Ivashov 7 (Colonel General Leonid Ivashov, President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems, 2007. Defense and Security, “Will America Fight Russia?” p. Lexis)

Numerous scenarios and options are possible. Everything may begin as a local conflict that will rapidly deteriorate into a total confrontation. An ultimatum will be sent to Russia: say, change the domestic policy because human rights are allegedly encroached on, or give Western businesses access to oil and gas fields. Russia will refuse and its objects (radars, air defense components, command posts, infrastructure) will be wiped out by guided missiles with conventional warheads and by aviation. Once this phase is over, an even stiffer ultimatum will be presented - demanding something up to the deployment of NATO "peacekeepers" on the territory of Russia. Refusal to bow to the demands will be met with a mass aviation and missile strike at Army and Navy assets, infrastructure, and objects of defense industry. NATO armies will invade Belarus and western Russia. Two turns of events may follow that. Moscow may accept the ultimatum through the use of some device that will help it save face. The acceptance will be followed by talks over the estrangement of the Kaliningrad enclave, parts of the Caucasus and Caspian region, international control over the Russian gas and oil complex, and NATO control over Russian nuclear forces. The second scenario involves a warning from the Kremlin to the United States that continuation of the aggression will trigger retaliation with the use of all weapons in nuclear arsenals. § Marked 21:44 § It will stop the war and put negotiations into motion.

## at: russia relations

Relations are impossible, but will never collapse

Migranyan, director – Institute for Democracy and Cooperation, professor – Institute of International Relations, Moscow, 1/30/’13

(Andranik, “Russia and Obama's Second Term,” The National Interest)

I shall begin with what I consider the most interesting viewpoint professed for many years by one of the best experts on Russian relations, Tom Graham. Back in December, he and Dmitri Trenin, director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, published an article in The International Herald-Tribune exploring the multiple problems bedeviling the U.S.-Russian relationship, such as the U.S. Congress’s Magnitsky Act, the Russian decision to cease cooperation on the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and the Russian ban on adoptions by American citizens. The authors argued that these problems stemmed from a lack of strategic dialogue and the two countries’ **inadequate understanding** of each other’s strategic interests. Placing such problems in a strategic context would improve Russian-American relations, they argued, citing as areas for potential strategic dialogue such strategic topics as China, cooperation on Arctic development and the fight against Islamist terrorism.

First, the problem here is that it is unrealistic to expect large, sovereign countries to share strategic interests with other countries that aren’t focused on a troublesome third country. Over the past fifty years, the sole example that comes to mind of a successful strategic dialogue is the American strategic outreach to China during the Nixon administration. It was initiated by Henry Kissinger, whose firm employs Tom Graham. The success of this dialogue can be explained by the perception in both the United States and China that the Soviet Union represented a threat to the existence of both; hence, their readiness to join forces against a common enemy.

Second, two countries can have convergent vital interests only if both are roughly equal in resources and power. Otherwise, the weaker one experiences a loss of sovereignty as a result of its smaller economic and military-political potential, and that negates the strategic character of the relationship.

Consider the widespread perception in the 1990s and at the beginning of the twenty-first century that Russia and the United States could forge a strategic relationship. It never happened because the United States felt it was so strong and self-sufficient that strategic cooperation came down to the American expectation that Russia should bend its own vital interests and submit to American foreign policy. Only then could peaceful, constructive and effective cooperation ensue. Graham and Trenin discuss, for example, current U.S. and Russian strategic interests with regard to China. But isn’t there a greater convergence in Russian and Chinese interests on the matter of containing Washington’s arrogant and unilateral foreign policy that attempts to dominate the world?

Regarding the development of Arctic resources, the United States’ refusal to sign the Convention on the Law of the Sea betrays a U.S. lack of interest in dividing Arctic resources in a way that coincides with international law. Rather, Washington wants to keep its hands untied for any action in the Arctic.

Strategic dialogue necessitates a certain level of trust between parties. But the talks between the two countries on the antimissile shield that the U.S. wishes to install in Europe testify to the lack of such trust. Americans insist that the shield is designed to parry hypothetical Iranian missiles; but a succession of U.S. presidents and other high-level officials also insist that the idea of a nuclear Iran is unacceptable. They declare that, should Iran continue to advance down the road to a nuclear weapon, the United States or Israel would destroy the program’s infrastructure.

With the emergence of a multipolar world, the need arises for power balances in various regions. Thus do we see countries attempting to protect their national interests by forming ad hoc coalitions instead of full-time alliances, whose time has passed, in the view of many analysts. This is why strategic dialogue, while perhaps notionally desirable, is not really feasible because it is difficult to determine which questions are tactical and which are strategic. For Moscow, a matter of strategic discussion with the United States is U.S. interference in Russia’s internal affairs. Another is America’s interference in countries in the post-Soviet sphere. But it is difficult to imagine any U.S. administration engaging in serious discussions on such matters without being attacked domestically for betraying U.S. national and geopolitical interests. It is obvious that there cannot be entirely cooperative or entirely competitive relations between two large countries with intersecting and conflicting interests.

Such a black-and-white approach can only exist between states engaged in total and open confrontation—as the Soviet Union and the West were during the Cold War—or in cases of a weaker country forced to yield its interests to the will of a stronger partner because of an economic or military-political dependency. This is the defining characteristic of the relations within NATO, whose European members depend for military protection largely on the United States. And yet within this framework there are conflicts even absent a confrontation with a third power (as with the USSR). Consider, for example, the clashes that arose with George W. Bush’s Iraq war, when Germany and France went against the wishes of the United States.

Thus, it seems inescapable that the United States and Russia will **sometimes partner** but also **sometimes have conflicting interests.**

Relations can’t collapse, and issues are compartmentalized

Migranyan, director – Institute for Democracy and Cooperation, professor – Institute of International Relations, Moscow, 1/30/’13

(Andranik, “Russia and Obama's Second Term,” The National Interest)

The fundamental reality is that both Russia and the United States have entered a new phase of international relations. Russia, having ensured its own sovereignty and policy independence, is seeking to build its relationships with all countries from the point of view of its own priorities. On this basis it tries to establish a balance of powers that effectively protects its interests in the Near Abroad and maintains its own economic and military-political security. It is naïve to believe that Russia is mentally separating itself from the culture of the West because it does not share the Western value system, as Dmitri Trenin wrote in December, or that it is becoming close to China almost to the point of being its junior partner. Such suggestions have little basis in reality. **Russia is simply trying to work for its own interests**, within accepted diplomatic rules, in order to gain advantageous bargaining positions.

The United States also has entered a new phase. It is going through a painful and complex transition from unilateral global domination to a policy of creating balance-of-power arrangements in various regions of the world so as to preserve American presence and influence. Thus, there will be inevitable ups and downs in U.S.-Russian relations as the two countries partner on some issues on which it is beneficial for both of them to be allied, and compete and experience tensions on other issues, where their vital interests diverge. This means there isn’t much chance of consistently smooth relations between the two countries.

## 1NC Offense

#### Plan causes US-Russia coop—enables reductions

#### Causes mutual US-Russia reductions of 1000, beyond New START levels

Rybachenkov ’12 (A RUSSIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL AND MUTUAL DETERRENCE1 Vladimir Rybachenkov2 1 Text of presentation at the Fourth Annual Nuclear Deterrence Summit, Arlington, VA, USA, February 14-17, 2012. 2 Senior Research Scientist, Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environment Studies

Though the Military doctrine of Russia and the US Nuclear Posture Review (both documents adopted in 2010) stipulate that the use of nuclear weapons would only be considered in extreme circumstance when the very existence of the state is under a threat, there is still a risk of an unauthorized or accidental launch. Moreover, in the era of globalization nuclear deterrence is inevitably conducive to further nuclear pro- liferation.

A question emerges at this point: what should be done to move our countries away from relations framed by a model of mutually assured destruction which continues to prevail in the US – Russian dialogue? The logical answer would be to proceed gradu- ally with further reductions of nuclear arms levels on the basis of the minimal suffi- ciency principle, to enhance strategic stability in the context of equal security for all and to exclude the possibility of first nuclear strike or missile launch due to a tech- nical failure or shortage of time for the political leaders to make a decision.

The New START Treaty, which reduced nuclear arsenals of Russia and the USA by 30% in comparison with the 2003 Moscow Treaty, made an important contribution to building predictability and confidence between our countries. A stage was set to further reductions eventually going down to the level of 1000 deployed warheads but evidently this would require involvement of other nuclear states.

#### New START didn’t lead to Russian TNW reductions—further reductions would

Miles Pomper, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Senior Research Associate, William Potter, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Director, and Professor, Nikolai Sokov, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Senior Research Associate, 12/4/2009, Breaking the U.S.-Russian deadlock on nonstrategic nuclear weapons,' http://thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/breaking-the-us-russian-deadlock-nonstrategic-nuclear-weapons

As U.S. and Russian negotiators hammer out a replacement to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which expires tomorrow, some Republican senators have already criticized PDF negotiators for not including nonstrategic nuclear weapons--a category of nuclear arms not subject to legally binding limits or verification and one in which there is a great disparity between U.S. and Russian holdings. The U.S. nonstrategic nuclear arsenal is estimated at 1,100 warheads (150-200 of them stationed in five European countries--Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey) while Russian nonstrategic stocks may number as high as 5,000 warheads.1 Although unwilling to include limitations on nonstrategic nuclear weapons in the current negotiations, U.S. and Russian officials have indicated that nonstrategic nuclear arsenals might be addressed in a new set of arms control talks that is expected to commence after the START replacement treaty is ratified.

#### China:

#### Russia-China war is coming – Russian TNWs are necessary to deter it

Saaradzhyan, Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center Research Fellow, January 2010

Simon, "Russia’s NoN-stRategic NucleaR WeapoNs iN theiR cuRReNt coNfiguRatioN aNd postuRe: a stRategic asset oR liability?," http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/russian-position-NSNWs.pdf

Serving as a equalizer vis-a-vis China whose conventional forces in the Far East are already su- perior to Russia’s assets in the region and this disparity continues to grow. The two countries have settled their border disputes, signed a treaty of friendship in 2001 and are partners in the Shang- hai Cooperation Organization. They also agreed to not be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other or to target their nuclear weapons at each other in a deal signed in 1992.33 However, all this doesn’t fully preclude the possibility that fast-growing China, which is already challenging Russia’s dominance in oil- and gas-rich Central Asia, will not come to pose a security threat to Russia’s resource-rich Siberia and Far East in the future.

While Russian officials generally remain mum on the issue, former officials and Russian experts do point to the potential threat of China’s conventional supremacy. “After the end of the Cold War...Moscow lost its superiority in conventional forces over NATO, China and the far eastern alliance led by the U.S,” according to Alexei Arbatov, one of Russia’s most authoritative arms con-trol experts who has reportedly been one of the co-authors of Russia’s official Strategy of National Security Until Year 2020 that President Dmitry Medvedev approved in May 2009.34 Now Russia sees its non-strategic nuclear weapons as the “nuclear equalizer” for lagging behind the West and China in conventional forces, according to Arbatov.35

More recently, the Defense Ministry has edged closer to acknowledging that China could become a rival. In July 2009 a reporter for the Defense Ministry’s newspaper Krasnaya Zvezda pointed out to General Nikolai Makarov that one of the slides in the commander’s own presentation “show that it is, afterall, NATO and China that are the most dangerous of our geopolitical rivals.” He then asked the general whether the brigades, which have replaced Cold War era divisions to make the armed forces more fit to fight local conflicts as opposed to all-out wars of the 20th century, will be prepared to “conduct defensive operations in massive warfare.”36 Makarov didn’t mention either China or NSNW in his answer, but earlier at the same conference he did point out that “in terms of China, we are conducting a very balanced, well-thought policy.” 37 However, as someone who has worked as a defense and security journalist in Russia for 15 years, the author of this article can note that Krasnaya Zvezda reporters more often than not get pre-approval for the questions they ask top commanders, so the reference to China as a “strongest geopolitical rival” is no accident.

More recently, in what leading Russian military expert Alexander Khramchikhin rightfully described as an “epochal statement,” chief of the Ground Forces Staff Lt. General Sergei Skokov stated in September 2009, when describing what kind of warfare the newly-established Russian army brigades should prepare for, “If we talk about the east, then it could be a multi-million- strong army with traditional approaches to conducting combat operations: straightforward, with large concentrations of personnel and firepower along individual operational directions.”. Significantly, the only of the Russian Army’s twenty four divisions to avoid re-organization into brigades is located in the Far East and its firepower is mostly submachine guns and artillery, according to the Defense Ministry.38 “For the first time since the early days of Gorbachev, a high-ranking national commander has de facto acknowledged officially that PRC is our potential enemy,” Khramchikhin wrote of Skokov’s statement.39

#### China-Russia war is likely and would escalate to global nuclear war

Sharavin, Political and Military Analysis Institute director, 2001

Alexander, “The Third Threat: Russia is overlooking the increasing military might of China,” Sept 28, Nezavisimoe Voennoe Obozrenie, No. 28, http://www.cdi.org/russia/Johnson/5470.html

China's economy is among the fastest-growing economies in the world. It remains socialistic in many aspects, i.e. extensive and highly expensive, demanding more and more natural resources. China's natural resources are rather limited, whereas the depths of Siberia and the Russian Far East are almost inexhaustible. Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China's population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for "the final throw to the north." The strength of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from late 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China's air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our "eastern brethren" will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter. An aforementioned prospect is, undoubtedly, rather disagreeable and we would not like to believe it can be true. However, it is a realistic prospect - just like a war against NATO or Islamic extremists.

#### Central Asia

#### Russian TNWs key to deter regional instability

Saaradzhyan, Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center Research Fellow, January 2010

Simon, "Russia’s NoN-stRategic NucleaR WeapoNs iN theiR cuRReNt coNfiguRatioN aNd postuRe: a stRategic asset oR liability?," http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/russian-position-NSNWs.pdf

Deterring powers in the south. “Russia is not the U.S. ... which is separated from other countries by two oceans. Russia has a complex situation in the southern direction. There are nuclear powers on Russian borders. Therefore, possession of tactical nuclear weapons is a factor that deters ag- gression,” according to head of the Defense Ministry’s 12th Main Directorate Vladimir Verkhovt- sev.40 In his 2007 statement Verkhovtsev didn’t identify countries that the Russian military would deter with non-strategic nuclear weapons, but it is common knowledge that the security environ- ment in the Caucasus remains rather volatile and that Russia fought a war with one of its southern neighbors, Georgia, in 2008. Another threat in the south is posed by the continuing turmoil in Afghanistan, which has the potential to destabilize Central Asia, a zone Russia also considers to be of “privileged interests.” In the longer term, Russia may rely on NSNWs if Iran decides to chal- lenge Russia’s efforts to keep the Caspian regions, the South Caucasus and Central Asia within the zone of its “privileged interests.”

#### Escalates and goes global

Peimani, University of Bradford Department of Peace Studies Central Asia and Caucasus specialist, 02

[Hooman, *Failed Transition, Bleak Future: War and Instability in Central Asia and the Caucasus*, p. 142]

The impact of war and instability in the Caucasus or Central Asia will not be confined to the countries immediately affected. Any local conflict could escalate and expand to its neighboring countries, only to destabilize its entire respective region. Furthermore, certain countries with stakes in the stability of Central Asia and/or the Caucasus could well be dragged into such a conflict, intentionally or unintentionally. Regardless of the form or extent of their intervention in a future major war, the sheer act of intervention could further escalate the war, increase human suffering, and plant the seeds for its further escalation. Needless to say, this could only further contribute to the devastation of all parties involved and especially the “hosting” CA or Caucasian countries. In fact, certain factors could even kindle a military confrontation between and among the five regional and non-regional states with long-term interests in Central Asia and the Caucasus. This scenario could potentially destabilize large parts of Asia and Europe. The geographical location of the two regions as a link between Asia and Europe- shared to different extents by Iran, Turkey, and Russia- creates a "natural" geographical context for the expansion of any regional war involving those states to other parts of Asia and Europe. Added to this, Iran, China, Turkey, Russia, and the United States all have ties and influence in parts of Asia and Europe. They are also members of regional organizations such as the Economic Cooperation Organization (Iran and Turkey) or military organizations such as NATO (Turkey and the United States). These geographical, political, economic and military ties could help expand any conflict in which they are involved.

#### Now—Russia’s TNW arsenal is key to stabilize US relations—plan kills stability:

#### Subs

#### Russia reciprocity would make Russia unable to deter US naval aggression

Sokov, Center for Nonproliferation Studies Senior Research Associate, 7/17/2009

Nikolai, “Tactical (Substrategic) Nuclear Weapons,” http://cns.miis.edu/opapers/090717\_german\_leadership/german\_leadership\_6\_issue\_4.pdf

Nuclear warheads for sea-launched cruise missiles, which are stored at 12th GUMO facilities at naval bases, appear to be another component of the forces Russia would use in a conflict with NATO. Russian naval commanders admit that they simply cannot face the U.S. Navy—in case of a direct clash between Russia and the United States—without reliance on these assets. Accordingly, crews of surface ships and submarines have reportedly trained to mate warheads to SLCMs and launch them.20

#### Unchecked US subs would stroke tensions and spark US-Russia miscalc

Grossman, Global Security Newswire staff writer, 10/1/2009

Elaine, "U.S. Sea-Based Missiles Seen as "Core" Nukes, Maybe at ICBM Expense," http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20091001\_4226.php

Speaking at the same event, FAS Acting President Ivan Oelrich noted that nuclear-armed submarines were viewed during the Cold War as "the perfect stabilizing weapon," thanks to their virtual immunity from a use-or-lose impulse. They have continued to enjoy "really great public relations" over the years, as the Navy has upgraded them with new capabilities, he said. In the process, though, they have taken on a more destabilizing role, he argued. "The submarines got bigger, the missiles got bigger [and] now we can put 475-kiloton-yield warheads on the D-5," Oelrich said. "Now the missiles on submarines are just as accurate as they are from ICBMs, from land-based missiles." From underwater launch positions just off an adversary's shoreline, a Trident submarine could unleash a salvo of missiles in "depressed trajectories," allowing them to reach targets in just 12 to 15 minutes, he said. "We can also move the submarines around to exploit gaps in Russian early warning radar systems. "And so the submarines, if you're on the other side [during a crisis], look like particularly threatening first-strike weapons," Oelrich said. Another aspect of the Trident-carrying submarines that could stoke tensions with potential nuclear adversaries is their capacity for multiple warheads on each missile, called "MIRVs," Kristensen noted this week. "If you have MIRV, you can do more with it" in terms of hitting several targets with a single shot, he said. "We have to make sure we're not in a posture where the overwhelming majority of our missiles are [lurking] out there somewhere, [at a time when] we want our potential adversaries to calm down." Kristensen added: "This is about what signals you send and what posture you nudge your adversary into."

# 1NR

## soil erosion

#### SQ solves or it’s empirically denied

MARK REY**,** UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, 5/15/03,

Farmers and ranchers have reduced soil erosion on cropland and pasture by 1.2 billion tons from 1982 to 1997 alone. Landowners have reduced the loss of wetlands caused by agriculture to only 27,000 acres per year between 1992 and '97. That's down from nearly 600,000 acres a year in the 1950s, '60s, and '70s. Landowners have used the Wetlands Reserve Program to restore nearly one million acres of wetlands since 1991. They have used the Conservation Reserve Program to produce hunting and recreation benefits estimated at more than $700 million per year.

## india

US-Indian relations low but will never collapse

**Padukone 12** (Neil Padukone is the Felow for geopolitics at the Takshashila Institution, 6/19/2012, "Natural Allies?", pragati.nationalinterest.in/2012/06/natural-allies/)

In the late 1990s, the United States and India embarked on a partnership based largely on three strategic issues: markets, counter-terrorism, and balancing China. With the opening of India’s economy in 1991, the United States saw India’s billion-strong population as a massive market for its businesses. In the wake of 9/11, Washington came to see India’s travails against Islamist militants in Kashmir and Afghanistan through the lens of its War on Terror and increased counter-terrorism cooperation with New Delhi. And as India’s and China’s strategic spaces began to overlap, managing China’s rise became a common concern for both New Delhi and Washington. With that in mind, the United States and India reversed decades of enmity and, through the 2006 nuclear deal, embarked upon a symbolic commitment to what heads of state of both countries have called a “natural alliance.” Yet with all the fanfare- particularly after U.S. President Barack Obama voiced his support for a permanent Indian seat on the UN Security Council in his 2010 Lok Sabha speech- bilateral ties have recently been marked by considerable drift: India has not fallen in line on the issue of Iran, Washington is only slowly coming around on Pakistani militancy, the countries’ UN voting records do not mesh, and trade disagreements abound. Questions have been raised over why U.S.-India relations have cooled, or whether they were over hyped in the first place. The U.S. Department of Defense’s “strategic pivot” toward Asia is one way to shore up relations and realign the Indo-U.S. partnership. India’s geostrategic location at the centre of the Indian Ocean- along with its naval expansion toward the southern Indian Ocean and its Port Blair naval base at the Andaman Islands- enable New Delhi to manage China’s presence in the region. Indeed, India and America’s navies have been more coordinated than any other bureaucracy since 2000. But the implications of this shared Beijing-centric orientation will only come about in the medium-term. One dimension of these ties, the sale of defence technologies, is another place where India has not yet delivered: the recent Medium Multi-Role Combat Aircraft (MMRCA) competition failed to award contracts to American companies. And in the middle of a global recession in which all countries are hunkering down, and domestic inflation and unemployment- not to mention concerns over doing business in India, such as retroactive taxation and tax avoidance measures- have grown, economic reforms that would further open India’s markets have slowed. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s recent visit to Kolkata was largely an effort to encourage India to increase the speed of its market liberalisation, particularly in the retail sector. This may be a prospect for the future, but is doubtful today given India’s economic slowdown and the attendant drop in employment. Yet perhaps the main reason for this strategic drift is that America’s key concern in South Asia these days is Afghanistan. President Obama delivered on his campaign promise to refocus efforts on the war in that country, and from 2009, his administration’s “AfPak” strategy took a regional perspective that originally sought to bring India into the equation. The thinking behind this, as Amitai Etzioni writes, is that “for Pakistanis, conflict (with India) poses an ominous existential challenge that drives their behaviour on all things,” including “their approach to the West and the war in Afghanistan… If the India-Pakistan confrontation could be settled, chances for progress on other fronts would be greatly enhanced.” The implication was that Washington ought to hyphenate India and Pakistan, to see the two as part of the same regional tussle, and try to settle the Kashmir dispute in order to make progress in Afghanistan. This was something New Delhi vehemently opposed and in fact, it sought de-hyphenation from Pakistan – engagement with New Delhi and Islamabad on separate and unconnected tracks. So when the office of the late US Special Adviser on Pakistan and Afghanistan Richard Holbrooke sought to include India and Kashmir in its purview, New Delhi successfully lobbied against it. This effort served one of India’s aims, insofar as it keeps Kashmir out of America’s area of direct intervention. Yet it also takes India, its assets, and its clout out of the broader Afghan resolution. Among these assets is the Indian-constructed Chabahar Road that connects Iran’s eastern Chabahar Port on the Gulf of Oman to western Afghanistan. The road ends Pakistan’s monopoly on seaborne trade to Afghanistan, which has long allowed Islamabad’s pernicious dominance of Kabul’s economic and political life. In light of America’s confrontation with Iran and efforts to sanction the latter’s energy sector, however, Washington opposes India’s use of Chabahar, particularly to import Iranian oil and natural gas. Indeed another goal of Secretary Clinton’s visit was to try to shore up India’s support for sanctions against Iran- to which end India is reducing its dependence on Iranian energy as it awaits an exemption on sanctions from the US State Department. But when New Delhi recently used its Chabahar road to send 100,000 tons of wheat to Kabul, its full potential vis-à-vis Afghanistan became evident. And this food aid was on top of India’s additional commitments to Afghanistan: constructing the Zaranj-Delaram highway in western Afghanistan that connects Chabahar to the Afghan ring road, the development of the Ayni Air base in Tajikistan (originally designed to treat wounded Afghan soldiers), building Afghanistan’s parliament building, exploring the Hajigak iron mine, and even commitments to train the Afghan National Police and Army- all of which amount to pledges of over $1 billion since 2001. Washington has been wary of encouraging India’s presence in Afghanistan citing Islamabad’s fear of encirclement. But, even without American attention, a refutation of Pakistan’s “India Threat” narrative is already underway. In order to remain focused on strategic horizons beyond South Asia, India is reorienting its defence apparatus away from Pakistan and towards China and the southern Indian Ocean; even the Ayni Base and Chabahar Road can be seen as elements of this strategic shift beyond the subcontinent. Together with Pakistan’s focus on the Durand Line and events within its own borders, political breathing space between Islamabad and New Delhi has opened up. India-Pakistan talks have already produced a number of important breakthroughs that portend better bilateral days to come: the granting of Most-Favoured Nation status, enhanced trade measures, as well as discussions on the specific parameters of a Kashmir peace based on economic integration. Specifically regarding the Indo-Pak dynamic in Afghanistan, things are less zero-sum than they appear. Important as the Chabahar route is, the combination of road, sea, and even rail links still comes with massive transport costs for India-Afghanistan trade. As S Verma, chairman of Steel Authority of India and the head of a consortium of Indian industries engaged in Afghanistan’s Hajigak iron mine, put it, “over the longer term,” transporting Afghan minerals over Pakistani territory “will be a productive investment. Not just for us, but others in the region including Pakistan. There are license fees, logistics, and so forth.” Meanwhile, Kaustav Chakrabarti of the Observer Research Foundation has suggested “deploying joint Indo-Pak nation building teams” in Afghanistan that include advisors, military trainers, bureaucrats, developments experts, medical crews and NGOs. These teams would “provide additional resources, bridge political polarities, foster cooperation between India and Pakistan and devise means to verify each other’s role, and ultimately, present a long-term mechanism,” guaranteed by India and Pakistan’s geographic proximity, “to ensure Afghanistan’s neutrality.” He cites as a precedent the collaboration between Indian and Pakistani armed forces in “UN peacekeeping missions in hot spots like Somalia.” Full realisation of any Indo-Pak promise will require more space, and time, between the two countries. The interim period, meanwhile, may indeed take a cooling period between the United States and India, who are unlikely to become allies in the fullest sense due to differing tactical approaches. But the strategic fundamentals of the Indo-American rapport- balancing China, expanding trade, and stabilising South Asia- remain intact.

#### India nuclear industry ramping up now

Asian News International, 11/8/12, UK to boost trade and nuclear cooperation with India, Lexis

British Foreign Secretary William Hague said on Thursday that London and New Delhi were on course to double bilateral trade by 2015 and boost nuclear cooperation. Hague, on a short stop-over in New Delhi, held high-level talks with Indian dignitaries, including Foreign Minister Salman Khurshid to strengthen bilateral ties. India offers the largest market for British goods outside the European Union. Addressing reporters in New Delhi, Hague said UK was expected to meet the target of doubling trade with India by 2015. "Since 2010, our partnership has truly become, stronger, wider and deeper already and we are on course to hit our target of doubling trade by 2015. British companies are leading their way in that, investing in India in key sectors such as energy and telecommunications and education," he said. India is the third-largest investor in UK. One of the main beneficiaries of Britain's increased economic focus on India would be the civil nuclear sector. Keeping in mind, India's growing needs for civil nuclear energy, British Foreign Secretary emphasised on strengthening civil nuclear cooperation. "I am also pleased by the progress we are making to strengthen our civil nuclear cooperation both commercially and through our research institutions," he said. India aims to lift its nuclear capacity to 63,000 MW in the next 20 years by adding nearly 30 reactors. The country currently operates 20 mostly small reactors at six sites with a capacity of 4,780 MW, or 2 percent of its total power capacity, according to the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited.

Problems are internal - co-op is useless

Bagchi 12

Indrani Bagchi, staff writer, Times of India, January 2, 2012, " India's energy security challenges", http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Globespotting/entry/india-s-energy-security-challenges

However, India’s quest for energy security now has to take couple of other factors into account - first, a resource nationalism among supplier countries particularly in Africa; and secondly security of transportation of energy. India’s energy security foreign policy has to be closely connected with both its Indian Ocean and South China Sea strategy as well as its Middle East policy, as well as climate change policies. All these policies currently work in silos in the Indian government, which does not make for anything “proactive”. Ultimately, India’s energy security challenges are internal - there are serious challenges in “energy governance”, pricing of resources and power tariffs are distorted, which means that power projects dependent on imported coal are finding it impossible to go onstream. The nuclear sector had brightened with the passage of the India-US nuclear deal. But between Fukushima and a crazy nuclear liability law that is keeping Indian and foreign nuclear companies from the Indian market, the future of nuclear power in India has dimmed.

## asia

#### Risk is high

**Hallinan 12** (Conn Hallinan, Columnist at FPIF, 5/23/2012, "Asia's Mad Arms Race", www.fpif.org/articles/asias\_mad\_arms\_race)

Asia is currently in the middle of an unprecedented arms race that is not only sharpening tensions in the region but also competing with efforts by Asian countries to address poverty and growing economic disparity. The gap between rich and poor—calculated by the Gini coefficient that measures inequality—has increased from 39 percent to 46 percent in China, India, and Indonesia. Although affluent households continue to garner larger and larger portions of the economic pie, “Children born to poor families can be 10 times more likely to die in infancy” than those from wealthy families, according to Changyong Rhee, chief economist of the Asian Development Bank. Guns Over Ghee This inequality trend is particularly acute in India, where life expectancy is low, infant mortality high, education spotty, and illiteracy widespread, despite that country’s status as the third-largest economy in Asia, behind China and Japan. According to an independent charity, the Naandi Foundation, some 42 percent of India’s children are malnourished. Bangladesh, a far poorer country, does considerably better in all these areas. And yet last year India was the world’s leading arms purchaser, exemplified by a $20-billion purchase of high-performance French fighter planes. India is also developing a long-range ballistic missile capable of carrying multiple nuclear warheads, as well as buying submarines and surface craft. Its military budget is set to rise 17 percent this year to $42 billion. “It is ridiculous. We are getting into a useless arms race at the expense of fulfilling the needs of poor people,” Praful Bidwai of the Coalition of Nuclear Disarmament and Peace told The New York Times. China, too, is in the middle of an arms boom that includes beefing up its navy, constructing a new generation of stealth aircraft, and developing a ballistic missile that is potentially capable of neutralizing U.S. carriers near its coast. Beijing’s arms budget has grown at a rate of some 12 percent a year and, at $106.41 billion, is now the second-largest on the planet. The overall U.S. budget for national security—not counting the various wars Washington is embroiled in—runs a little over $800 billion, although some have estimated it at over $1 trillion. Although China has made enormous strides in overcoming poverty, some 250 million Chinese officially are still considered poor, and the country’s formerly red-hot economy is cooling. “Data on April spending and output put another nail into hopes that China’s economy is bottoming out,” Mark Williams, chief Asia economist at Capital Economics, told the Financial Times. The same is true for most of Asia. For instance, India’s annual economic growth rate has fallen from 9 percent to 6.1 percent over the past two and a half years. Regional Tensions Tensions between China and other nations in the region have set off a local arms race. Taiwan is buying four U.S.-made Perry-class guided missile frigates, and Japan has shifted much of its military from its northern islands to face southward toward China. The Philippines are spending almost $1 billion on new aircraft and radar, and recently held joint war games with the United States. South Korea has just successfully tested a long-range cruise missile. Washington is reviving ties with Indonesia’s brutal military because the island nation controls the strategic seaways through which pass most of the region’s trade and energy supplies. Australia is also re-orienting its defense to face China, and Australian Defense Minister Stephen Smith has urged “that India play the role it could and should as an emerging great power in the security and stability of the region.” But that “role” is by no means clear, and some have read Smith’s statement as an attempt to rope New Delhi into a united front against Beijing. The recent test of India’s Agni V nuclear-capable ballistic missile is largely seen as directed at China. India and China fought a brief but nasty border war in 1962, and India claims China is currently occupying some 15,000 square miles of Indian territory. The Chinese, in turn, claim almost 40,000 square miles of the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh. Although Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh says that “overall our relations [with China] are quite good,” he also admits “the border problem is a long-standing problem.” India and China also had a short dust up last year when a Chinese warship demanded that the Indian amphibious assault vessel Airavat identify itself shortly after the ship left the port of Hanoi, Vietnam. Nothing came of the incident, but Indian President Pratibha Patil has since stressed the need for “maritime security” and “the protection of our coasts, our ‘sea lines of communications,’ and the offshore development areas.” China’s forceful stance in the South China Sea has stirred up tensions with Vietnam, Taiwan, Brunei, and Malaysia as well. A standoff last month between a Philippine warship and several Chinese surveillance ships at Scarborough Shoal is still on a low simmer. China’s more assertive posture in the region stems largely from the 1995-96 Taiwan Straits crisis that saw two U.S. carriers humiliate Beijing in its home waters. There was little serious danger of war during the crisis—China does not have the capability to invade Taiwan—but the Clinton administration took the opportunity to demonstrate U.S. naval power. China’s naval build-up dates from that incident. The recent “pivot” by Obama administration toward Asia, including a military buildup on Wake and Guam and the deployment of 2,500 Marines in Australia, has heightened tensions in the region, and Beijing’s heavy-handedness in the South China Sea has given Washington an opening to insert itself into the dispute. China is prickly about its home waters—one can hardly blame it, given the history of the past 100 years—but there is no evidence that it is expansionist. A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said in February, “No country, including China, has claimed sovereignty over the entire South China Sea.” Nor does Beijing seem eager to use military force. Beijing has drawn some lessons from its disastrous 1979 invasion of Vietnam. On the other hand, Beijing is seriously concerned about who controls the region’s seas, in part because some 80 percent of China’s energy supplies pass through maritime choke points controlled by the United States and its allies. Eisenhower’s Warning The tensions in Asia are real, if not as sharp or deep as they have been portrayed in the U.S. media. China and India do, indeed, have border “problems,” but China also describes itself and New Delhi as “not competitors but partners,” and has even offered an alliance to keep “foreign powers”—read the United States and NATO—from meddling in the region.

#### They read a card that Indo-Pak is likely

#### That’s extinction

Ghulam Nabi Fai, executive director of the Kashmiri American Council, July 8, ‘1, The Washington Times, “The most dangerous place,” p. B4

The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could **trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe**. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries. Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

## remittances

#### It’s the biggest determinant of growth – even outweighs IT

Rajan, associate fellow – Center for Development Studies, ‘7

(S. Irudaya, http://www.iss.nl/content/download/8303/81035/file/Panel%202\_Rajan.pdf)

According to the estimates of the World Bank, the remittances have grown steadily from $ 0.08 million in 1970, to $ 2.8 billion in 1980, $ 3.4 billion in 1991, about $ 11.7 billion in 2000 and $ 23 billion in 2004 (Table 7). Similarly, the proportion of remittances to gross national product has increased from a negligible 0.14 per cent in 1970 to about 2 per cent in 2000 and close to five per cent in recent years, thus **constituting a tremendous contribution to the Indian economy**. It should be borne in mind that these estimates of the flows of remittances are based solely on formal channels of transfers and that flows through informal channels such as hawala are not taken into account. The true level of remittances would be much higher than the official estimates, if we include undocumented financial flows also. To understand the true significance of remittances, **a comparison with the software sector** would be of help. The Reserve of India figures show that during the period April- December 2003, earnings from software amounted to $8.63 billion. Private remittances during the same period were over $14.8 billion. Remittances were sufficient to finance the entire merchandise trade deficit for India for the period. They have kept in check current account deficits several previous years too. Non-resident Indian remittances were more than double the Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) investments of $8.2 billion during the year 2003-2004. (The Hindu, 2004).

## uq

#### The GOP is receptive

Micah Cohen, NYTimes, 2/8/13, Signs of a Shift on Immigration Among G.O.P. Rank-and-File, fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/08/signs-of-a-shift-on-immigration-among-g-o-p-rank-and-file/

With notable speed after the Nov. 6 presidential election, a number of Republican politicians and opinions makers — from House Speaker John A. Boehner to the talk show host Sean Hannity — altered their positions on immigration and expressed a new openness to comprehensive reform. Since then, the push to overhaul the nation’s immigration system appears to have sustained momentum. A new ABC News/Washington Post poll found a jump in public approval of President Obama’s handling of immigration, and most recent polls have found a majority of Americans support providing immigrants who have come here illegally a pathway to United States citizenship. So, has the shift on immigration among some — but not all — Republican legislators, strategists and media personalities filtered down to rank-and-file Republicans? The polling evidence — with a few significant caveats — says “possibly, yes.” There are signs of an uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship, or at least a conditional pathway to citizenship. First, the caveats. Tracking opinions on immigration policy over time is tricky because each pollster asks different questions with different options, making for apples-to-oranges comparisons. In addition, when narrowing the focus to self-identified Republicans and Republican leaners, small sample sizes and large margin of sampling errors become a problem. A typical national survey includes about 1,000 respondents, making the subsample of Republicans pretty small, usually around 200 to 300. But keeping those disclaimers in mind, the most recent polls on immigration suggest an increase in the percentage of Republicans who favor immigration reform that includes a route to United States citizenship. On average, the share of Republicans who favor providing undocumented immigrants with a path to citizenship is 48 percent among the six national polls released so far in 2013 and included in the PollingReport.com database. (The release of a CNN poll conducted Jan. 14-15 did not provide a breakdown by political party and is not included in the average). Among the six previous polls that asked about a pathway to citizenship and released results by party identification, an average of only 38 percent of Republicans favored providing a path to citizenship. Question wording has an effect here. Two of the polls that found the highest level of Republican support emphasized the requirements illegal immigrants might have to meet to become citizens. Conservative voters might be more likely to support a path to citizenship if it involves certain qualifications. For instance, a Fox News poll conducted Jan. 15-17 among registered voters found that 56 percent of Republicans said the government should “allow illegal immigrants to remain in the country and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes, learning English, and passing a background check.” And a Gallup poll released this week found that 59 percent of Republicans would vote for “a law that would allow undocumented immigrants living in the United States the chance to become legal residents or citizens if they meet certain requirements.” On the other hand, a CBS News poll of adults conducted Jan. 24-27 found that only 35 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants currently working in the country “should be allowed to stay in their jobs and to eventually apply for U.S. citizenship.” (CBS found that 25 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants should be able to stay as guest workers and 36 percent said they should be required to leave the United States). The apples-to-apples comparisons we have are more mixed: Republican support in the mid-January AP/GfK poll jumped to 53 percent from 31 percent in 2010. The latest ABC News/Washington Post poll moved to 42 percent Republican support for a path to citizenship from 37 percent in November 2012 (that’s inside the margin of sampling error). The CBS News poll did not move at all, finding 35 percent Republican support in both its December 2012 and late January 2013 surveys. And Quinnipiac polls, released on Thursday and in early December 2012, both found roughly 40 percent of registered Republicans support a path to citizenship and just more than 10 percent support legal status without citizenship. An uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship could be statistical noise. And even if it is real, it could reverse itself. Some political science research suggests that anti-immigrant attitudes increase when immigration is in the news. But there are reasons to think that immigration, over all, has become less of a hot-button issue. A Pew study found that the number of illegal immigrants living in the United States has dropped since the 2007 push for change. Another Pew survey found that only 44 percent of Republicans see dealing with immigration as a top priority. That’s down from previous peaks of 69 percent in 2007 and 61 percent in 2011. Further polling is needed before a more concrete picture of Republican attitudes emerges. But if Republican voters have warmed to providing a conditional path to citizenship, it could increase the likelihood of an overhaul becoming law by **freeing House Republicans, in particular, to back some kind of reform.**

#### Ignore older ev

David Graham, The Atlantic, 2/7/13, Why Immigration-Reform Advocates Feel Good About Their Chances, www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/why-immigration-reform-advocates-feel-good-about-their-chances/272977/

The way John McCain and Michael Bennet talk about it, you'd be surprised immigration reform hasn't passed already. "We have the opportunity to pass a broad-based bill that deals not just with one problem or two problem but takes on the entire of array in ways this touches our economy," said Bennet, a Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado, at an Atlantic conference in Washington Thursday. (Bennet is the brother of Atlantic Editor in Chief James Bennet.) "I do think you've got two parties that've got reasons to get this done." And McCain, as usual, was colorful and blunt. A veteran of several failed attempts at reform, he offered one big explanation for why this time would be different. "The climate has changed, American opinion has changed, elections have changed ... and I'm working with people who are effective," he said. "Chuck Schumer is effective. I hate him! But he's effective." Of course, there's more to it, especially for Republicans like McCain, who along with Bennet is a member of the "Gang of Eight" senators working on a bipartisan proposal. The Arizonan pinpointed three reasons this is the time to get reform done. One is simple political math: As many Republicans seem to be realizing, the GOP will find it harder and harder to win elections if it continues to alienate Latino voters. A second is technological, he said, repeatedly citing drones and other technological advances developed to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as useful tools for policing the border with Mexico more effectively. But much of it comes down to fairness, he concluded. "Can we leave 11 million people in the shadows forever?" McCain asked, referring to the estimated number of illegal immigrants in the country. "The people that wash our dishes, cut our lawns, take care of our children -- is it right to leave them in the shadows forever? I don't think so." Intriguingly, the two Democratic senators who bookended McCain's appearance -- Bennet and Minnesota's Amy Klobuchar -- offered economic rationales for reform, while the Republican made the compassionate case. But what's interesting is how views often associated with one party or the other seem to have been pushed aside, if not totally dispensed with. Bennet said it was reasonable to expect immigrants to learn English, and he said it was fine to make legislation contingent upon border security as long as employee verification, the standard Democratic priority, was part of a comprehensive bill. Bennet would offer only oblique criticism of GOP hardliners like David Vitter and Ted Cruz, saying, "There are some people that are better at putting themselves in other people's shoes that others." Meanwhile, the occasionally cranky McCain was all smiles and jokes, with praise for both Klobuchar and Bennet; he saved his fire for budgetary matters. Asked about the sequester -- which he voted for -- he said, "It's insane, and it's unacceptable." And he criticized his 2008 rival Barack Obama's campaign-style strategy of barnstorming the country to drum up grassroots backing for his side. The real solution, McCain said, was to invite legislators to the White House to hash out a compromise. "There's no point in going out and giving another speech." There should be no illusion that the road forward on immigration reform will be smooth. Panelists identified two big ones. First is the already-cliched "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants, which McCain pointed out was likely to disappoint some advocates -- it won't be a walk in the park. The second sticking point is likely to be a guest-worker program. While lawmakers in both parties seem to agree that the country should lift caps on visas for highly skilled workers, the fate of agricultural and other low-skill workers seems certain to provoke acrimonious debate. For the time being, however, it's the not-inconsiderable common ground between the parties that's on display.

## at: rothman

#### He’s key to its success

John Avlon, Daily Beast, 1/31/13, Immigration Reform Proposal Shows Similar Ideas Betweeen Bush and Obama, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/31/immigration-reform-proposal-shows-similar-ideas-betweeen-bush-and-obama.html

Wehner’s comments cut to the heart of the lessons learned. After essentially ignoring immigration reform in its first term, the Obama administration is front-loading the ambitious effort and—for the time, at least—**deferring to the Gang of Eight in hopes that it might be** less polarizing if the president’s name isn’t on the bill when senators from the opposing party try to sell it to their base. The death of the Bush bill came largely at the hands of a right-wing talk-radio revolt that attacked any path to citizenship as “amnesty.” The fact that then–presidential candidate John McCain was sponsoring the bill with none other than Ted Kennedy created an opening for competitors like Mitt Romney to try to get to McCain’s right in a play to the primary’s conservative populist cheap seats. But the other hostile front came from resurgent House Democrats who frankly did not want to give the polarizing lame-duck incumbent named Bush a political win. Fast-forward six years, and the right-wing talk-radio crowd is weakened. The evangelical, law-enforcement, and business communities are now united behind comprehensive immigration reform. Responsible Republicans know they cannot afford to alienate Hispanics any longer. And the presence of Florida Sen. Marco Rubio—a onetime Jeb Bush protégé—is an essential addition to the coalition. “Senator Rubio, a Tea Party choice, is well respected and well liked and trusted,” adds Wehner. “With him as the lead in these negotiations, conservatives are more willing to consider immigration reform than in the past. You’re not seeing the explosion of opposition now that we saw in 2007. That doesn’t mean it won’t happen; but for now, it hasn’t.” Long story short: it’s much easier for Marco Rubio to make the case for the Senate’s bipartisan path to citizenship than to argue on behalf of President Obama’s bill, which would be a nonstarter to much of the base. And so the president wisely held off from offering his specific policy vision in the much-hyped Las Vegas speech earlier this week. It’s not unlike the reason Harry Truman gave for naming the postwar European-aid bill after his secretary of state, George Marshall: “Anything that is sent up to the Senate and House with my name on it will quiver a couple of times and then turn over and die.” Unlike Truman and George W. Bush, however, Obama is pushing for this bill at a time of maximum political capital and national popularity, **with polls showing his approval rating at nearing 60 percent**. To truly depolarize this policy debate, it’s tempting to imagine Obama enlisting President Bush to make the sale to the nation. But W. has made a determined effort to stay out of political and policy debates since leaving 1600. The first post-election policy event of the Bush Center was a conference on immigration reform, in which the former president let himself wax poetic on his unfinished legacy: “America can be a lawful society and a welcoming society at the same time,” he said. “As our nation debates the proper course of action relating to immigration, I hope we do so with a benevolent spirit and keep in mind the spirit of immigrants.” A lead researcher the Bush Center, Matthew Denhart, hails Washington’s full circle. “It’s funny how politics work sometimes—the details of immigration reform announced this week by the Senate and White House are virtually indistinguishable from what was advanced by President Bush and other leaders in 2007 ... While it’s unfortunate immigration reform failed to pass Congress five years ago and has languished ever since, the current plan holds promise to boost economic growth, which should be our country’s top priority.” Other Bush allies, like the Goldwater Institute’s Clint Bolick, who co-authored a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed on immigration reform with Jeb Bush, are balancing optimism with skepticism as they look at the current proposal: “It is a step forward with some excellent features,” says Bolick. “But entering the country has to have a consequence, and providing a path to citizenship rather than permanent residency will encourage future illegal immigration, just as the 1986 law did. It also fails to confront preferences for distant-family members that crowd out work-based immigration. But it is great to see Republicans and Democrats coming to grips with immigration issues.” The renewed atmosphere of something like bipartisanship is refreshing—and, of course, needed, to get anything done in a divided government. But one final irony is worth noting. The current Gang of Eight plan learns the lesson of opposition to the 2007 proposal by front-loading border security before any progress toward a pathway to citizenship is made. The trigger mechanism and metrics for establishing this success are still unclear. But the fact is that border security dramatically increased during the Obama administration’s first term, with officials almost doubling the number of agents patrolling the border from what was in place when Bush made his speech to the nation. The walls have continued to be built, and criminal deportations have hit record highs. Combined with the effects of the Great Recession, which reduced demand for undocumented workers, the Obama administration has quietly accumulated a record of success on a front usually considered a conservative policy priority. And so the stars seem to be aligning into one of those moments where, as Seamus Heaney once wrote, “hope and history rhyme.” **Make no mistake—there is still plenty of time for Washington to screw this up. But there is urgency to the effort,** rooted in the parties’ individual self-interest as well as the national interest. After all, if President Obama and President Bush can agree on the substance of something as contentious as immigration reform, surely it isn’t too much to hope that our divided Congress can find a way to reason together on this issue.

#### But, fights mean Obama pushes his own bill which fails

Howard Kurtz, Daily Beast, 1/29/13, President Obama Embraces the Senate’s Bipartisan Immigration Plan, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/29/president-obama-embraces-the-senate-s-bipartisan-immigration-plan.html

President Obama made a crucial tactical shift on Tuesday as he offered a full-throated appeal for immigration reform, embracing the plan cobbled together by a group of senators from both parties. Despite predictions that Obama would unveil a significantly more liberal approach than the group led by John McCain, Marco Rubio, and Chuck Schumer, he made the calculation that having big-name Republicans on board could break the logjam on Capitol Hill. Speaking from Las Vegas, the president wasted little time praising “a bipartisan group of senators announced their principles for comprehensive immigration reform, which are very much in line with the principles I’ve proposed and campaigned on for the last few years.” Translation: I’m on board. But Obama also wielded a stick, saying if Congress doesn’t act quickly, he would send up his own bill. Obama spoke of the 11 million illegal immigrants by saying “yes, they broke the rules,” but can no longer be allowed to “live in the shadows.” And he said the “pathway to citizenship” he would create would require those here illegally to go to the “back of the line,” behind legal applicants. “It won’t be a quick process, but it will be a fair process, and will lift these individuals out of the shadows.” With that single sentence, he mirrored the Senate approach. Obama made a bow toward greater enforcement but stressed the need to think of immigrants as human beings, not an abstract problem. The major question now is whether John Boehner’s House will be receptive to a compromise approach after an election in which Mitt Romney performed miserably among Hispanic voters. The key element of the Senate proposal is that while the nation’s illegal immigrants would in effect be legalized, they would not be able to become citizens until border security and employer verification of immigration status are beefed up. Only then would those here illegally be able to pursue citizenship by paying a fine and back taxes. The Washington Post, citing an unnamed administration official, reported Tuesday morning that Obama would call for a faster and more straightforward path to citizenship for undocumented workers and students, out of concern that a cumbersome process could create delays that could last for decades. But Obama did not do that. He made a pitch for how reform would help the economy, saying that Intel and Instagram were created by immigrants who came here and stayed. **This may be a rare moment when the stars are aligned**. What passes for the Republican establishment, including such figures as Karl Rove, is lining up behind the Senate plan. McCain, who has frequently been at odds with Obama since losing to him in 2008, seems prepared to play the kind of dealmaking role that was his signature before his second presidential campaign. And Obama faced little backlash last year after suspending enforcement against illegal immigrants under 30 who were brought to the U.S. when they were under 16. But immigration reform has proved utterly elusive since 1986, when Ronald Reagan and congressional Democrats passed a law aimed at what were then the 3 million illegal immigrants in the country. George W. Bush tried, and failed, to muscle a bill through Congress, but the GOP has taken a sharp turn toward harsher rhetoric in recent years—at least until Obama won reelection. In a bit of deft maneuvering, the Senate gang of eight—which includes Linsdey Graham and Dick Durbin—announced its agreement on Monday, getting out ahead of Obama’s speech. Had the president put forth a substantially different plan, he would have undermined the Senate effort and complicated the political salesmanship. But many House Republicans view any path to legalization as a form of amnesty for those who broke the law. “This will be the end of the Republican Party if it passes,” GOP Rep. Lou Barletta told The Daily Beast earlier. The lingering question is whether enough House conservatives will follow the lead of their Senate counterparts in an environment in which the party is becoming increasingly less competitive with a fast-growing demographic. Rubio, the son of Cuban-American immigrants, could provide cover for Republicans who fear being perceived as soft on the issue. Rubio hailed the gang of eight’s agreement for its “straightforward principle” that “we have to modernize our legal immigration system, we have to have a real enforcement mechanism to ensure we’re never here again in the future, and we have to deal with the people that are here now in a way that’s responsible but humane.” With a budget deal far from certain and the prospects for gun-control legislation daunting at best, immigration reform may offer Obama his best chance of a major second-term achievement.
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#### PC key to force a vote

Ronald Brownstein, National Jouranl, 1/31/13, On Immigration, What Obama Can Learn From Bush's Failed Efforts, www.nationaljournal.com/columns/political-connections/on-immigration-what-obama-can-learn-from-bush-s-failed-efforts-20130131

The prospects for major immigration reform are now the brightest in years, but for key players in Washington, a shadow still looms: the ghost of 2006. That was the last time the stars were aligned for a breakthrough. Immigration reform that included a path to citizenship for those in the United States illegally had the support of President Bush, a broad labor-business-faith coalition, and a bipartisan Senate majority. Yet that armada ultimately splintered against the stony refusal of House Republican leaders to consider a bill opposed by a majority of their majority. Any of that sound familiar? Already many of the same dynamics are developing, with President Obama stamping immigration reform as a top priority, a bipartisan Senate coalition reassembling, a broad outside alliance of support groups coalescing—and most House Republicans rejecting anything that hints at “amnesty” for illegal immigrants. Yet the contrasts between now and 2006, particularly in the political climate, are also significant. Understanding both the similarities and the differences will be critical for reform advocates if they are to avoid replicating the disappointment they suffered under Bush. Presidential interest was then, as it is now, critical in elevating immigration reform. Since his days as Texas governor, Bush had courted Hispanics, and—even during the 2000 GOP presidential primary campaign—he strikingly defended illegal immigrants as “moms and dads” trying to make a better life for their children. Together with his political “architect,” Karl Rove, Bush saw comprehensive reform that coupled a path to citizenship with tougher enforcement as an opportunity to consolidate the beachhead that allowed him to capture more than 40 percent of Hispanic voters in his 2004 reelection. But Bush largely looked away when Republicans who controlled the House channeled that impulse in a very different direction. In December 2005, they passed an enforcement-only bill drafted by Judiciary Committee Chairman Jim Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, that, for the first time, designated all undocumented immigrants as felons. (Previously, illegal presence in the U.S. had been a civil, not criminal, violation.) Initially, debate in the GOP-controlled Senate drifted. Majority Leader Bill Frist, considering a 2008 presidential bid, pushed his own enforcement-only bill. But amid the backdrop of huge public rallies against Sensenbrenner’s proposal, Sen. Arlen Specter unexpectedly joined with three other Republicans and all eight Judiciary Committee Democrats in late March to approve a comprehensive plan, including a path to citizenship, that followed a blueprint negotiated by Sens. Edward Kennedy and John McCain. When broader Senate agreement teetered over the terms of legalization, Republican Sens. Chuck Hagel and Mel Martinez devised a compromise that divided illegal immigrants into three categories, requiring those here less than two years to leave but allowing those with deeper roots to eventually earn citizenship by paying fines and learning English. After Bush finally delivered a national address on immigration, a bill embodying that plan cleared the Senate with 62 votes, including support from 23 Republicans. House Republicans immediately signaled their disinterest by refusing to appoint a conference committee and instead scheduled hearings in border communities to highlight security lapses. “Border security reigned supreme,” recalls Ron Bonjean, the communications director for then-Speaker Dennis Hastert. “I remember being in a meeting with … the leadership where pollsters came in and said border security was the key to our reelection.” Even in 2006, something like the Senate plan likely could have attracted 218 votes in the House—but not a majority of Republicans. Faced with a collision between his two political imperatives—courting Hispanics and mobilizing conservatives—Bush blinked**, allowing House leaders to replace the Senate bill with enforcement-only legislation**, which he signed that fall. These choices began the GOP’s slide among Hispanics that continues unabated: Hispanic support for Republican House candidates plummeted from 44 percent in 2004 to just 29 percent in 2006, presaging Mitt Romney’s disastrous 27 percent showing among those voters in 2012. That slippage is one of the two most important differences in the political environment around immigration between 2006 and today. Back then, as Bonjean notes, hardly any House Republicans argued that the GOP needed to pass a plan attractive to minorities. But many GOP leaders now see that as self-preservation. “The political imperative has shifted the tectonic plates,” says Frank Sharry, a key player in the 2006 debate who remains central as executive director of America’s Voice, which backs full citizenship for immigrants. “Immigration was viewed as a wedge issue for Republicans in 2006. Now it’s viewed as a wedge issue for Democrats.” The “Gang of Eight” proposal released this week makes it likely that, as in 2006, the Senate will eventually pass a bipartisan immigration bill. Once again, there are probably 218 House votes for such a plan, but not a majority of the majority Republicans. **That raises a**nother **key difference** from 2006: Hastert faced little pressure to consider the Senate bill, because Bush bit his tongue when the speaker buried it**.** If House Republicans shelve another bipartisan Senate plan in 2013, they should expect much more public heat, because Obama won’t be as deferential.

#### And momentum

Bill Keller, NYTimes, 2/3/13, Selling Amnesty, www.nytimes.com/2013/02/04/opinion/keller-selling-amnesty.html?pagewanted=print

The good news is that the anti-immigration side has no lobbying equivalent of the National Rifle Association, no group with its hands so firmly on the throats of Congress that it can override public opinion. But the bill will face a reservoir of popular fear, resentment and misunderstanding. President **Obama** and the indefatigable Senator Charles Schumer **will work the Democratic constituencies and rally public support**, but the hard sell is up to a few key Republicans who understand that this is their party’s best hope of redemption with the surging Latino electorate. So far the most effective antidote to right-wing opposition has been Senator Rubio. In the days after the Gang of Eight unveiled its proposal the Floridian made the rounds of the shouting heads on the conservative media circuit, arguing the case. By the time Rubio was done, Rush Limbaugh was unconvinced but muted, and Sean Hannity, who announced after the November election that he had “evolved” on the issue, was calling it “the most thoughtful proposal that I’ve heard.” Karl Rove, another Fox talker, who tried unsuccessfully to sell immigration reform when he was President George W. Bush’s right arm, called the Senate principles “a huge step forward.” Fox pundits, perhaps mindful that their owner, Rupert Murdoch, recently came out for a path to citizenship, have avoided using the A-word to describe the latest proposals. Rubio could bolster the case for legalizing undocumented immigrants by making more of the economics. My conservative colleague David Brooks has spelled out the rosiest economic case for increased immigration, including legalization of the undocumented. I would add a point made by Gordon Hanson, who studies immigration economics at the University of California, San Diego. Hanson points out that giving the 11 million undocumented immigrants provisional legal status would greatly improve the odds that their children would become educated, productive, taxpaying members of society rather than drains on the economy. **Supporters of reform are moving with unusual speed, hoping to** build up momentum that will carry over to the House. They aim to get a bill through the Senate this summer, leaving much of 2013 for the House to act before representatives are completely immersed in midterm electoral politics.

#### Obama capital key to lobbying pressure—it’s empirically successful

David Nakamura, WaPo, 2/4/13, Obama to meet with labor, business leaders on immigration, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2013/02/04/obama-to-meet-with-labor-business-leaders-on-immigration/?wprss=rss\_politics

President Obama will meet separately Tuesday with labor and business leaders on immigration reform, as the White House seeks to enlist the often at-odds interest groups in a common push toward a comprehensive legislative package. Obama has invited 16 labor and progressive leaders, including the heads of the AFL-CIO and NAACP, to the White House at 11 a.m., and a dozen big business chief executives, including the heads of Coca Cola, Goldman Sachs and Yahoo, at 3:20 p.m. The president “will continue his dialogue with outside leaders on a number of issues – including immigration reform and how it fits into his broader economic agenda, and his efforts to achieve balanced deficit reduction,” the White House announced. The lobbying strategy is similar to the script Obama followed in the recent negotiations over the fiscal cliff, when he also met with labor and business groups. The White House believes that increasing pressure on Congress from different interest groups with large networks outside Washington will help Obama in his pursuit of an ambitious second-term agenda, including stricter gun-control laws and immigration reform.

#### Bipart is premised on pressure

John Dickerson, 1/31/13, Bipartisan Baloney, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/gang\_of\_eight\_immigration\_reform\_why\_republicans\_and\_democrats\_agreeing.html

Amateur meteorologists claim to have spotted other flickers of the bipartisan phenomena. President Obama and Republican leaders reached a deal on a three-month extension of the debt limit and a bill to aid the victims of Hurricane Sandy. These are not historic acts, but why not raise a glass in tribute if for no other reason than to break the monotony of having to constantly raise a glass to drown our frustration. But let's not mistake this for genuine bipartisanship. Or, if this is the new standard for bipartisanship, then we should change our definition of it. These examples of ghost bipartisanship are born from pressure, not cooperation. Lawmakers aren't reasoning together; one side is crying uncle. **That will** almost **certainly be true of any immigration reform measure that passes** (if the reform effort doesn’t break down under the weight of the partisanship itself). The folk story of bipartisanship goes like this: The two parties tackle a common problem, they fight like hell, but both sides ultimately give up something to get a deal. In 1983, Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill negotiated a compromise over Social Security. In 1990, George H.W. Bush forged a deal to reduce the deficit with Democratic leaders. In 1997, Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich hammered out a balanced budget agreement. These bipartisan moments were not simply the product of reason divorced from acrimony and politics. As President Truman said, "There was never a nonpartisan in politics. A man cannot be a nonpartisan and be effective in a political party." But today’s droplets of bipartisanship are distinct from that tradition. They come not from shared sacrifice but from one side giving in. Charles Krauthammer says Republicans got rolled on the fiscal cliff talks. The Weekly Standard and Sen. Rand Paul say Republicans blinked on the debt limit fight. On the issue of immigration, the bipartisan opportunities exist not because wise men from both parties have decided to solve one of the nation's most pressing issues, but because Republicans are giving in to the pressure created by the last election. This fact is clear by the host of Republicans who once opposed or were skeptical of any immigration-reform package that included “amnesty” but who are now supporting it. It’s not about policy; it’s about politics. Similarly, on the question of gun control, there is an emerging consensus that Congress will support background checks for gun purchases. This too could be called bipartisanship, except that it’s an emergency event brought on by the Newtown, Conn., massacre, which means it tells us nothing about the baseline health of bipartisanship. If recent cooperation shouldn’t be confused with new bipartisan vigor, there’s another new reason to be skeptical: history. Barack Obama's re-election marks only the second time that three consecutive presidents have served consecutive two-year terms. The last time was Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. This gives us three modern examples of the presidential learning curve. After re-election, presidents of both parties draw the same conclusion: Bipartisanship is a pipe dream. In Bill Clinton's second inaugural address, he declared his election would bring about a new bipartisan era. "The American people returned to office a president of one party and a Congress of another. Surely they did not do this to advance the politics of petty bickering and extreme partisanship they plainly deplore." This was true long enough for the president to reach a budget deal with Republicans—just before his second term devolved into impeachment hearings. When Republicans pursued him for lying to a grand jury and obstructing justice, Clinton interpreted it as nothing more than blind partisanship. In 2004, after George W. Bush was re-elected, the man who once promised to unite and not divide entered his second term with a far dimmer view of compromise. "I've got the will of the people at my back," he said despite his narrow victory. Bush’s definition of bipartisanship meant other people falling in line: "I'll reach out to everyone who shares our goals." Bush later admitted that when giving his State of the Union address, he relished the partisan reaction it provoked. "Sometimes I look through that teleprompter and see reactions. I'm not going to characterize what the reactions are, but nevertheless it causes me to want to lean a little more forward into the prompter, if you know what I mean. Maybe it's the mother in me." Like Clinton, President Obama faces the prospect of hammering out deals with a divided government, but he reached the opposite conclusion. The president’s aggressive second-term trajectory was evident even before he gave his inauguration speech, but the speech set the emotional tone for a second term full of conflicts. When Obama’s top political adviser argues that Democrats don’t have “an opposition party worthy of the opportunity,” it cemented the proof. There may be bipartisan progress in the months to come, but it will be of a tougher kind. Members of the two parties may join arms and make a deal, but it won’t be the result of fellow feeling, conciliation, or understanding. If there’s going to be gang-like behavior that achieves bipartisanship, it’s more likely to come through a headlock than a hug.

#### Democratic unity key to immigration

AP, 2/6/13, Obama presses Senate Democrats on strategy for tough fights ahead at annual retreat, www.washingtonpost.com/business/obama-trying-to-sell-senate-democrats-at-annual-retreat-on-a-strategy-for-tough-fights-ahead/2013/02/06/c6f7ace8-7034-11e2-b3f3-b263d708ca37\_story.html

With a big to-do list at the start of his second term, President Barack Obama is trying to sell Democrats on his strategy for tackling immigration, gun control and a host of fiscal dilemmas. Obama met behind closed doors for more than two hours Wednesday with lawmakers from his own party at the Senate Democrats’ annual retreat at a hotel in Annapolis, Md. House Democrats will hear from Obama at their annual retreat Thursday in Leesburg, Va. Senate Democratic unity will be critical to Obama’s prospects for enacting the ambitious agenda he’s laid out for the start of his second term. Almost all the items he’s seeking face opposition from Senate Republicans — not to mention the even stronger opposition Obama is likely to run up against if and when the GOP-controlled House takes up those items. The White House said Obama spoke briefly, took questions from 10 of the senators assembled, then spent an hour chatting with them in smaller groups. Obama’s spokesman, Jay Carney said the session was focused on coordinating what Democratic senators are doing with the administration’s own efforts to promote Obama’s priorities. High on the agenda was immigration, where Carney said Obama would note the “significant progress” made toward a bipartisan deal. Obama is letting the Senate take the lead on crafting comprehensive immigration legislation, including a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants. But he is using all the power that the presidency affords to implore lawmakers to act without delay. A bipartisan Senate group has reached agreement on the broad outlines of such an overhaul, but a few thorny issues remain, including a possible guest-worker program and whether to delay steps toward citizenship until certain border-security measures are in place.

#### Hirsch agrees

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “**It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says** Norman **Ornstein** of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”

#### The plan disrupts sequencing matters

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

**Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course**, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But **the real problem was that the plan was** unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had **settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood**.

Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it **distracted the government’s attention** from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

#### Wins don’t spillover—capital is finite and decreases—prioritizing it is key to 100-day agenda success

David Schultz, professor at Hamline University School of Business, 1/22/13, Obama's dwindling prospects in a second term, www.minnpost.com/community-voices/2013/01/obamas-dwindling-prospects-second-term

Four more years for Obama. Now what? What does Barack Obama do in his second term and what can he accomplish? Simply put, his options are limited and the prospects for major success quite limited.

Presidential power is the power to persuade, as Richard Neustadt famously stated. Many factors determine presidential power and the ability to influence including personality (as James David Barber argued), attitude toward power, margin of victory, public support, support in Congress, and one’s sense of narrative or purpose.

Additionally, presidential power is temporal, often greatest when one is first elected, and it is contextual, affected by competing items on an agenda. All of these factors affect the political power or capital of a president.

Presidential power also is a finite and generally decreasing product. The first hundred days in office – so marked forever by FDR’s first 100 in 1933 – are usually a honeymoon period, during which presidents often get what they want. FDR gets the first New Deal, Ronald Reagan gets Kemp-Roth, George Bush in 2001 gets his tax cuts.

Presidents lose political capital, support

But, over time, presidents lose political capital. Presidents get distracted by world and domestic events, they lose support in Congress or among the American public, or they turn into lame ducks. This is the problem Obama now faces.

Obama had a lot of political capital when sworn in as president in 2009. He won a decisive victory for change with strong approval ratings and had majorities in Congress — with eventually a filibuster margin in the Senate, when Al Franken finally took office in July. Obama used his political capital to secure a stimulus bill and then pass the Affordable Care Act. He eventually got rid of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell and secured many other victories. But Obama was a lousy salesman, and he lost what little control of Congress that he had in the 2010 elections.

## at: loan guarantees

#### No new or actual increases- just extensions of previous allocations to nuclear

Baker, 12 -- Energy Boom writer

(Joseph, "Obama's Proposed 2013 Budget Allots $27 Billion for the Department of Energy," 2-14-12, www.energyboom.com/policy/united-states-obamas-proposed-2013-budget-decreases-doe-funding, accessed 9-13-12)

President Barack Obama has requested $27.2 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) as part of the 2013 budget proposal he has put forth to the United States Congress. At face value $27.2 billion may seem like a lot of money; however, relative the total $3.7 trillion the President has asked to spend, the DOE's portion is a drop in the bucket. Additionally, while spending increases have been proposed for many departments like the Internal Revenue Service (up 4.7% from 2012 to $92.1 billion), the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (up 8.4% from 2012 to $1.18 trillion) and the Federal Highway Administration (the largest increase from 2012 up 103% to $81.1 billion), the DOE allotment is down $2.3 billion from what the president originally asked for in the 2012 budget. Even amidst the decrease, Energy Secretary Steven Chu hailed the budget request, saying: “The choice we face as a nation is simple: do we want the clean energy technologies of tomorrow to be invented in America by American innovators, made by American workers and sold around the world, or do we want to concede those jobs to our competitors? We can and must compete for those jobs. This budget request includes responsible investments in an American economy that is built to last.” On Monday, while speaking about the 2013 budget proposal Obama said, "In the State of the Union, I outlined a blueprint for an economy that is built to last -– an economy built on new manufacturing, and new sources of energy, and new skills and education for the American people. Today, we’re releasing the details of that blueprint in the form of next year’s budget." In terms of supporting "new sources of energy" here is how the funding will be dolled out to the DOE: $60 million to perform critical research on energy storage systems and devise new approaches for battery storage. $770 million for nuclear energy, including $65 million for cost-shared awards to support first-of-a-kind small modular reactors and $60 million for nuclear waste R&D that aligns with the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future. $276 million for research and development of advanced fossil fuel power systems and carbon capture, utilization and storage technologies to allow for the continued use of our abundant domestic coal resources while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. $350 million for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) to continue support for promising early-stage research projects that could deliver game-changing clean energy technologies. $120 million to support the Energy Frontier Research Centers and $140 million for the five existing Energy Innovation Hubs and to establish a new hub to focus on grid systems and the tie between transmission and distribution systems. $11.5 billion to protect Americans by maintaining U.S. nuclear deterrence capabilities, reducing nuclear dangers in an increasingly unstable and unpredictable world, and providing for the Navy’s nuclear propulsion needs. **As was the case last year**, the clear majority of the funding will support nuclear power development. **This comes with little surprise** as the Obama Administration has been clanging the bell to ring in a new era of nuclear power generation. And, despite a shake up in the world's view of the safety of nuclear power following the disaster in Japan in March 2011, the Administration is succeeding.

## at: smr loans

#### Money was allocated in January 2012, and it’s small

World Nuclear Association, the international organization that promotes nuclear energy and supports the many companies that comprise the global nuclear industry, September 2012

(“U.S. Nuclear Power Policy,”

**In January 2012** DOE allocated **$452 million over five years** to help the design and licensing of **one or two** SMR designs through new cost-sharing arrangements with industry. This will support first-of-a-kind engineering, design certification and licensing. To that end, it issued a draft Funding Opportunity Announcement to solicit inputs from industry, for designs that have “the potential to be licensed by the NRC and achieve commercial operation by 2022.” (Small, compact reactors of up to 300 MWe in capacity have a number of potential advantages in terms of safety, construction and siting, as well as potential economic benefits. Smaller ones can be made in factories and transported by rail and road to generation sites, being added progressively as modules of a large plant, reducing both capital costs and construction times.) Westinghouse intends to apply for its own 225 MWe SMR, in conjunction with Ameren Missouri, as does Holtec in conjunction with NuHub for the SMR-160. Babcock & Wilcox's 125 MWe mPower supported by Bechtel and NuScale Power's 45 MWe design supported by Fluor are also in contention. The NRC is currently involved in pre-application discussion on both latter types in anticipation of design certification applications for the NuScale reactor, and for the mPower design - in 2013.

## impacts

#### Remittances key to global microcredit diffusion

Giuliano, Asst Professor Economics – UCLA, fellow – NBER and IZA, ‘6

(Paola, “Remittances, Financial Development, and Growth,” Institute for the Study of Labor, IZA Discussion Paper No. 2160)

[footnote 3 included]

The relationship between remittances, financial development and growth is a-priori ambiguous. On one hand, well-functioning financial markets, by lowering costs of conducting transactions, may help direct remittances to projects that yield the highest return and therefore enhance growth rates. On the other hand, remittances might become a substitute for inefficient or nonexistent credit markets by helping local entrepreneurs bypass lack of collateral or high lending costs and start productive activities.3

[footnote 3 begins]

Entrepreneurs in developing countries confront much less efficient credit markets, and available evidence indicates that access to credit is among their biggest concerns (Paulson and Towsend, 2000). Several recent papers also suggest that credit constraints play an especially critical role in determining growth prospects in economies characterized by a high level of income inequality (Banerjee and Newman, 1993; Aghion and Bolton, 1997; Aghion, Caroli and Garcia Penalosa, 1999)

[footnote 3 ends]

The empirical analysis finds strong evidence that the second channel works: remittances boost growth in countries with less developed financial systems by providing an alternative way to finance investment and helping overcome liquidity constraint. In contrast, while more developed financial systems seems to attract more remittances (the volumes of remittance inflows increase with lower transaction costs and fewer restrictions on payments), they do not seem to magnify their growth impact.

Although this mechanism has not been studied in a macro context, there is some evidence at the micro-level. Dustmann and Kirchamp (2001) find that the savings of returning migrants may be an important source of startup capital for microenterprises. Similarly, in a study of 30 communities in West-Central Mexico, Massey and Parrado (1998) conclude that earnings from work in the United States provided an important source of startup capital in 21% of the new business formations. Woodruff and Zenteno (2001) also find that remittances are responsible for almost 20% of the capital invested in microenterprises throughout urban Mexico.

#### It solves hunger

Pronyk, PhD, Rural AIDS & Development Action Research Programme @ the School of Public Health – University of the Witwatersrand, ‘7

(Paul M, “Microfinance Programs and Better Health,” *JAMA* 298(16) p. 1925-1927)

A number of mechanisms exist through which access to microfinance may stimulate wider health and social benefits. Foremost among these is supporting improvements in household economic well-being, including poverty reduction and an enhanced capacity to meet basic needs such as food security. Notably, the share of people living in extreme poverty in sub-Saharan Africa has changed little since 1980 and nearly 26% of children in the region are reported to be malnourished.4​

Evidence of the effects of microfinance on poverty reduction from diverse settings is generally encouraging.8 For example, longitudinal studies from Bangladesh have found an association between poverty reduction and greater consumption attributable to microfinance participation, particularly among female loan recipients.9​ Other evidence points to substantial financial returns to capital investments made by small-scale entrepreneurs (60% per year and higher).10-11​ Although data from Africa are limited, a recent cluster randomized trial in South Africa reported improvements in household asset ownership after 2 years of microfinance program involvement.12

Several studies also suggest microfinance can positively influence nutritional outcomes. For example, longitudinal research from Ghana, comparing participants both with nonparticipants in the same communities and with residents of control communities, reports reductions in stunting and wasting in infants.13​ Well-established programs in Bangladesh have demonstrated similar effects on nutrition, where significant improvements in upper arm circumference in children 6 to 72 months old14 and lower rates of general malnutrition have been noted among microfinance households relative to controls.15​

#### US remittances key to Mexican economy

Newland, Director and co-founder – Migration Policy Institute, frmr Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, lecturer – LSE, ‘4

(Kathleen, “Beyond Remittances: The Role of Diaspora in Poverty Reduction in their Countries of Origin,” <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Beyond_Remittances_0704.pdf>)

Mexico is the second-largest recipient of remittances in the world. Its Diaspora is unusual in that, compared to others discussed in this paper, it is so heavily concentrated in one country, the United States. (Of course, many US citizens of Mexican origin live in parts of the country that were once part of Mexico; in that sense, they are not a community of migrant origin). Like India, the government of Mexico for decades had an attitude toward Mexicans who had left the homeland that was ambivalent at best. Formal programs for Mexicans abroad began only in 1990. Two federal programs, the Paisano Program and the Program for Mexican Communities Living Abroad (PCMLA) focused on improving the treatment of returning migrants at the hands of Mexican border and customs officials and on improving services to Mexicans in the United States. The PCMLA, which also helps channel remittances to local development projects in Mexico, is implemented by the Foreign Ministry through Mexican consulates and cultural centers in the United States.

Since 2000, the government has escalated its outreach to the Diaspora, with President Vicente Fox referring to Mexican migrants as “heroes”. In 2001, his administration established the Presidential Office for Mexicans Abroad, which was designed to strengthen ties between Mexican emigrants and their communities of origin. The Fox Administration also introduced legislative changes to allow Mexicans living abroad to hold US dollar accounts in Mexico and to maintain dual nationality (although without voting rights). The government’s new activism has a two-fold emphasis: to expand the opportunities for Mexicans abroad, and to facilitate remittances.

#### Mexican decline causes U.S. isolationism

Haddick, MBA – U. Illinois, managing editor – Small Wars Journal, ‘8

(Robert, <http://westhawk.blogspot.com/2008/12/now-that-would-change-everything.html>)

There is one dynamic in the literature of weak and failing states that has received relatively little attention, namely the phenomenon of “rapid collapse.” For the most part, weak and failing states represent chronic, long-term problems that allow for management over sustained periods. The collapse of a state usually comes as a surprise, has a rapid onset, and poses acute problems. The collapse of Yugoslavia into a chaotic tangle of warring nationalities in 1990 suggests how suddenly and catastrophically state collapse can happen - in this case, a state which had hosted the 1984 Winter Olympics at Sarajevo, and which then quickly became the epicenter of the ensuing civil war. In terms of worst-case scenarios for the Joint Force and indeed the world, two large and important states bear consideration for a rapid and sudden collapse: Pakistan and Mexico. Some forms of collapse in Pakistan would carry with it the likelihood of a sustained violent and bloody civil and sectarian war, an even bigger haven for violent extremists, and the question of what would happen to its nuclear weapons. That “perfect storm” of uncertainty alone might require the engagement of U.S. and coalition forces into a situation of immense complexity and danger with no guarantee they could gain control of the weapons and with the real possibility that a nuclear weapon might be used. The Mexican possibility may seem less likely, but the government, its politicians, police, and judicial infrastructure are all under sustained assault and pressure by criminal gangs and drug cartels. How that internal conflict turns out over the next several years will have a major impact on the stability of the Mexican state. Any descent by the Mexico into chaos would demand an American response based on the serious implications for homeland security alone. Yes, the “rapid collapse” of Mexico would change everything with respect to the global security environment. Such a collapse would have enormous humanitarian, constitutional, economic, cultural, and security implications for the U.S. It would seem the U.S. federal government, indeed American society at large, would have little ability to focus serious attention on much else in the world. The hypothetical collapse of Pakistan is a scenario that has already been well discussed. In the worst case, the U.S. would be able to isolate itself from most effects emanating from south Asia. However, there would be no running from a Mexican collapse.

# 2NR

## india

**Alt causes**

**Pennington ‘12** (US, India see progress on nuclear cooperation By MATTHEW PENNINGTON | Associated Press – Thu, Jun 14, 2012 12:01 AM EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) — Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton welcomed progress in U.S. efforts to invest in India's civilian nuclear power industry but said **more action is needed to translate improving ties into economic benefits.** The two governments held their annual strategic dialogue in Washington on Wednesday, seeking to boost relations that have blossomed in recent years but have yet to meet U.S. hopes for greater market access for American companies. "It's not enough **just to talk about cooperation** on issues ranging from civil nuclear energy, attracting U.S. investment to India or defending human rights or promoting women's empowerment," Clinton said, alongside India's foreign minister, S.M. Krishna. "**We have to follow through** so that our people, citizens of two, great pluralistic democracies, **can see and feel the benefits,"** she said. Krishna said India plans to invest $1 trillion in infrastructure development over the coming five years, offering enormous business opportunities for U.S. companies. He offered assurances to prospective investors that there will be "a level playing field and total transparency." Two years ago, President Barack Obama declared that **the U.S.-India relationship would be a defining partnership of the 21st century**. Security cooperation and defense sales have grown rapidly, and Washington looks to New Delhi as a partner in the economic development of Afghanistan. But some analysts say the relationship is being oversold. Clinton said two-way trade and investment has grown 40 percent since 2009 and is set to exceed $100 billion this year, but there is "a lot of room for further growth." The two sides agreed Wednesday to expedite negotiations on a bilateral investment treaty to reduce barriers. Clinton welcomed the signing, announced Wednesday, of an agreement between Westinghouse Electric Co. and the Nuclear Power Company of India Ltd. allowing preliminary site development for future construction of nuclear power plants in western India. Clinton said it was a significant step toward the fulfillment of a 2008 India-U.S. civil nuclear agreement. That landmark pact, negotiating by the administration of President George W. Bush, allowed India access to technology from international suppliers it had been denied since it conducted its first nuclear test explosion in 1974. Krishna said it should "put at rest" confusion surrounding the agreement. "I'm glad that nuclear commerce is now beginning to expand itself," he said at a news conference, **expressing hopes that more Indian and U.S. companies would become involved in the months ahead.** Clinton said she looked forward to additional deals with other American companies, including General Electric. But she said there was still a lot of work to be done to address the implications of Indian nuclear liability legislation that effectively has blocked U.S. suppliers from capitalizing on the agreement. Scott Shaw, a spokesman for Westinghouse, said by email those issues will need to be addressed before signing any final agreements for the project in India's Gujurat state. The Obama administration has invested considerable diplomatic capital in promoting ties with India, but New Delhi has struggled to deliver on the kinds of economic changes that Washington wants. In November, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's government backtracked on plans to allow foreign investment by such companies as Wal-Mart in its supermarket — or "multibrand" — retail sector after it ran into domestic opposition. Another area of intense commercial interest to the U.S. is India's defense sector, with sales exceeding $8 billion in the past five years, reflecting growing ties between the two militaries. Clinton said the U.S. was convinced that in the future, it can conduct with India joint research, development and co-production of defense systems. One obstacle to improving ties was lifted ahead of the Washington session when the U.S. on Monday dropped the threat of penalties against India for its large yet declining oil imports from Iran. That is one of various diplomatic issues on which the U.S. and India have not always seen eye to eye, despite their shared strategic interests in areas such as fighting Islamic militancy and managing the rise of China. Clinton said India understands the importance of denying Iran a nuclear weapon, and credited New Delhi's efforts to diversify its sources of crude oil to rely less on Iran. Krishna welcomed the U.S. decision as consistent with the growing strategic partnership between the U.S. and India, but he told The Associated Press that Iran will continue to remain an important source of oil to India. He also said Prime Minister Singh was considering visiting Iran in August for a summit of the Non-Aligned Movement. The U.S. increasingly looks to India as a partner in developing Afghanistan, where New Delhi has provided some $2 billion in assistance. Washington also wants India to play a more active role in training Afghan security forces as the U.S. and its NATO allies plan to withdraw combat forces by 2014. Krishna said India is willing to help if Afghanistan requests it. India has sought reassurance that the U.S. and its allies will retain a substantial presence in Afghanistan beyond 2014 because of concerns for that country's stability as Western forces withdraw after a decade of fighting the Taliban and al-Qaida. "Any perception of lack of will on the part of the international community to deal firmly with terrorist groups will risk Afghanistan sliding back to being a safe haven for terrorist and extremist groups that threaten the region and beyond," Krishna said. He stressed the necessity to deal with "terrorist sanctuaries and safe havens" beyond Afghanistan's borders — a reference to India's archrival, Pakistan.

## uq

#### Kurtz ev cites empirics but agrees this time is different than last time:

And as George W. Bush learned in his second term, **hammering out a compromise on such a volatile issue is maddeningly elusive**. Perhaps the election changed the landscape and both parties will find a way to compromise. In the meantime, **it might be wise to take the upbeat media coverage with a healthy dose** **of skepticism**.

#### Pass now, top of the docket

Steve Benen, MSNBC, 2/6/13, Defining the 'extremes' in the immigration debate, maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/02/06/16868677-defining-the-extremes-in-the-immigration-debate

At the surface, there's ample reason for optimism on comprehensive immigration reform. President Obama is investing considerable political capital into the issue; the public strongly supports the reform efforts**; a bipartisan bill is already progressing** in the Senate; and every Republican strategist and consultant is warning the party not to further alienate the fastest-growing voting constituency in the country. Even House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) recently declared, "This issue has been around far too long. A comprehensive approach is long overdue, and I'm confident that the president, myself, others can find the common ground to take care of this issue once and for all."

#### Passage likely but not guaranteed

Miami Herald, 1/29/13, Immigration’s moment arrives, www.miamiherald.com/2013/01/29/3207103/immigrations-moment-arrives.html

The rapidly changing mood in Washington on immigration, particularly evident in the willingness of prominent Republicans like Sen. Marco Rubio of Miami to challenge diehard opponents of reform within their own party, represents a significant milestone in the long fight to ensure fairness for everyone living within America’s borders. Rarely has the power of the vote on a divisive national issue been so evident and so immediate. And so useful. The turnaround comes as a direct consequence of a quadrennial election in which President Obama won a second term after capturing 71 percent of the Hispanic vote, forcing immigration opponents to confront reality. As Sen. John McCain acknowledged recently, “We are losing dramatically the Hispanic vote, which we think should be ours.” Welcome to the future, sir. Immigration advocates have been insisting all along that the issue is one of fairness, given that undocumented immigrants perform a vital service by taking low-wage jobs that keep the economy humming but which many Americans shun. In good times, they provide cheap manpower for building booms. They toil on our farms, clean our yards and homes, wash our cars and our clothes, even look after our children and elderly parents — but are relegated to the shadows because of unrealistic immigration laws that deny them a chance to move up the ladder. This week, the fairness argument and the political argument finally came together as eight senators of both parties — including Sen. Rubio and Sen. McCain — offered a joint plan to reform immigration, with President Obama applauding their plan and offering his own blueprint to bring 11 million undocumented residents out of the shadows. The willingness to work in a bipartisan fashion is encouraging. It’s the way Congress should work. But even though the moment is ripe for change, this is far from a done deal. The tactic of endless hearings and procedural wrangling almost killed healthcare reform and will doubtlessly be tried again to kill an immigration overhaul.

#### Yes passage

John Avlon, 1/29/13, Obama’s Odd New Pals on Immigration, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/01/29/obama-s-odd-new-pals-on-immigration.html

This time it will be different. After repeated failures at the federal level, comprehensive immigration reform finally looks like a real possibility this year. And that’s because a broad bipartisan coalition has been built in the Senate, motivated by both self-interest and national interest. Today in Nevada, President Obama will add his vision to their legislative foundation, officially making immigration reform the core of his second-term agenda. Obama’s unexpected ally in this effort is the evangelical community—part of an emerging conservative coalition in favor of immigration reform that supporters describe as “the Bible, the badge, and business.” Back in 2007, when President Bush tried belatedly to push through a bipartisan immigration bill, the prevailing winds were against progress. The presidential race to succeed him was already underway and the right-wing talk-radio crowd attacked the McCain-Kennedy bill as “amnesty”—providing a pre–Tea Party bandwagon that candidates like Mitt Romney and Tom Tancredo climbed on to beat back McCain’s center-right campaign. Often forgotten in this narrative is the fact that congressional Democrats weren’t particularly in the mood to hand Bush a victory either. But six years later, the right-wing talk-radio crowd is receding in relevance as their listeners age out of existence. Many conservatives who opposed the last comprehensive are realizing that failure to win over Hispanic votes represents an existential threat to the Republican Party. But perhaps most of all, the **attitudes of the Republican rank and file have changed**.

#### Private conversations prove

Jonathan Strong, Roll Call, 2/6/13, Democrats See Hopeful Signals From Republicans on Immigration, www.rollcall.com/news/democrats\_see\_hopeful\_signals\_from\_republicans\_on\_immigration-222229-1.html

Top Democrats are walking a fine line in assessing the GOP’s signals on an immigration overhaul, both criticizing what they described as tepid steps forward by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor while praising what Republicans privately say they will be willing to do. At a speech billed as a rebranding of the GOP’s image, the Virginia Republican said he would support citizenship for young people brought to the country illegally as children. But Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra called the shift small potatoes. “Been there, done that. We’ve moved on. I think the American people have moved on. It’s great that our **Republican colleagues are catching up**,” the California lawmaker said at a news conference here, where House Democrats are gathered for a retreat over the next two days. But Becerra, who is part of a secretive bipartisan working group on the topic that includes several conservative Republican lawmakers, did not dismiss signals by the GOP that it is open to moving immigration legislation. He described a House Judiciary Committee hearing Tuesday as encouraging, saying, “I didn’t hear Republicans speaking about how it is impossible and how there should be death placed upon anyone who tries to fix the system comprehensively.” “Perhaps the most encouraging thing for me is the conversations I hear privately outside of the reach of a camera from some of my Republican friends and colleagues who I believe understand that the American people are ready to fix this broken immigration system,” he added.

#### Polls

Paul Szoldra, 2/6/13, There's Been A Drastic Recent Swing In Obama's Approval Rating On Immigration, www.businessinsider.com/immigration-reform-poll-obama-washington-post-abc-citizenship-2013-2

The case for comprehensive **immigration reform got a big boost today**, according to a new poll from The Washington Post and ABC News. The poll found that Americans now view President Barack Obama favorably on handling immigration, and his plan to reform the nation's immigration system has support. According to the poll, 49 percent approved and 43 percent disapproved of Obama's handling of the issue. That was a sharp change from a similar poll in July, in which only 38 percent approved and 52 percent disapproved. The proposal Obama recently introduced is structured around four major points: strengthening border security, cracking down on employers hiring undocumented workers, providing a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented workers currently living in the U.S., and streamlining the legal immigration system. Obama also gained support in specific areas of his proposal, with 83 percent supporting increased border security and 55 percent backing a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. The responses went across party lines. Sixty-eight percent of Democrats offered support for illegal immigrants gaining citizenship, compared with just 42 percent of Republicans. Fifty-two percent of Independents supported a path to citizenship.

## winners win

#### Even if a confrontational strategy is key, that doesn’t mean the plan’s singular win spills-over—it’s more likely to undermine Obama’s careful strategy

Ryan Lizza, 1/7/13, Will Hagel Spike the G.O.P.’s Fever?, www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2013/01/how-much-will-the-nomination-of-chuck-hagel-hurt-obamas-second-term-agenda.html

But Obama’s victory has made almost no difference in changing the psychology or incentives of the members of the G.O.P. who matter most: the House Republicans. The idea that a bloc of conservative, mostly Southern, Republicans would start to coöperate with the President on issues like tax policy and immigration may have rested on a faulty assumption.

The past few weeks of fiscal-cliff drama have taught us that “breaking the fever” was the wrong metaphor. There is no one event—even the election of a President—that can change a political party overnight. Congress is a co-equal branch of government, and House Republicans feel that they have as much of a mandate for their policies as Obama does for his. Shouldn’t House Republicans care that their views on Obama’s priorities, like tax cuts for the rich and immigration, helped cost Romney the White House and will make it difficult for their party’s nominee to win in 2016? In the abstract, many do, but that’s not enough to change the voting behavior of the average House Republican, who represents a gerrymandered and very conservative district.

A better metaphor for the coming battles with Congress may be what Woody Hayes, the college-football coach, famously called “three yards and a cloud of dust”: a series of grinding plays where small victories are earned only after lots of intense combat. While the fiscal-cliff showdown demonstrated that there’s potential for bipartisan deal-making in the Senate, passing any Obama priority through the House of Representatives is nearly impossible unless the political pressure is extremely intense.

The fiscal-cliff bill passed the House only when Speaker John Boehner’s members realized that their only alternative was blowing up the settlement negotiated by Joe Biden and Mitch McConnell—and accepting all the blame and consequences.

That episode offers the White House a general template for the coming fights over spending, immigration, and gun control—three issues where there is very little consensus between Obama and most House Republicans. Deals will have to be negotiated in the Senate and gain the imprimatur of some high-profile Republicans. Then a pressure campaign will have to be mounted to convince Boehner to move the legislation to the floor of the House under rules that allow it to pass with mostly Democratic votes. It’s easier to see how this could happen with the coming budgetary issues, which have deadlines that force action, than for the rest of Obama’s agenda, which is more likely than not to simply die in the House.

#### Their ev is hype

Jackie Calmes, NYTimes, 11/12/12, In Debt Talks, Obama Is Ready to Go Beyond Beltway, mobile.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/us/politics/legacy-at-stake-obama-plans-broader-push-for-budget-deal.xml

That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney.

George C. Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A & M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama's presidency is titled "Overreach," said, "He didn't understand the limits of what he could do."

"They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we'd build this advancing-tide theory of legislation," Mr. Edwards said. "And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they've learned a lot, I think."

"Effective leaders," he added, "exploit opportunities rather than create them."

The budget showdown is an opportunity. But like many, it holds risks as well as potential rewards.

"This election is the second chance to be what he promised in 2008, and that is to break the gridlock in Washington," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, a Reagan White House chief of staff, who voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and later expressed disappointment. "But it seems like this is a replay of 2009 and 2010, when he had huge majorities in the House and Senate, rather than recognizing that 'we've got to figure out ways to work together and it's not just what I want.' "

For now, at least, Republican lawmakers say they may be open to raising the tax bill for some earners. "We can increase revenue without increasing the tax rates on anybody in this country," said Representative Tom Price, Republican of Georgia and a leader of House conservatives, on "Fox News Sunday." "We can lower the rates, broaden the base, close the loopholes."

The challenge for Mr. Obama is to use his postelection leverage to persuade Republicans or to help Speaker John A. Boehner persuade Republicans that a tax compromise is in their party's political interest since most Americans favor compromise and higher taxes on the wealthy to reduce annual deficits.

Some of the business leaders the president will meet with on Wednesday are members of the new Fix the Debt coalition, which has raised about $40 million to urge lawmakers and their constituents to support a plan that combines spending cuts with new revenue. That session will follow Mr. Obama's meeting with labor leaders on Tuesday.

His first trip outside Washington to engage the public will come after Thanksgiving, since Mr. Obama is scheduled to leave next weekend on a diplomatic trip to Asia. Travel plans are still sketchy, partly because his December calendar is full of the traditional holiday parties.

Democrats said the White House's strategy of focusing both inside and outside of Washington was smart. "You want to avoid getting sucked into the Beltway inside-baseball games," said Joel Johnson, a former adviser in the Clinton White House and the Senate. "You can still work toward solutions, but make sure you get out of Washington while you are doing that."

The president must use his leverage soon, some Democrats added, because it could quickly wane as Republicans look to the 2014 midterm elections, when the opposition typically takes seats from the president's party in Congress.

#### Disrupts deal-making

David Gergen, CNN Senior Political Analyst, 1/19/13, Obama 2.0: Smarter, tougher -but wiser?, www.cnn.com/2013/01/18/opinion/gergen-obama-two/index.html?hpt=hp\_c1

Smarter, tougher, bolder -his new style is paying off politically. But in the long run, will it also pay off in better governance? Perhaps -and for the country's sake, let's hope so. Yet, there are ample reasons to wonder, and worry.

Ultimately, to resolve major issues like deficits, immigration, guns and energy, the president and Congress need to find ways to work together much better than they did in the first term. Over the past two years, Republicans were clearly more recalcitrant than Democrats, practically declaring war on Obama, and the White House has been right to adopt a tougher approach after the elections.

But a growing number of Republicans concluded after they had their heads handed to them in November that they had to move away from extremism toward a more center-right position, more open to working out compromises with Obama. It's not that they suddenly wanted Obama to succeed; they didn't want their party to fail.

House Speaker John Boehner led the way, offering the day after the election to raise taxes on the wealthy and giving up two decades of GOP orthodoxy. In a similar spirit, Rubio has been developing a mainstream plan on immigration, moving away from a ruinous GOP stance.

One senses that the hope, small as it was, to take a brief timeout on hyperpartisanship in order to tackle the big issues is now slipping away.

While a majority of Americans now approve of Obama's job performance, conservatives increasingly believe that in his new toughness, he is going overboard, trying to run over them. They don't see a president who wants to roll up his sleeves and negotiate; they see a president who wants to barnstorm the country to beat them up. News that Obama is converting his campaign apparatus into a nonprofit to support his second term will only deepen that sense. And it frustrates them that he is winning: At their retreat, House Republicans learned that their disapproval has risen to 64%.

Conceivably, Obama's tactics could pressure Republicans into capitulation on several fronts. More likely, they will be spoiling for more fights. Chances for a "grand bargain" appear to be hanging by a thread.