# \*\*\*2AC\*\*\*

We meet --- the plan obtains SMRs for military bases ---- and we read evidence says the best way for that to occur is through alternative financing

CX Clarified --- we will defend that alternative financing would be the way it would occur, but any PICS that compete off the plan is bad

They still get all their Ground through DAs to alternative financing but

Specifying alt financing makes infinite PIC ground that shifts the discussion away from the relevancy of the plans effects to bureaucratic debates ---- that’s key to relevant decisionmaking which outweighs and link turns their ground arguments

1NC strategy proves they get core disads based off of the implementation of the plan

<and they don’t have a definition --- we are still cash transfers ---- webb 93>

#### Financial incentives induce behaviors using cash – that includes power purchasing

Webb 93 – lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.

By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

## 2AC India

#### Link is export tradeoff, the internal link is nuclear energy as an electricity source for Inida—duhh….what? If plan builds cheap SMRs then it solves the internal link even if India stops exporting.

#### India nuclear industry collapsing

MV Ramana, Daily Mercury, 10/16/12, India’s nuclear power failures warn against uranium exports, www.dailymercury.com.au/news/indias-nuclear-power-failures-warn-against-uranium/1584030/

First, despite all the hoopla about India's nuclear ambitions, nuclear energy is unlikely to contribute more than a few percent of the country's electricity capacity in the next several decades, if ever.

India's Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) has always promised much and delivered little. In the early 1970s, for example, DAE projected that by 2000 there would be 43,000 MW of installed nuclear capacity. In 2000, that capacity was actually 2720 MW. Today, nuclear power constitutes barely 2% of the total electricity generation capacity.

There is at least one good technical reason why future targets are unlikely to be met: India is pursuing an unreliable technology. The DAE's plans involve constructing hundreds of fast breeder reactors. Fast breeder reactors are so-called because they are based on energetic (fast) neutrons and because they produce (breed) more fissile material than they consume.

In the early decades of nuclear power, many countries pursued breeder programs. But practically all of them have given up on breeder reactors as unsafe and uneconomical. Relying on a technology shown to be unreliable makes it likely that nuclear power will never become a major source of electricity in India.

#### Regulatory barriers block India exports

IDSA, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, Nov 2010, IDSA Task Force Report: Development of Nuclear Energy Sector in India, http://bit.ly/RpF1TY

The existing 1962 enactment, as it should be, is state-centric though there was an amendment incorporated in 1987 to allow public sector participation. It vests general authority of managing and developing atomic energy within India with the Central Government.22 The Central Government has all the powers and continues to have the complete authority to produce, develop, use and dispose of atomic energy either by itself or through any authority or corporation established by it. This law primarily outlines a regulatory framework for the mining24, acquisition25, manufacturing, identification and disposal of uranium and other related radioactive sources that are needed for the generation of atomic energy. The law points out that when any such radioactive source is found, the same will automatically vest with the Central Government and that the Government has all the powers such as to “prohibit the manufacture, possession, use, transfer by sale or otherwise, export and import and in an emergency, transport and disposal of any radioactive substance”.26 The law also refers to compensation, reward, and punishment for those who find or do the mining of these radioactive materials without informing the Central Government.

With India ending its ‘nuclear isolation’ all these basic regulatory requirements also need change. Till this point of time India was outside the purview of the nuclear trade regime. The change in the US perception towards India, particularly concerning nuclear energy, has been attributed to various factors. The economic factor emerges as the primary reason as this deal would have given a lease of life to the fledging US nuclear industry.27 The other factor is India’s emerging influence in global affairs with its faster growth rate. Yet another factor, a more convincing one at that, seems to be the one wherein it has been argued that by ending India’s nuclear isolation it could be indirectly (and through various bilateral arrangements) tied down to the global non-proliferation regime.28 Whatever be the raison d’etre of the 2005 Statement followed by the 2007 Cooperation Agreement emphasising primarily on energy security, one cannot be oblivious to the fact that both these instruments had a broader global agenda relating to a host of issues. A specific and clearer legal articulation of these obligations would have facilitated delinking some of the global policy agenda pursued in connection with certain stated interests. For this reason, the 1962 enactment requires a thorough revision and amendment, as suggested above, with a view to transform India’s existing nuclear energy policy into a more definitive binding legal commitment.

There are some indications that India has been attempting to bring in some change in its atomic energy-related legal framework. For example, the Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage Bill, 2010 is on the anvil. There are number of legal issues that need consideration. The next section will deal with that.

#### Plan not key—thorium supplies dictate India nuclear energy industry

IDSA, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, Nov 2010, IDSA Task Force Report: Development of Nuclear Energy Sector in India, http://bit.ly/RpF1TY

Another critical factor, the third stage of India’s nuclear energy programme, that can perhaps play a decisive role in establishing nuclear energy as the primary source of energy in India is whether thorium emerges as a viable fuel option for India or not. India has low uranium reserves which, prior to the nuclear deal was restraining it from utilising nuclear power. Estimates suggest that India possesses about 90,000 tonnes of the metal. “After accounting for various losses including mining (15 per cent), milling (20 per cent) and fabrication (5 per cent), the net uranium available for power generation is about 61,000 tonnes.”15 However, given India’s large reserves of thorium, it would be beneficial for it to develop the technology that is able to utilize thoriumtoproducepower. “Althoughnot fissile itself, thorium (Th-232) will absorb slow neutrons to produce uranium-233 (U-233), which is fissile (and long-lived).”16 Current research suggests that India has made some progress in this field and may very well be on its way to develop thorium-based reactors.

#### Indo-Pak water scarcity’s coming – causes escalatory disputes

Nitish Priyadarshi 12, lecturer in the department of environment and water management at Ranchi University in India, “War for water is not a far cry”, June 16, <http://www.cleangangaportal.org/node/44>

Such is the deep nexus between water and global warming that the increased frequency of climate change-driven extreme weather events like hurricanes, droughts and flooding, along with the projected rise of ocean levels, is likely to spur greater interstate and intrastate migration- especially of the poor and the vulnerable- from delta and coastal regions to the hinterland.

As the planet warms, water grow scarcer. Global warming will endanger the monsoon, which effects much greater than those of drought alone-particularly in India given that 70 percent of India’s rainfall comes from the monsoon.

The declining snow cover and receding glaciers in the Himalayan state of Jammu and Kashmir could trigger renewed hostilities between India and Pakistan, neighbouring states in the South Asian region that are at odds on a host of issues.

The two countries share the Indus River, one of the longest rivers in the world. The river rises in southwestern Tibet and flows northwest through the Himalayas. It crosses into the Kashmir region, meandering to the Indian and Pakistani administered areas of the territory.

Pakistan and India have long been embroiled in a territorial dispute over Kashmir, but have so far managed to uphold a World Bank-mediated Indus Water Treaty (IWT) that provides mechanisms for resolving disputes over water sharing. Any drastic reduction in the availability of water in the region has the potential of causing a war between the hostile south Asian neighbors.

The Indus water system is the lifeline for Pakistan, as 75 to 80 percent of water flows to Pakistan as melt from the Himalayan glaciers. This glacier melt forms the backbone of irrigation network in Pakistan, with 90 percent of agricultural land being fed by the vastly spread irrigation network in Pakistan, one of the largest in the world. Any disruption of water flow would cause a grave impact on agriculture produce in Pakistan.

The Indus Waters Treaty is a water-sharing treaty between the Republic of India and Islamic Republic of Pakistan, brokered by the World Bank (then the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development). The treaty was signed in Karachi on September 19, 1960 by Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and President of Pakistan Mohammad Ayub Khan. The treaty was a result of Pakistani fear that since the source rivers of the Indus basin were in India, it could potentially create droughts and famines in Pakistan, especially at times of war. However, India did not revoke the treaty during any of three later Indo-Pakistani Wars.

Until now, the Indus Water Treaty has worked well, but the impact of climate change would test the sanctity of this treaty. Under the treaty signed in 1960, the two countries also share five tributaries of the Indus river, namely, Jhelum, Chenab, Ravi, Beas and Sutlej. The agreement grants Pakistan exclusive rights over waters from the Indus and its westward-flowing tributaries, the Jhelum and Chenab, while the Ravi, Beas and Sutlej rivers were allocated for India’s use.

Transboundary water sharing between India and Pakistan will become an extremely difficult proposition as surface water would become a scarce commodity with the depletion of water reserves up in the mountains.

The sharing of the Ganges waters is a long-standing issue between India and Bangladesh over the appropriate allocation and development of the water resources of the Ganges River that flows from northern India into Bangladesh. The issue has remained a subject of conflict for almost 35 years, with several bilateral agreements and rounds of talks failing to produce results.

#### Water depletion swamps and exacerbates other factors

Wirsing and Jasparro 6

<http://www.apcss.org/Publications/APSSS/IndusRiverDiplomacy.Wirsing.Jasparro.pdf>.

ROBERT G. WIRSING, Ph.D.

Dr. Robert G. Wirsing came to the Asia-Pacific Center from the University of South Carolina where he was Professor of International Studies and a member of the Department of Government and International Studies since 1971. His primary research interests focus on the contemporary politics, international relations, and defense and security issues of South Asia.

Dr. Christopher Jasparro is a researcher at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Honolulu, Hawaii !!EMPHASIS NOT IN ORIGINAL!!

When speaking of the river resource issue in India-Pakistan relations, one is strongly tempted to caption it cleverly with the title of Norman Maclean’s poignant novella, *A River Runs Through It*.1 For the Indus River runs through the history of India-Pakistan relations every bit as consequentially as the Big Blackfoot River ran through the lives of Maclean’s fictional Montana family. By the same token, Maclean’s solemn avowal at the end of the piece—“I am haunted by waters”—might well have occurred to more than a few Indian and Pakistani diplomats over the years as they contemplated the river-ensnarled diplomatic agenda between the two co-riparian neighbors. The national destinies of India and Pakistan are inextricably joined by the Indus River whose waters they share; and no aspect of their diplomatic relationship bears more heavily on those destinies than that pertaining to the Indus River*.* For over a half century, bitter rivalry over river resources has been a chronic source of severe interstate tension between India and Pakistan. It has arguably been one of the leading causes of full-scale warfare between them. Today India and Pakistan are both faced with rapidly escalating problems of acute river resource scarcity. Intensified rivalries over river resources could precipitate violent interstate conflict between them in the future.Even if direct violence is avoided, the inability to resolve river resource issues between them will undoubtedly limit the ability of both countries to manage and utilize water resources in the most efficient manner. That, in turn, can be counted on to exacerbate intrastate resource conflicts as well as related domestic disaffection—developments that appear certain to reduce even further the Indian and Pakistani states’ capacities to manage peacefully the interstate resource disputes between them. Increased tensions over water, in other words, help exacerbate or intensify overall tensions, thus at worst creating a more favorable environment for interstate conflict or at least making resolution of interstate security issues between the countries even more difficult

#### Export market’s already hugely competitive

Jeffrey Hays 12, founder of Facts & Details, freelance journalist and teacher in Japan, “nuclear business and reactor production in japan”, April, <http://factsanddetails.com/japan.php?itemid=2307&catid=23&subcatid=152>

The New York Times reported: Makers of nuclear reactors from other countries, including Areva of France, General Electric of the **U**nited **S**tates, Russia’s state-owned Rostacom and several government-backed Chinese conglomerates like China National Nuclear, are pursuing new contracts. According to the Yomiuri Shimbun: French rival Areva SA promotes its reactors for their hardiness, saying they would not be destroyed even if a jumbo jet smashed into them. South Korea has also developed safer and economically efficient nuclear reactors in a project supported by both the public and private sectors. It succeeded in winning a contract from the United Arab Emirates. In Finland, South Korea is competing with Japan to win orders.

#### Fights for contracts now

Hiroko Tabuchi 11, reporter for the Gainesville Sun, “Japan Courts the Money in Reactors”, October 10, <http://www.gainesville.com/article/20111010/ZNYT01/110103010?p=5&tc=pg>

But makers of nuclear reactors from other countries, including Areva of France, General Electric of the **U**nited **S**tates, Russia’s state-owned Rostacom and several government-backed Chinese conglomerates like China National Nuclear, are pursuing new contracts. Within Japan, Tokyo’s effort has already drawn protest from nuclear opponents.

## 2AC Budget Trade-Off

Effective operations prevent Indonesia collapse

Frederick Kagan and Michael O’Hanlon 7, Fred’s a resident scholar at AEI, Michael is a senior fellow in foreign policy at Brookings, “The Case for Larger Ground Forces”, April, <http://www.aei.org/files/2007/04/24/20070424_Kagan20070424.pdf>

To consider the strategic implications of another scenario, what about the possibility of severe unrest in one of the world’s large countries, such as Indonesia or Congo or Nigeria? At present, such problems are generally seen as being of secondary strategic importance to the United States, meaning that Washington may support and help fund a peacekeeping mission under some circumstances but will rarely commit troops—and certainly will not deploy a muscular forcible intervention. This reluctance could well fade in the face of factors that compound the dangers. For example, if Al Qaeda or an associated terrorist group began to develop a sanctuary akin to Afghanistan in a given large country, the United States might—depending on circumstances— consider overthrowing that country’s government or at least helping the government reclaim control over the part of its territory occupied by the terrorists. Or, it might intervene to help one side in a civil war against another. For example, if the schism between the police and armed forces in Indonesia worsened, and one of the two institutions wound up working with an Al Qaeda offshoot, the United States might accept an invitation from the moderate half of the government to help defeat the other half, along with the terrorist organization in question.3 Or, if a terrorist organization was tolerated in Indonesia, the United States might strike at it directly. Such action might be taken if, say, the terrorist group took control of land near a major shipping lane in the Indonesian Straits, or if it simply decided to use part of Indonesia for sanctuary.4 Clearly, the requirement for international forces would be a function of the degree of instability in the country in question, how intact the indigenous forces remained, and how large any militia or insurgent force proved to be. For illustrative purposes, if a large fraction of Indonesia, or all of Congo, were to become ungovernable, the problem could be twice to three times the scale of the Iraq mission. It could be five times the scale of Iraq if it involved trying to restore order throughout Nigeria, though the monumental scale of such an operation might nudge planners toward more modest objectives—such as trying to stabilize areas where major ethnic or religious groups come into direct contact. General guidelines for force planning for such scenarios would suggest foreign troop strength up to 100,000 to 200,000 personnel, in rough numbers. That makes them not unlike the scenario of a collapsing or fracturing Pakistan. For these missions that do not affect vital strategic interests, certainly as compared with those considered in South Asia, the US contribution might only be 20 to 30 percent of the total, rather than the 50 percent assumed above. But even so, up to two to three American divisions could be required.

Global war – bases are key

Menon 1(Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University, 9-19, The National Interest, Lexis)

The consequences of Indonesia's breakup would affect American interests, as well. American energy and raw materials companies (Exxon-Mobil, Texaco, Chevron, Newmont Mining, Conoco and Freeport-McMoRan, among others) operate in Indonesia, particularly in Aceh, Riau, and West Papua, and many of the ships that traverse the Strait of Malacca are American-owned. The United States is also a major trader and investor in East Asia and is to some degree hostage to its fate, especially now that the American economy is slowing. Moreover, if Indonesia fractures, worst-case thinking and preemptive action among its neighbors could upset regional equilibrium and undermine the American strategic canopy in East Asia. The United States has a network of bases and alliances and 100,000 military personnel in the region, and is considered the guarantor of stability by most states-a status it will forfeit if it stands aside as Indonesia falls apart. America's competitors will scrutinize its actions to gauge its resolve and acumen. So will its friends and allies-Australia, Japan, Singapore, Thailand and South Korea-each of whom would be hurt by Indonesia's collapse.

Non-unique-DOE already increased incentives

**Non-intrinsic: a logical policymaker could do the plan and preserve funding for \_\_\_\_\_**

**-(\_\_) tests the germane-ness of the DA to the plan, we won’t make any more intrinsicness arguments.**

Tons of renewables procurement now-ensures eventual cuts

Daniel Goldfarb 10, associate at Greenstart, a cleantech accelerator in San Francisco, where he does startup recruitment and runs university strategy, “The Military’s Clean Energy Imperative”, October 6, <http://leadenergy.org/2010/10/the-militarys-green-imperative/>

When does inaction on energy reform go too far? When it risks our nation’s economic health? When it leads our planet towards environmental catastrophe? Surely we must draw a line when it puts American soldiers directly in harms way. A recent New York Times article suggests that the military has seen enough, and in the absence of Congressional action, is taking the lead on developing clean energy technologies. This new role for the military should come as no surprise. The Department of Defense is the largest single consumer of energy in the United States. In 2007, it consumed 1,100 trillion BTU’s—more than the entire country of Nigeria and at a higher per-capita rate than all but three countries in the world. The DoD further estimates that for every $10 increase in the per barrel price of oil, it costs the militairy $1.3 billion. At the same time, energy is the key enabler of US military combat power. American military force is tethered to increasingly vulnerable fuel supplies: “In Iraq and Afghanistan, one Army study found, for every 24 fuel convoys that set out, one soldier or civilian engaged in fuel transport was killed.” While much ink has been spilled on the strategic disadvantage of America’s reliance on fossil fuels, and that we fund a number of adversarial nations, until recently the tactical dangers have not gotten their due attention. Fossil fuels aren’t just forcing our military into geo-strategic wars, but also putting our soldiers at risk in the field of combat: “Concerns about the military’s dependence on fossil fuels in far-flung battlefields began in 2006 in Iraq, where Richard Zilmer, then a major general and the top American commander in western Iraq, sent an urgent cable to Washington suggesting that renewable technology could prevent loss of life.” So while Congress is arguing over an RES bill that will do little to bring clean energy technologies to market and tax credits — which while meager, are necessary for fostering innovation — the military will be aggressively pursuing renewable technologies. This ambitious stance on energy stems from the 2007 Defense Reauthorization Act, which set a goal to produce or procure renewable energy equivalent to 25% of the department’s total energy use by 2025. The resulting efforts have shown substantial decreases in cost as well as vulnerabilities. If the military throws its full weight behind developing clean energy technologies the potential benefits to our armed forces and our nation as a whole are huge, suggests a recent report by CNA. Throughout U.S. history, and especially after WWII, the military has driven technological innovation through its unmatched efforts and abilities in R&D and directed procurement. When a technology has been necessary for national security, the DoD has spared no expense in acquiring it. The technologies that have followed from defense priorities, moreover, have regularly spilled over into the civilian market, creating whole industrial sectors—aerospace, micro-computing, mass communications—that have powered the American economy for decades. At many of the most vulnerable junctures in U.S. economic history, defense priorities aligned with the needs of the domestic civilian market and allowed the DoD to catalyze rapid technological change that enhanced U.S. security and economic health. The huge amount of consumption on the part of the military doesn’t just mean **there are a lot of cuts to be made**, but that there is a huge market that could pull renewable technologies to market. It is largely because of the DoD that personal computers can be purchased for under a thousand dollars rather than upwards of ten thousand. Between 1955 and 1958 the federal government, led by the DoD, purchased between 36 and 39 percent of semiconductors produced in the U.S. and that figure shot up to between 45 and 48 percent in 1959-1960. A robust and stable market for semiconductor technologies, provided by the military and NASA’s ‘Buy American’ policies, allowed producers to scale productions and thus drive down costs. In the same way, the military today could drive down the cost curve on solar panels, bio-fuels, batteries, small modular nuclear reactors, and a number of other clean energy technologies. So at this crucial moment, while America continues to fall behind in the global clean energy race and while Congress continues to sit on the sidelines, it may have to be the military that leads the way. This will mean both increased investments in deployment and procurement as well as early and applied R&D. The American military will have to leverage its incomparable assets to do what it has done many times before, simultaneously pushing and pulling cutting edge technologies to market. We must fully realize that our energy policy is our national security policy and our ‘military industrial complex’ could be our ‘green industrial complex’

#### Weaker defense dollar triggers tradeoff disads

Murdock 12

Clark Murdock, CSIS Defense and National Security Group Senior Adviser, 1/10/12, Weaker Defense Dollars, www.defensenews.com/article/20120610/DEFFEAT05/306100005/Weaker-Defense-Dollars

The White House and Capitol Hill have spent months publicly battling over the size of defense cuts, while the Defense Department faces a far greater threat from within: the prospect of not only fewer defense dollars but also **weaker defense dollars**.

Most of the current commentary inside the Capital Beltway is focused on the $500 billion in sequestration cuts that could emerge in January, **but it is the escalating cost of continuing to do business that has sapped the defense dollar’s purchasing power**.

The deepest level of cuts being envisioned, the dreaded sequester, only goes half as far as has been seen in every previous drawdown this century, including a drop of 43 percent after the Korean War, 33 percent after the Vietnam War and 36 percent following the Cold War. Nonetheless, senior Pentagon officials have stridently opposed these cuts, invoking epithets ranging from “mindless” and “devastating” to “catastrophic.”

This reaction is likely due to the fact that the defense budget is being hollowed out by internal cost inflation. The defense budget is $300 billion larger than it was in 2001, and yet there are fewer dollars available today for buying weapons and fielding new capabilities. Indeed, increasing personnel, operations and acquisition costs have combined to form a three-headed monster that is eating away at the foundation of U.S. military superiority.

**Personnel and operating costs** have always made up the largest portion of the budget, but they have recently **ballooned to 70 percent of the total budget and are squeezing out** the **accounts that pay for new hardware and** the **development of** the **next generation of systems**. If personnel costs are allowed to continue to grow at their current rate, they will, as Todd Harrison of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments has observed, “consume the entire defense budget by FY2039.”

Plan’s the greater internal link to hegemony-grid insecurity causes immediate collapse of military operations-their evidence is about long-term strategy

.

**No impact to defense cuts**

Schake 11

Kori, A heretic responds, Research fellow at the Hoover Institution and an associate professor of international security studies at the United States Military Academy.

http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/13/a\_heretic\_responds

I agree with Tom that our current level of defense spending is not an undue burden on the American economy. Since the end of World War II, spending levels have been far in excess of our current roughly 4 percent of GDP without demonstrable negative economic effects. But three other factors persuade me that reductions to defense spending should be undertaken. First, we have a national security vulnerability of epic proportions in our federal debt. Defense is not the primary cause of that debt; obviously, our medical and retirement programs need to be reduced and brought into sustainable proportions. But defense is a significant contributor to the debt. Military strength is not the sole basis of American power -- our economy, our values, our vibrancy demand we put ourselves on sound financial footing, which requires us to address the problem of American debt addiction. I have a difficult time seeing how either the math or the politics work to bring federal spending into line with receipts if conservatives rule defense out of bounds. Second, our near-term margin of error is actually enormously wide in defense compared to any prospective challenger. The world is much more conducive to American interests than it was when Defense spending as a proportion of GDP was much higher: we are militarily dominant, the threats to us are fewer and less apocalyptic, our allies are more capable to handle their own problems, our enemies less so, and our values on the ascendancy. Coming off two intellectually and operationally demanding wars, the American military is weary but amazingly proficient and adaptive. Moreover, our military services are better than at any time in history. They have conducted a rolling modernizatixon, replacing equipment with much better equipment as it was exhausted in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have battle tested forces that can successfully span the spectrum from high-intensity warfare to counterinsurgency, excelling at individuals taking initiative. While others may learn from studying our operations, there's no substitute for the doing we have been doing. Third, the American military is brilliant at effectiveness; efficiency, not so much. As Admiral Mullen confessed during the last budget cycle, money has been plentiful in DOD for so long we've forgotten how to budget and economize. We tend to overwhelm problems with resources. That's not a bad strategy, but it's a profligate strategy, and we ought to hold ourselves to a higher standard. Our strongest suit is not spending but innovation, and because of the demands of the wars, we have a military primed for tackling the problems with more innovative approaches. **Spending does not guarantee capability; in many cases, it impedes finding better solutions and creates complacency.** We have more than doubled the baseline budget in the past ten years, even before adding in the operational costs of the wars. Is the world twice as dangerous as it was in 2001? I doubt it. Besides, inputs are not the right measure of outputs. I believe it's genuinely wrong to equate spending with commitment to defense. Our safety lies in our ability to find better solutions, not our ability to spend more than our adversaries.

**No impact to defense cuts and lack of tightening ensures irresponsibility**

Korb 12

Lawrence, Commentary: Defense cuts won't hurt that much

http://money.cnn.com/2012/08/02/news/economy/defense-cuts-commentary/

Across-the-board spending cuts will be the most damaging thing to hit the Defense Department since Pearl Harbor. That is, if you believe the defense establishment. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta claims that so-called sequestration will have a catastrophic impact on our national security and create a hollow force. Sens. John McCain and Lindsay Graham are sounding the alarm about the profound negative consequences to our national security and economy. And the Aerospace Industries Association claims that sequestration would result in the loss of more than 1 million jobs. Korb: What Iraq pullout means to the budget Sequestration certainly is not a smart way to cut the defense budget. But close analysis of these claims makes it clear that they're wildly exaggerated. If automatic reductions in defense spending go into effect, the fiscal year 2013 base (or non-war) budget will be reduced by $55 billion to $500 billion and remain at that level in real terms for the next decade. This will result in a total reduction of $500 billion over a decade from projected levels of defense spending. But it also means the Pentagon will still be spending more in 2013 after sequestration than it did in 2006, at the height of the Iraq war, and more than we spent on average at the end of the Cold War and during the first Gulf war. Moreover, the United States will still account for 40% of the world's military expenditures -- 70% if you combine that with what our allies spend. These cuts come after 13 straight years of defense increases, which brought defense spending to levels not seen since World War II. Are those hyperventilating about sequestration really claiming that we wouldn't be able to provide for national security? As for jobs, there are at least three reasons why sequestration will have only a minimal impact in 2013. First, the reductions are unlikely to have much impact on the hundreds of billions of dollars in existing multi-year defense contracts. Second, in making the reductions, DOD can also tap other funds beyond its requested $550 billion base budget, in essence giving it $721 billion from which to cut next year. For instance, it can choose to draw on its requested overseas war funding budget of $88 billion since it has items like routine personnel costs that have nothing to do with the wars. Plus, the DOD could draw from its $83 billion in unobligated balances, which is money authorized but not yet spent. Third, sequestration will not have an impact on foreign military sales, which were over $40 billion this year and account for about 25% of the revenues of major defense companies. DOD, in short, does not have a resource problem. It has a management problem. Its leaders did not have to enforce fiscal discipline during the gusher of defense spending between 2001 and 2010. As a result, it wasted $50 billion on weapons systems it later cancelled and has cost overruns topping $500 billion on 95 major weapons systems. Sen. McCain himself called the acquisition process for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, the most expensive weapons program, a scandal and a tragedy. Frank Kendall, the Pentagon's acquisition chief, said the department was guilty of "acquisition malpractice" in managing the F-35 program. Even those who believe defense spending should be reduced object to the "meat ax approach" of sequestration in which all items in the defense budget would be cut equally. They have a point. But there are other alternatives. One, laid out by the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, would achieve the same level of required savings under the Budget Control Act, but implement the cuts more gradually. This would be done by reducing projected levels of inflation-adjusted spending by 2.2% a year over the next decade. To do this, however, Congress would need to amend the BCA. But even the prospect of such a work-around, which would give Pentagon leaders more say about where and when the cuts occur, isn't enough to convince them to proactively plan for potential funding cuts, which they say would be catastrophic. Really? This from the organization that planned for a nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union that would have destroyed civilization as we know it? If they need a guide, they can turn to a plan by the co-chairmen of the president's Deficit Reduction Commission (Bowles-Simpson), which outlined $973 billion in cuts to defense over the next decade. The most serious security problem facing the nation is our federal debt. Reducing defense won't solve that problem. But since defense accounts for 20% of federal expenditures and 50% of all discretionary spending, it can and should reduce be reduced to 2006 levels, sequester or no sequester. The American people support it. And if the Pentagon's leaders can't do it, they don't deserve to be there

#### No challengers

Kaplan, senior fellow – Center for a New American Security, and Kaplan, frmr. vice chairman – National Intelligence Council, ‘11

(Robert D and Stephen S, “America Primed,” *The National Interest*, March/April)

But in spite of the seemingly inevitable and rapid diminution of U.S. eminence, to write America’s great-power obituary is beyond premature. The United States remains a highly capable power. Iraq and Afghanistan, as horrendous as they have proved to be—in a broad historical sense—are still relatively minor events that America can easily overcome. The eventual demise of empires like those of Ming China and late-medieval Venice was brought about by far more pivotal blunders.

Think of the Indian Mutiny against the British in 1857 and 1858. Iraq in particular—ever so frequently touted as our turning point on the road to destruction—looks to some extent eerily similar. At the time, orientalists and other pragmatists in the British power structure (who wanted to leave traditional India as it was) lost some sway to evangelical and utilitarian reformers (who wanted to modernize and Christianize India—to make it more like England). But the attempt to bring the fruits of Western civilization to the Asian subcontinent was met with a violent revolt against imperial authority. Delhi, Lucknow and other Indian cities were besieged and captured before being retaken by colonial forces. Yet, the debacle did not signal the end of the British Empire at all, which continued on and even expanded for another century. Instead, it signaled the transition from more of an ad hoc imperium fired by a proselytizing lust to impose its values on others to a calmer and more pragmatic empire built on international trade and technology.1 There is no reason to believe that the fate of America need follow a more doomed course.

Yes, the mistakes made in Iraq and Afghanistan have been the United States’ own, but, though destructive, they are not fatal. If we withdraw sooner rather than later, the cost to American power can be stemmed. Leaving a stable Afghanistan behind of course requires a helpful Pakistan, but with more pressure Washington might increase Islamabad’s cooperation in relatively short order.

In terms of acute threats, Iran is the only state that has exported terrorism and insurgency toward a strategic purpose, yet the country is economically fragile and politically unstable, with behind-the-scenes infighting that would make Washington partisans blanch. Even assuming Iran acquires a few nuclear devices—of uncertain quality with uncertain delivery systems—the long-term outlook for the clerical regime is itself unclear. The administration must only avoid a war with the Islamic Republic.

To be sure, America may be in decline in relative terms compared to some other powers, as well as to many countries of the former third world, but in absolute terms, particularly military ones, the United States can easily be the first among equals for decades hence.

China, India and Russia are the only major Eurasian states prepared to wield military power of consequence on their peripheries. And each, in turn, faces its own obstacles on the road to some degree of dominance.

The Chinese will have a great navy (assuming their economy does not implode) and that will enforce a certain level of bipolarity in the world system. But Beijing will lack the alliance network Washington has, even as China and Russia will always be—because of geography—inherently distrustful of one another. China has much influence, but no credible military allies beyond possibly North Korea, and its authoritarian regime lives in fear of internal disruption if its economic growth rate falters. Furthermore, Chinese naval planners look out from their coastline and see South Korea and a string of islands—Japan, Taiwan and Australia—that are American allies, as are, to a lesser degree, the Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand. To balance a rising China, Washington must only preserve its naval and air assets at their current levels.

India, which has its own internal insurgency, is bedeviled by semifailed states on its borders that critically sap energy and attention from its security establishment, and especially from its land forces; in any case, India has become a de facto ally of the United States whose very rise, in and of itself, helps to balance China.

Russia will be occupied for years regaining influence in its post-Soviet near abroad, particularly in Ukraine, whose feisty independence constitutes a fundamental challenge to the very idea of the Russian state. China checks Russia in Central Asia, as do Turkey, Iran and the West in the Caucasus. This is to say nothing of Russia’s diminishing population and overwhelming reliance on energy exports. Given the problems of these other states, America remains fortunate indeed.

The United States is poised to tread the path of postmutiny Britain. America might not be an empire in the formal sense, but its obligations and constellation of military bases worldwide put it in an imperial-like situation, particularly because its air and naval deployments will continue in a post-Iraq and post-Afghanistan world. No country is in such an enviable position to keep the relative peace in Eurasia as is the United States—especially if it can recover the level of enduring competence in national-security policy last seen during the administration of George H. W. Bush. This is no small point. America has strategic advantages and can enhance its power while extricating itself from war. But this requires leadership—not great and inspiring leadership which comes along rarely even in the healthiest of societies—but plodding competence, occasionally steely nerved and always free of illusion.

Plan doesn’t spend cash up-front

**DOE 11**, “Funding Federal Energy and Water Projects”, July, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/52085.pdf>

On-site renewable PPAs allow Federal agencies to fund on-site renewable energy projects with no upfront capital costs incurred. A developer installs a renewable energy system on agency property under an agreement that the agency will purchase the power generated by the system. The agency pays for the system through these power purchase payments over the life of the contract. After installation, the developer owns, operates, and maintains the system for the life of the contract. The PPA price is typically determined through a competitive procurement process.

Saves money

**GAO 8**, “Federal Energy Management: Addressing Challenges through Better Plans and Clarifying the

Greenhouse Gas Emission Measure Will Help Meet Long-term Goals for

Buildings”, September, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/290/282358.html>

According to agency officials, alternative financing mechanisms offer benefits but also present challenges. In terms of benefits, these mechanisms can be used to complete energy projects and meet federal energy reduction goals when upfront funding is not available. For example, DOD officials stated that alternative financing mechanisms are necessary for DOD to meet future energy goals and, in March 2008 testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness, House Committee on Armed Services, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment stated that ESPCs typically account for more than half of all site energy savings.[Footnote 28] Furthermore, according to DOD, the agency fell short of meeting past energy efficiency goals owing to a lapse in ESPC authority from October 2003 to October 2004. In addition, DOE officials noted that alternative financing mechanisms provide large energy savings per dollar spent and estimated that ESPC project savings generally exceed guaranteed energy savings by about 10 percent. In 2005, we reported that agencies cited other benefits from alternatively financed projects, such as improved reliability of the newer equipment over the aging equipment it replaced, environmental improvements, and additional energy and financial savings once the contracts have been paid for.[Footnote 29]

Doesn’t spend appropriations

**GAO 8**, “Federal Energy Management: Addressing Challenges through Better Plans and Clarifying the

Greenhouse Gas Emission Measure Will Help Meet Long-term Goals for

Buildings”, September, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/290/282358.html>

Constrained Budgets Limit Agencies' Ability to Undertake Energy Projects, and Agencies Are Turning to Alternative Financing: Meeting long-term energy goals will require major initial capital investment. According to DOE, to meet the energy goals under E.O. 13423, the federal government would have to invest approximately $1.1 billion annually (beginning in fiscal year 2008, based on fiscal year 2007 performance) through 2015 on energy-related projects. In addition, in June 2007, ASE reported that meeting federal energy goals will require an investment of approximately $11 billion from 2009 through 2015, or $1.5 billion annually.[Footnote 23] Paying for this investment up front with appropriated funds may be difficult for agencies because energy projects compete with other budget priorities. As figure 10 shows, from fiscal years 2000 through 2007, upfront funding ranged from approximately $121 million to $335 million annually--well below the $1.1 billion level of investment needed annually to meet future energy goals, according to DOE's estimate. Furthermore, according to draft DOE data for fiscal year 2007, federal agencies will face an estimated $5.3 billion gap in appropriated funding for energy investment from fiscal year 2008 through 2015.

Figure 10: Approximate Upfront Funding for Energy Projects, Fiscal

Years 2000-2007:

This figure is a shaded line graph showing approximate upfront funding for energy projects, fiscal years 2000-2007. The X axis represents the fiscal year, and the Y axis represents the dollars (in millions). Source: GAO analysis of DOE data for 2000-2005 and draft data for 2006 and 2007.

[Chart Deleted]

Officials from all six agencies we reviewed cited budget constraints as a challenge to meeting future energy goals. For example, only 4 of the 10 military installations we visited have received upfront funding from DOD's Energy Conservation Investment Program since 2003.[Footnote 24] Furthermore, several DOD installation officials told us that they no longer request funding for energy improvements because they do not believe upfront funding will be made available. In our previous work we similarly noted that agency officials had stopped requesting such funding. We also noted that paying for energy efficiency improvements with upfront funding is generally the most cost-effective means of acquiring them.[Footnote 25] Because the total amount of upfront funding is limited, federal officials increasingly rely on alternative financing mechanisms--such as contracts with private companies that initially pay for energy improvements and then receive compensation from the agencies over time from the monetary savings they realize from these projects-- to meet energy goals. Seven of the 11 civilian sites and 9 of the 10 military installations we visited have used, are currently using, or are planning to use alternative financing to implement energy projects. Furthermore, in an August 2007 memo, the White House Council on Environmental Quality directed agency heads to enter into energy savings performance contracts (ESPC) and utility energy savings contracts (UESC) for at least 10 percent of annual energy costs to accomplish energy-related goals.[Footnote 26] It further directed them to report on progress toward finding and developing alternatively financed projects.[Footnote 27] Figure 11 shows the total amount of funding agencies received from upfront funding and alternative financing for UESCs and for ESPCs. As discussed earlier, most agencies met their fiscal year 2007 goals. However, for 2008 onward, if funding stays at the current level, there is an apparent gap between the amount received and the amount estimated to meet energy goals.

#### Desal solves US ag collapse

Larry C Witte 11, professor of mechanical engineering specializing in energy transport and thermodynamics at the University of Houston, “Time has come to harness nuclear power for water desalination”, November 4, <http://www.chron.com/opinion/outlook/article/Time-has-come-to-harness-nuclear-power-for-water-2252669.php>

The spread of arid regions from prolonged drought in many parts of the world has been as fast as it has been remarkable. Severe water stress might become even more serious for the world's population than the need for energy.

Because water in many regions is being consumed faster than it's being replenished, potable water for human consumption or near-potable water for irrigation has become an increasingly scarce resource.

Water scarcity is now recognized as an issue of strategic importance. The U.S. government forecasts that at least 36 states will face water shortages within the next few years.

In Texas, we are now draining water at an alarming rate from underground reservoirs that have been there for thousands of years. The vast Ogallala aquifer, the primary water resource of the Great Plains, underlying 156,000 square miles, is seriously depleted. Extreme drought in recent years has made the situation worse, and forecasts show that water needs are expected to grow even as supplies may shrink because of increasing populations. The current drought might go on for another year, according to meteorologists, but even an end to the drought will not immediately replenish the vast underground aquifers.

Texas, of course, is not alone. Almost every part of the country is running into water problems. The expanding population of Arizona and Nevada is desperate for water. The water table of the highly productive San Joaquin Valley in California has been so lowered by intensive irrigation that the land has settled 30 feet in some places. Atlanta and its suburbs - home to 5 million people - came close a few years ago to seeing its principal water supply, Lake Lanier, dry up. There is talk that Atlanta's credit rating might even be downgraded because of its inability to cope with water issues.

Notably in Texas, El Paso, in conjunction with Fort Bliss, have developed a desalination plant to produce 27.5 million gallons per day (MGD) of fresh water using a previously unusable brackish ground water supply. It is said to be the largest inland desalination plant in the world.

Nuclear desalination is safe and reliable. The U.S. lags India and Japan in combining nuclear power with desalination. Currently eight nuclear reactors coupled to desalination units are operating in Japan. And plans to build nuclear desalination units are being considered in South America, Europe and the Middle East.

The technology for nuclear desalination is relatively simple. Energy from a reactor core is used to turn water into steam that passes through turbines to produce power. Some of the power can be used to drive pumps in a reverse osmosis filtration process that separates fresh water from salty seawater or brackish inland water sources. A flash distillation process can also be employed that uses the heat stored in the reactor coolant water directly.

What can be done to cope with this situation, especially in Texas?

Desalination could certainly be part of the solution. And since Texas needs power along with water, why not use nuclear reactors to provide energy and desalinated water simultaneously? The appeal of desalination is growing: between 2000 and 2005, desalination capacity increased by 41 percent worldwide.

A study funded by the Texas Water Development Board in 2006 showed that most desalination in Texas is for inland water sources rather than seawater. Currently desalination plants in the United States use oil or natural gas for fuel. But seawater desalination represents only 8 percent of installed capacity in the United States, compared to 60 percent worldwide.

The Texas Gulf Coast would be the right place for desalination reactors; they could take advantage of the availability of sea water for reactor cooling and desalination purposes. Risks like earthquakes, and earthquake-induced tsunamis, are very low in the Gulf of Mexico. It would make good sense to have a grid of pipelines eventually crisscrossing Texas, carrying not oil or natural gas, but fresh water

In fact, the National Research Council recently said that desalination of seawater and brackish groundwater "offers the potential to substantially reduce water scarcity … particularly in water-scarce regions, in localities experiencing rapid growth, or where users are able and willing to pay for high-quality, reliable new supply." A study by Argonne National Laboratory confirms that a nuclear plant that both generates electricity and provides heat for desalination would be more economical over its operating life than a similar plant using fossil fuels. And a nuclear plant doesn't emit greenhouse gases.

Protecting water resources is essential. State and local governments need to prevent excessive use of water. Recycling wastewater for irrigation can help. And rainwater can be recaptured through engineering to prevent excessive runoff, which would help replenish supplies. But such measures, however helpful and necessary, are not enough. Nuclear desalination plants could contribute substantially to our energy and water needs. The federal government could help address the water crisis by providing incentives for the development of dual-purpose reactors capable of providing electricity for commercial and residential use and heat for desalination.

If it seems difficult to foresee the use of nuclear desalination in Texas to provide relief from severe water shortages, it seems impossible to envisage our economy and environment remaining healthy for long without access to more fresh water. Today's water problems should be a warning of things to come.

#### Extinction

Lugar 4

(Richard, U.S. Senator, <http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html>)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But **we do so at our peril.** One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe.   Productivity revolution  To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world**.** The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a **decisive** humanitarian **role** in the **survival of billions of people** and the health of our planet.

## 2AC Elections

#### Obama win is locked in—too many routes to victory

Robert Shrum, Daily Beast, 10/26/12, Robert Shrum: Why Obama Will Win, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/10/26/robert-shrum-why-obama-will-win.html

Obama’s strategists knew the Romney spin was and is as ephemeral as the air it’s spoken on. For Romney may be the last refuge of a candidate who dares not be candid—who has to hide his beliefs and commitments in a fog of political presumption. But if you see past the smoke and mirrors, you will understand that Barack Obama continues to command the electoral landscape. After the debacle in Denver, I argued that the structure of the race hadn’t fundamentally changed—and wouldn’t unless the president faltered again in the second debate. He didn’t. He let Romney into the game; state and national polls did tighten—mostly because undecideds who lean Republican and voted for McCain moved to Romney. They would have anyway. Now the surge is receding—and contrary to the conventional verdict, the second and third debates not only stemmed Romney gains, but restored Obama’s advantage. Even the outlier of outliers, the flawed Gallup tracking poll, which recently accorded Romney a seven-point lead, shows him only three ahead in a seven-day average—which means the numbers will almost certainly shift further toward the president as the bad days drop out of the average. Gallup drives news, but it’s increasingly discounted by political analysts. The Greenberg survey for the Democracy Corps—a rare survey in which 33 percent of the respondents were reached on their cellphones—has Obama leading 49 to 46 percent. It’s not a big lead—and never will be. But the president has other big advantages that will prove decisive. And here is where the fundamentals haven’t changed. The outcome will be decided in the battleground states—and here Obama has many more paths to a 270 electoral-vote majority. For example, he could lose Ohio—and still get there if he took New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Colorado. But Ohio is anything but lost; after dispensing with the GOP-infected numbers of Rasmussen, and the figments of the fly-by-night pollsters, the president has a consistent margin of 4 to 5 percent—and is at or near 50 percent. Similarly, in the new PPP data, he is five points up in Virginia with 51 percent of the vote. In Nevada, Mark Melman, who almost alone called Senator Harry Reid’s 2010 triumph, shows Obama eight ahead. One of Republican Governor Brian Sandoval’s top advisers has bluntly predicted: “Obama will carry the state.” The adviser may not keep his job, but the president will take Nevada. So it goes across the swing states, even in Florida and except in North Carolina. But there, the Obama campaign has registered a legion of new voters—and everywhere it has the most in-depth, technologically sophisticated, and well-staffed turnout operation in history. That can and will make the difference where the contest is close. The president has twice as many field offices as Romney—800 of them across the battlegrounds. And Romney’s are afterthoughts—late to the game, run by the Republican National Committee, and without the rich, data-based voter targeting of the Obama effort. A GOP operative in Colorado says he adds two to four points to the president’s poll numbers in the state because Obama has a better organization. Finally, Romney can run, but he can’t hide—from the Bain ads that are on the air again in the Midwest, from the relentless Obama focus on the choice between a candidate who stands for the middle class and a candidate who favors the 1 percent. Now he faces the prospect of explaining his 1991 testimony in a post-divorce lawsuit against the founder of Staples—which has been unsealed by a court in Boston. This could be the next chapter in the story of a business career that was his calling card, but has become a political liability. Stuff just keeps happening to Mitt Romney. He has to flee the press to avoid answering questions about the only Senate candidate he’s made an ad for—Indiana’s Richard Mourdock, who suddenly dominated the national news with his repugnant divination that a pregnancy due to rape is “something God intended.” Romney can’t bring himself to pull the endorsement ad; he’s too afraid of his own right-wing shadow. He can’t escape the extremists in his party with whom he fellow-travelled as he pandered his way to the nomination. Thus the gender gap widens—and the moderate makeover unravels. Mitt is mired in the mid-20s with Hispanics, who heard him say “illegals” should “self-deport.” He’s far behind with younger voters—and the Obama organization will get them to the polls, with an assist from Romney’s position on social issues like reproductive rights and marriage equality. The restrictive voter-ID laws have mostly been struck down, at least for this year, and blacks and other minorities won’t be blocked from casting their ballots. Blue-collar workers in the Midwest can’t forgive Romney’s opposition to saving the auto industry—and they don’t trust the man from Bain. Even his lead among seniors is being eroded by his plan to replace Medicare with Vouchercare—and to raise the cost of their prescription drugs. That’s why enough of the battleground states, where the campaign is being fully engaged, will be Obama country on Election Night. The brief silly cycle of spin about the impending, even inevitable Romney presidency is ending.

**A “close race” in the numbers doesn’t affect chances of victory**

Silver 10-31-12

Nate, Oct. 31: Obama’s Electoral College ‘Firewall’ Holding in Polls

http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/01/oct-31-obamas-electoral-college-firewall-holding-in-polls/#more-36981

There were 12 polls published on Wednesday among Iowa, Nevada, Ohio and Wisconsin. Mr. Obama held the lead in 11 of the 12 surveys; the exception was a survey by the University of Iowa, which had Mr. Obama down by about one point there, but also had a very small sample size (about 300 likely voters). On average, Mr. Obama led in the polls of these states by 3.9 percentage points. None of this ought to have been surprising, exactly, if you have been attentive to the polls rather than the pundits. It was a pretty good day of surveys for Mr. Obama but not a great one: for the most part, the polls were coming in close to FiveThirtyEight forecasts in each state, give or take a modest outlier here and there. Rather, the polls in these states confirmed what we already knew: that Mr. Obama remains the favorite in the Electoral College. Mr. Obama is not a sure thing, by any means. It is a close race. His chances of holding onto his Electoral College lead and converting it into another term are equivalent to the chances of an N.F.L. team winning when it leads by a field goal with three minutes left to play in the fourth quarter. There are plenty of things that could go wrong, and sometimes they will. **But** it turns out that an N.F.L. team that leads by a field goal with three minutes left to go winds up winning the game 79 percent of the time. Those were Mr. Obama’s chances in the FiveThirtyEight forecast as of Wednesday: 79 percent. Not coincidentally, these are also about Mr. Obama’s chances of winning Ohio, according to the forecast. Regular readers will have seen the chart below once or twice before. It sorts the competitive states in order of Mr. Obama’s current projected margin of victory or defeat in each one, keeping a running tally of the number of electoral votes that Mr. Obama is accumulating.

Even in a decline in approval and loss of popular vote irrelevant

Silver 10-31-12

Nate, Oct. 31: Obama’s Electoral College ‘Firewall’ Holding in Polls

http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/01/oct-31-obamas-electoral-college-firewall-holding-in-polls/#more-36981

Suppose, however, that Mr. Obama were to tie Mr. Romney in the popular vote on Tuesday. The way that the forecast model works, this would require subtracting some from Mr. Obama in each state in order for the arithmetic to add up. Even under these conditions, Mr. Obama would still be a favorite in the forecast. In fact, he’d be about a 70 percent favorite to win the Electoral College conditional upon the national popular vote being tied, according to our simulations. A tie in the national popular vote is a tolerable condition for Mr. Obama, in other words. His position is robust enough in states like Ohio that he has some slack. With a lead of about 2.5 percentage points in the tipping-point states, Mr. Obama could underperform his state polls by a point or two and still win. Conversely, Mr. Romney has few chances to win unles

s the state polls are systematically wrong.

No impact to reduced turnout

Nate Cohn, New Republic Election Expert, Part-Time Georgetown Coach -- his articles go through a TNR editing process and are available for all on his blog, he has been profiled on New York Magazine and MSNBC, 10/1/12, Obama’s College Voter Trump Card, [www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/107974/obamas-college-voter-trump-card](http://www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/107974/obamas-college-voter-trump-card)

Even if turnout among these voters is down 18 percent—and that’s beneath 2004, by the way—the total number of young, disproportionately non-white, and Obama-friendly voters actually increases from 23.5 to 25.7 million.

Even in this relatively low-turnout scenario, 6.5 million new 18-22 year olds will enter the electorate and they can go a long way toward helping Obama compensate for declining turnout among ’08 voters or an increase in conservative turnout. If they vote 63-37 for Obama, the president would net-1.7 million voters.

If non-white or young voters turned out at ’08-levels in 2012, demographics would actually ensure that Obama does even better than he did four years ago. These same demographic trends give Democrats a bit of breathing room to withstand modest declines in enthusiasm among young voters without actually falling far behind where they stood four years ago.

With this in mind, it’s no surprise that Obama opened his campaign at Ohio State University, or that Michelle Obama is holding rallies on college campuses across the battleground states. Today’s college students didn’t vote four years ago, and even an underwhelming turnout from America's most diverse age group could help the Obama campaign make up for losses among voters who have abandoned their cause since 2008.

One policy won’t impact environmental turnout

Neil Munro, Daily Caller, 8/30/2011, Obama still has green energy vote for 2012, dailycaller.com/2011/08/30/obama-still-has-green-energy-vote-for-2012/?print=1

But there’s little evidence so far that progressives’ disappointment with Obama’s environmental policies threatens to reduce their turnout on election day, or that it pressures White House officials to make additional concessions to environmentalists during a political season dominated by the public’s demand for additional jobs.

Monday’s colorful, TV-ready protests against the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada’s oil fields to U.S consumers took place in Lafayette Park, in front of the White House.

The day’s events included 100 peaceful arrests of environmentalists and celebrities, a multi-faith spiritual event in Lafayette Park, press club speeches by environmental leaders, and numerous suggestions that approval of the pipeline by Obama will cost his campaign votes, volunteers and donations. Hundreds of others have already been arrested, and numerous environmental groups have contributed to two weeks of protest.

If Obama approves the pipeline, environmental activist Andrew Driscoll predicted he would not vote to re-elect him. “He hasn’t done anything to earn our vote yet,” said the Massachusetts activist. “The fate of humanity, the fate of the planet” will be determined by Obama’s pipeline decision, he said.

“If he approves it, it will be a huge blow, not only for our future, but also for this administration,” said Elijah Zarlin, a campaign manager at CREDO Action, an Atlanta-based progressive group. The protesters “are the people who are maybe going to vote for Obama, and are the people Barack will lose” if he approves the pipeline, he added.

However, the leadership of the green movement isn’t threatening to break with Obama over this one decision.

Instead, they are balancing their goal of stopping the pipeline with the need to keep their supporters motivated even when the public opposes regulation of job-producing companies, and with their shared desire to avoid the election of a GOP president, such as Texas Gov. Rick Perry.

The protests, arrests, caravans and petitions help make the president uncomfortable and reduce the chance that he’ll side with industry interests, said Philip Radford, Greenpeace’s executive director. The movement won’t accept a compromise offer from the White House, but will instead try to defeat the pipeline at the federal, state and local levels, he said. “This will be an embarrassment for the president,” he predicted.

“If the tar-sands pipeline is approved [by Obama], we will be back and our numbers will grow,” said James Hansen, a NASA scientist and political advocate. “For the sake of our children and grandchildren, we must find someone who is worthy of our dreams.”

Advocates for the $7 billion pipeline — including labor unions — say it will create 20,000 good jobs and reduce gasoline-price disruptions. That’s a message that resonates with the swing-voting independents that Obama needs to win next November.

Green activists’ importance to Obama’s re-election campaign is boosted by Obama’s losses among other voters, including whites, women, Hispanics and younger voters. Gallup’s daily poll on August 29 already showed Obama’s approval rate at 38 percent, and his disapproval rate at 55 percent.

But the environmentalists’ importance is also offset by their apparent reluctance to abandon Obama, even when he supports policies they dislike.

For example, a monthly survey of 1,000 registered voters by Public Policy Polling shows that Obama still maintains a favorable rating of 87 percent among liberals, and an unfavorable rating of 12 percent, down roughly 4 percentage points from a score of 91 percent and 7 percent in March.

The August poll showed that 27 percent believe he is too conservative, up from 18 percent in March. Roughly 8 percent considered him too liberal in both polls.

The August poll also showed that 86 percent of liberals would vote for Obama in 2012, down only 2 points from 88 percent in a March. Six percent said they were unsure, up from 3 percent in March.

That support is more faithful than conservatives’ support for President George W. Bush, which fell sharply once he pushed a 2007 immigration reform bill that included a conditional amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants.

Environmentalists aren’t breaking with Obama in part because they’re lowering their own expectations of Obama’s commitment to environmental causes during a economic trough. “I’m still optimistic he will stop [the pipeline], but I’m afraid he won’t,” said Zarlin.

Obama and DoD action on renewables now

Colman 12

Zack Colman, The Hill, 8/7/12, White House to seek $7B in green energy contracts for military, thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/242593-army-announces-renewable-energy-contracts-as-white-house-continues-green-push

The White House announced Tuesday it is inviting contract proposals from green energy firms to boost the Army’s use of renewable energy.

The administration is making **$7 billion available** for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to spend on locally-generated biomass, geothermal, solar or wind energy for up to 30 years.

The move is part of a broader White House-led push to green the armed forces, **over GOP opposition**, **which claims the efforts are a waste of taxpayer dollars**.

The Defense Department has set ambitious targets, aiming for renewable sources to account for 25 percent of its energy by 2025, with the Army working toward getting 1 gigawatt of power from green sources by that year.

Heather Zichal, the White House deputy assistant for energy and climate change, praised the DOD’s “extraordinary work” to promote renewable energy usage, in a media call on Tuesday.

She said alternative energy will reduce costs and enhance national security.

Republicans, however, have pressed the White House and military to abandon some alternative energy programs. They say the efforts cost too much with budget sequestration threatening to slash the defense budget by $492 billion over 10 years.

Zichal, though, said **the president was fully behind the push** and believed the military’s turn toward alternative energy was “operationally necessary, financially prudent and mission critical.”

She also lauded the Navy’s July demonstration of its “Great Green Fleet” aircraft carrier strike group. That Pacific Rim exercise tested a fuel that combined a $26-per-gallon biofuel with conventional petroleum.

On Monday, the Army, along with the Interior Department, announced it would integrate green energy electricity sources such as wind and solar at military installations. Interior and the Army said those power generators would keep the lights on should the commercial electric grid fail.

**The military-centric announcements are** one **part of a larger White House renewable energy blitz** this week.

Earlier Tuesday, the administration revealed it would fast-track seven solar and wind electricity projects on federal lands and also held a news conference celebrating the completion of the first wind farm on federal lands in Nevada.

#### Incentives now

Kramer 12

David Kramer, Physics Today, Sept 2012, Romney, Obama surrogates spell out candidates’ energy policies, www.physicstoday.org/resource/1/phtoad/v65/i9/p20\_s1

Both candidates favor growth in nuclear energy, and both support loan guarantees to back the initial deployment of advanced reactors. Stuntz said Romney would take steps to lower the cost of building new plants, “whether that means modular reactors that can be approved and rolled out in more cookie-cutter fashion . . . or whether that means smaller reactors.”

The Obama administration’s support for nuclear power is evident from the $7 billion loan guarantee from DOE to back construction of two new reactors at an existing nuclear power plant in Georgia, Reicher noted. “**There’s serious money going into** s**mall** m**odular** r**eactors** and serious policy work going on in how to reform the licensing process” at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expedite approval.

#### New information won’t impact swing voters

Chris Cillizza, WaPo, 10/9/12, Who are the “undecided” voters? And what the heck are they waiting for?, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/10/09/who-are-the-undecided-voters-and-what-are-the-heck-are-they-waiting-for/

Even if you agree with Ayres, however, it’s tough to know what message works to persuade broad swaths of them. Because so many of these undecideds are low information voters, crafting a message that works is next to impossible. They could just as well make up their mind based on the last person’s ad they saw

 on TV or what their girlfriend’s brother told them as any specific message being directed their way by the microtargeting arms of the two campaigns.

#### Plan shields controversy

Appelbaum 12 Binyamin, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R&D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8, http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been **more successful** than other federal agencies because it is the **main user of the innovations that it finances**. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an **unusually direct stake in the outcome** of its research and development projects.¶ "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes."¶ Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda **in controversial areas.** No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

New military spending swings Florida and other battlegrounds

Thompson, 12

(Political Columnist-Forbes, “The Florida Effect: How Military Votes Could Hand Romney the White House,” 8/21, http://www.forbes.com/sites/lorenthompson/2012/08/21/the-florida-effect-how-military-votes-could-hand-romney-the-white-house/print/)

Much has been written about the wrangling and irregularities that surrounded Bush’s controversial victory — Gore actually won the popular vote nationwide — but one crucial factor in Bush’s Florida win has been largely overlooked. If Eglin Air Force Base in the state’s western Panhandle had been located in Alabama rather than Florida, Al Gore would have been sitting in the White House on 9-11. The counties around Eglin generated the most lopsided totals in the state favoring Bush, with the main county where the base is located giving Gore less than one in four votes. Not coincidentally, the only other county in the state where Bush did so well and Gore so badly was near the Navy’s big bases at Jacksonville. As the Wikipedia entry for that county observes, it is “a popular choice of residence for military personnel” stationed at those bases. So it was George Bush who was sitting in the White House on 9-11, because military votes had enabled him to overcome strong support for Gore in places like Miami-Dade County, winning a majority in both Florida and the Electoral College. Had Gore prevailed in Florida there probably wouldn’t have been an Iraq war three years later, and there might not have even been terrorist attacks on 9-11 since there would have been less disruption to the nation’s security team. Paradoxically, the preference of voters near big military bases in Florida for a “strong leader” like Bush may have led to a decade of war. But that’s just speculation; what is very real is the role that **voters motivated by military interests play in national elections** — a role that usually favors GOP presidential candidates. I’m not just talking about active-duty military personnel stationed at big bases in swing states like Colorado, Ohio and Virginia. I’m also referring to dependents whose lifestyles are determined by military pay and benefits, reservists residing in all 50 states, veterans who have retained their ties to the military, and civilians working at big bases whose jobs are endangered every time the Pentagon cuts spending. Add all these constituencies up, and they **amount to a pretty sizable voting bloc for any presidential candidate who is willing to throw money at the military.** Lately, those candidates have tended to be Republicans. Although Democrats presided over most of the big military buildups of the last century, their party’s thinking about defense was transformed by the Vietnam War. The left wing of the party became decidedly anti-military, just as the transition to an All Volunteer Force was making the military more conservative in its political leanings. This ideological divide, which has been documented by analysts such as Thomas Ricks, has made military voters more inclined to support Republicans than they were before Vietnam. It appears that the end of conscription and the growing professionalization in the ranks has produced a political culture tending to favor conservatives. Voters with ties to the military are not a large part of the electorate, so the impact of these trends on elections isn’t noticeable in most states. But in states like Florida that are fairly evenly balanced between supporters of the two national parties, the military vote can decide election outcomes. That’s especially true in presidential elections, because of the way in which the Electoral College awards votes on a winner-take-all basis from state to state. Since candidates can secure all of a state’s Electoral College votes with a modest plurality in the statewide balloting, military voters potentially exercise a disproportionate influence in states that are otherwise evenly balanced between the parties. Florida is the biggest prize in this sweepstakes given its rapid population growth. The 1990 census gave it 25 Electoral College votes because based on its population it had 23 members in the House of Representatives and the constitutionally mandated two U.S. Senators. The 2000 census gave it two more representatives and thus two more votes in the college. The 2010 census added two additional representatives, giving the Sunshine State a total of 29 Electoral College votes. So in this year’s balloting, Florida will be the only swing state that can deliver over a tenth of the 270 Electoral College votes candidates need to secure the presidency.

Plan swings Florida—gets Hispanic votes

Whitman, 12

(former EPA administrator and New Jersey governor, is the co-chair of the Clean and Safe Energy (CASEnergy) Coalition and Karen, president of Hispanic Elected Local Officials and a member of the CASEnergy Coalition, "Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond", 6/22, articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621\_1\_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community)

We all know how **critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election**. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters. Notably, the conference addresses **two issues** also **of paramount concern to all Floridians: energy and the economy.** From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and **the state's thriving Hispanic community** can **advocate for** economic **growth through renewed investment in** clean energy is by supporting **nuclear energy**. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all. As we look toward diversifying America's energy portfolio and building out the energy generated by renewables, candidates should look to nuclear energy as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are registering their support for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options. Florida is one of many states exploring opportunities to expand capacity at existing facilities, which would mean the creation of new jobs and added economic impact. By showing our support for Florida's five nuclear-energy reactors, as well as paving the way for the expansion of the infrastructure that supports them in the state and beyond, **we can help create and sustain green jobs and work to reduce unemployment**. Florida needs jobs. While overall U.S. unemployment rates stand at 8.2 percent, unemployment in Florida is slightly higher, at 8.6 percent. National unemployment among Hispanics is higher still, at 11 percent. At present, the U.S. nuclear-energy industry supports 100,000 American jobs. Each new nuclear facility creates an average of 1,400 to 1,800 high-paying jobs, often reaching as many as 3,500 jobs during peak construction periods. Once operational, these facilities create 400 to 700 direct and permanent jobs. What does this all mean for minorities, who are so disproportionately impacted by unemployment? Latinos in Florida will be able to take advantage of contract opportunities set aside for minority development programs. And Florida's communities will provide the goods and services needed to support a growing nuclear-energy industry. Recent trends in entrepreneurship indicate business starts in the Hispanic community will continue at a much higher rate than in other communities. Hispanic communities are therefore readily able to address the growing needs of new nuclear facilities. Educational institutions across the state are also targeting minority populations with training programs designed to produce nuclear work-force-ready candidates. These programs and partnerships are cropping up at minority-serving institutions statewide. Take, for example, Miami Dade College's Nuclear-Career Academic Bridge, which leverages a combination of financial aid, mentorships and focused, skills-oriented training to ready students to enter the nuclear industry upon completion of the program.¶ These kinds of efforts — which expose Hispanic students in greater numbers to critical science, technology, engineering and mathematics education — not only promote greater diversity in the energy work force, but also put Hispanic students in line to enter well-paying careers in an industry with a bright future. Just as nuclear power creates and sustains jobs, it also promotes healthy economic growth. Each of America's 104 nuclear-power facilities generates, on average, $430 million in economic output annually, as well as an additional $40 million per year in total labor income. Minority-owned suppliers and businesses are among key beneficiaries of this economic infusion.

Nimby’s backwards for nuclear

**NEI 11**, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Plant Neighbors—And a Lot of Them—Favor Use and Expansion of Nuclear Energy”, Fall, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/publicationsandmedia/insight/insightfall2011/plant-neighborsand-favor-use-and-expansion-of-nuclear-energy/

An overwhelming majority of residents within 10 miles of America’s nuclear energy facilities favor the use of nuclear energy and believe their local facility is safe. Eighty percent of residents near the nation’s 64 commercial reactor sites said they favor the use of nuclear energy to produce electricity, according to a survey by Bisconti Research Inc. and Quest Global Research Group. Even more—87 percent—believe the plants help the local economy, provide good jobs for local residents and generate revenue for local businesses. In the national telephone survey, 83 percent of respondents gave U.S. reactors a high safety rating—scores of five to seven on a seven-point scale. The nationwide survey polled the attitudes of adults who live within 10 miles of U.S. nuclear energy facilities and has a margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points. Bisconti Research has surveyed the attitudes of residents near U.S. nuclear energy facilities every two years since 2005. The national sample includes 1,152 full-time residents, 18 of them near each of the 64 nuclear facility sites. It excludes households with anyone who works for a company that operates a nuclear energy facility. Respondents were evenly split among Democrats, Republicans and Independents.

#### Relations resilient despite Romney

Loiko 12

(Sergei – prominent Russian rights activist, “THE WORLD; FOREIGN EXCHANGE; Russian rights activist is wary of Putin” June 29, 2012, Los Angeles Times, MAIN NEWS; Foreign Desk; Part A; Pg. 3)

What do you think of the fate of the reset in the Russian-U.S. relationship, which appears to be all but buried now? I think that the reset in the relations will continue with some nuances added. What we should expect now is some kind of a revamping of the reset if Obama wins the election. If Mitt Romney comes to the White House, the reset will be initially subjected to some serious invectives but eventually a desire for a constructive cooperation will prevail. We will survive this difficult period we always experience in election years.

Plan accesses impact

**Romney’s all talk---he’d work with Russia**

**Gasyuk 12** (Gasyuk, Rossiyskaya Gazeta’s Washington D.C. correspondent, 6-13, “Romney keeps the gloves off”, http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/06/13/romney\_keeps\_the\_gloves\_off\_15854.html)

Given the sharp disagreements between the United States and Russia on Syria, which is now careening toward civil war, Republicans will harshly criticize every attempt by Obama to further emphasize any progress in bilateral relations. “Some realism regarding U.S.-Russia relations would be constructive for the White House if it wants to avoid Republican attacks,” Simes told Russia Now. But this doesn’t mean that presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney, if elected, will transform his public anti-Russian statements into political practice. “I believe that most likely Governor Romney believes in the statements he made, but that does not mean that in practice this rhetoric will be his guide for action,” Simes said. “Many statements from the GOP candidates including those on foreign affairs surely have to be taken in the context of the political and electoral reality in the U.S.,” Aron said. “It is not only possible, but highly probable,” that Mitt Romney’s views on Russia will evolve if he is elected, Simes said. American political history is rife with examples of strategic U-turns that begin the morning after the inauguration balls. When Dwight Eisenhower ran for president, his advisers—such as the famous John Foster Dulles—spoke of Harry Truman’s “cowardly” policy of containment of the Soviet Union and called for the speedy liberation of Eastern Europe. However President Eisenhower instead started the process of normalizing relations through personal meetings with Nikita Khrushchev in 1955 and 1959. President Richard Nixon was viewed as a leading anti-Communist, but it was Nixon who found the way toward detente. Nixon made the first-ever trip by an American president to then-Communist Russia in 1972, but also opened the door to dialogue with Communist China. No one should be too surprised that Mitt Romney, if elected, might rethink his position. When needed for supply routes, Russia is no longer America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As a president, many observers believe he would take a more realistic approach to handling bilateral ties.

# \*\*\*1ar\*\*\*

No sequestration

Koenig 12

Robert, 'Sequester' threat worries defense firms but could spur deficit deal,

https://www.stlbeacon.org/#!/content/25575/sequestration\_would\_prompt\_defense\_cuts

Most observers on Capitol Hill predict that **the automatic cuts won’t happen**, but they disagree on how long Democrats and the White House will maintain the sequestration threat – for the moment, at least – as leverage to reach a deficit and tax deal. Even though it is clear that the House’s approach won’t fly in the Senate, Blunt said Wednesday that “we might have a vote” there. But some Democrats fear that the House’s intransigence on the issue heightens the risk that the automatic cuts will go into effect. McCaskill thinks the threat of sequestration may help Congress arrive at a compromise on deficit reduction. “The looming sequestration keeps people at the table talking,” she said. “Do I believe that there will be a $500 billion hit to the Defense Department? I do not. Am I willing to say right now that we should take it off the table? No, because I think we need to put everybody’s feet to the fire to get them to the table to compromise” on deficit reduction. “That’s what the American people want to do.” Last week, Durbin and some other key senators held a closed-door meeting to try to develop a plan to solve the end-of-the-year “taxmageddon” threat – at which time, if Congress fails to act, the Bush-era tax cuts and other tax breaks would expire and sequestration would kick in. Dick Durbin Dick Durbin Durbin, a key member of the bipartisan “gang” of senators who have been meeting privately to try to work out a deficit-reduction compromise, said last month that, to avoid a sequester, “we’ve got to get back to the same basic Bowles-Simpson principles” of mixing revenue increases and spending cuts. He was referring to the recommendations of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform in late 2010. Among those involved in talks to avoid the end-of-year “fiscal cliff” was U.S. Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. He has floated the idea of extending some or all of the tax cuts through mid-2013, to give Congress and the administration time to reach agreement on major tax and entitlement reform. But Baucus says the sequestration threat may be needed to reach a deal. “Sequestration is very important and I’ve said **it’s a good point of leverage to get results**,” Baucus told reporters after a June 11 speech to a Bipartisan Policy Center forum. “I’m not saying how it should be resolved, but it is leverage that should not be given up easily.”

CBO revised projections-cuts aren’t devastating

Thompson 12

Mark, What Defense Cuts?, Pulitzer Prize-winner Mark Thompson has covered national security in Washington since 1979, and for Time since 1994.

http://nation.time.com/2012/07/20/what-defense-cuts/

The fear-mongering about impending defense cuts is becoming deafening. Yet even if sequestration happens in January, the Congressional Budget Office says the Pentagon will still be spending as much as it did in 2006. While the cuts may be crude – that is how Congress wrote the law imposing it – they are not draconian. Here’s a new and interesting CBO chart. All the sturm und drang is about the flat budget lines in the “FYDP Period” on the chart – Pentagon spending over the next five years. Only by turning your level upside down and standing on your head can you call those flat lines “cuts” in the normal taxpayer sense of the word. But what’s really, ahem, priceless is another CBO chart. It tracks the Pentagon’s current plans without sequestration, which would lop about $600 billion from the U.S. military’s bottom line over the coming decade. The Pentagon has been insisting for months that sequestration must be avoided because the military has already pared $487 billion from its 10-year spending plan. We’ve already cut so deeply, senior defense officials plead. Cutting more will endanger the nation’s security. Those cuts have been called “huge” by lawmakers who should know better. Here’s the CBO’s estimate from this chart of just how much the Pentagon’s procurement account will be cut from 2013 to 2017 under its current plans:

Cuts would be from Latin America and Africa

Armbuster 12

Ben, McCain Can’t Explain Why Military Spending Cuts Would Be ‘Devastating’

http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/07/30/605331/mccain-military-spending-cuts-devastating/

Panetta does repeatedly say the military spending sequester would be “devastating” to the U.S. military but he has also failed to explain why. Panetta’s most specific remark on this point has been to say that the U.S. would have to reduce its presence in Latin America and Africa — i.e. hardly a “devastating” blow to the military or U.S. security. Moreover, a recent non-partisan Congressional Budget Office report found that the automatic spending cuts would bring the Pentagon’s budget back to what it spent in 2006. As for McCain’s jobs argument, defense industry CEOs and other experts have said warnings that the military spending cuts will damage the economy and cause massive layoffs are “overblown.” And if you’re going to argue that federal spending is necessary to create jobs — a concept Republicans are now embracing in order to protect the nation’s bloated military budget — it’s probably better to, as one study has found, try to direct those dollars away from the Pentagon toward other domestic priorities.

Other cuts outweigh

O’Hanlon 12

Michael, a senior fellow with the 21st Century Defense Initiative and director of research for the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution, where he specializes in U.S. defense strategy, the use of military force, and American foreign policy. He is a visiting lecturer at Princeton University, an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University, and a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies

http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/22-defense-cuts-ohanlon

Cutting defense is a delicate balancing act. As former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. Mike Mullen has persuasively argued, federal debt has itself become a national security threat. The military budget needs to contribute to deficit reduction — and shouldn’t be maintained just to create jobs. The Congressional Budget Office has thrown another monkey wrench into this debate. Just to fund Obama’s plans for future forces and weapons, the CBO argues in a new report, the Pentagon will need $500 billion more over the next decade than it estimates. That is an average of $50 billion a year. Obama’s math is too optimistic; the costs of his planned force posture are likely to be substantially greater than currently recognized. Such reports are not uncommon. The Defense Department tends to be optimistic when forecasting costs. But when the nation is trying to construct a binding plan to guide future spending for a decade, it is more important than usual. What this means: Just to meet Obama’s planned budget, as specified in the first tranche of reductions under the Budget Control Act, we will need to cut back on a lot more weaponry, force structure and civilian and military personnel than planned. Pay cuts may even be needed. Because cutting waste, fraud and abuse, while important, does not offer the potential for savings at anywhere near the levels needed, we will need to cut military muscle, as well. The deeper budget cuts proposed by Bowles and Simpson and sequestration will have to be postponed — or at least softened — because we likely will have a daunting task in simply getting down to Obama’s $500 billion annual defense spending level.

## AT: China Impact D

Economic interdependence doesn’t solve---Chinese belligerence causes miscalc and crisis escalation

Medcalf & Heinrichs 11 - Rory Medcalf is Director of the International Security Programme at the Lowy Institute, Sydney. Raoul Heinrichs is Sir Arthur Tange Scholar at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University, and editor of the Lowy Institute Strategic Snapshot series, June 27, 2011, “Asia’s Maritime Confidence Crisis,” online: http://the-diplomat.com/2011/06/27/asia%E2%80%99s-maritime-confidence-crisis/?print=yes

To the casual observer, recent security tensions in Asian waters might seem a storm in a Chinese teacup. The spectacle of opposing vessels – often motley flotillas of civilian patrol boats, fishing trawlers and survey ships – jostling near contested reefs, rocks and islets in the South and East China seas is the kind of activity that was likened back in Cold War days to a game of ‘nautical chicken’. Surely, in an age of economic interdependence and nuclear weapons, this petty posturing wouldn’t lead to great-power war?

Yet such wishful thinking ignores the real dangers of Asia’s China-centric maritime incidents. In the absence of effective mechanisms for crisis-management and confidence-building, these events are increasing in frequency and intensity. The harassment by Chinese civilian vessels of the USNS Impeccable in 2009 presaged a serious set of encounters in 2010, including North Korea’s sinking of the Cheonan and a diplomatic crisis between China and Japan over the ramming of a Japanese customs vessel near the disputed Senkaku/Diaoyu islands.

Though major power tensions have eased somewhat in 2011, encounters have continued. Chinese helicopters have continued to ‘buzz’ Japanese naval units, even in the sensitive period following Japan’s earthquake and tsunami. In March, a Philippine survey ship was shadowed and harassed by Chinese patrol boats, eliciting formal diplomatic protests from Manila. More recently, in May and June, Chinese patrol boats have allegedly severed seismic cables aboard Vietnamese vessels operating near disputed territories in the South China Sea. Washington has weighed in, particularly with signals of reassurance to its ally Manila – prompting Chinese warnings about fanning flames and getting burned.

At the weekend, Sino-US and Sino-Vietnamese talks seem to have put a lid on the simmering tensions. And the chance that such incidents will lead to major military clashes shouldn’t be overstated. But each encounter involves risks, however small, of miscalculation and casualties. As the number and tempo of incidents increases, so does the likelihood that an episode will escalate to armed confrontation, diplomatic crisis or possibly even conflict. An accumulation of incidents could also play into a wider deterioration of relations

## 1AR AT: Spin-offs

Spin-off tech means their defense is irrelevant

Butler 10

Glen, Lieutenant Colonel. The nuclear option,

http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2010/11/4847032/

As the overall expertise in SMR technology grows, additional capabilities such as expeditionary and vehicular power sources should be explored. Other technologies — including hybrid/electric vehicle power storage and recharging facilities, and water desalination plants — could possibly even co-locate with nuclear plants on installations to co-use the energy. Many external challenges do exist; compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 takes time, and community support would be a critical piece of this undertaking — but neither are impediments to success if planning and execution are conducted smartly. The idea of putting nuclear power plants on military installations is by no means new, yet the time has never been better and the technology never as promising as now. The president and Chu continue to voice support for new nuclear energy initiatives, and a large, bipartisan group of political leaders stands poised to back such a plan. This inviting climate is the open door and momentum the DoD should capitalize on by aggressively pursuing what could truly be the next Apollo program. If we fail to explore this promising frontier, we are likely to lose this modern energy “space race” to the Chinese and other eager competitors. That is something the U.S. cannot afford to do. Look no further for guidance than the current National Military Strategy, released in May, in which the commander in chief declares: The United States has a window of opportunity to lead in the development of clean energy technology. If successful, the United States will lead in this new Industrial Revolution in clean energy that will be a major contributor to prosperity ... We must continue to transform our energy economy ... increase use of renewable and nuclear power. ... We will invest in research and next-generation technology. ... Our effort begins with the steps we are taking at home. We will stimulate our energy economy at home, reinvigorate the U.S. domestic nuclear industry ... and provide incentives that make clean energy the profitable kind of energy. The military, with its self-sufficient mini-communities across the country, offers perfect beta-test platforms and has the requisite expertise and pioneering spirit to take the nuclear energy helm. Beyond the economic value cited above by the president, putting nuclear SMRs on military installations would greatly improve our energy security — which, in turn, would strengthen our national security. After all, energy security is national security. The time for the long-anticipated nuclear renaissance is now … and the military should enthusiastically seize the opportunity to lead the way.

## 1AR UQ OW

Obama win-polls irrelevant

Cohn 11-1

Nate, Elections Expert for The New Republic, Don't Focus On National Early Voting Numbers

http://www.tnr.com/blogs/electionate#

With Obama’s most straightforward path to the 270 enduring with five days to go, the last thing Romney needs is a weak southern flank. But Romney spent all of yesterday in Florida, and it’s not hard to see why. CBS/NYT/Quinnipiac and other polls released yesterday pointed toward a slight Obama edge in Virginia and a tied race in Florida. On average, Obama leads by .7 points in Virginia and trails by .8 in Florida in polls conducted since the final debate. Unlike the other battleground states, Romney’s standing in these averages may be inflated by outlying polls from second-tier pollsters showing Romney ahead by 5 points. Just for good measure, the polls continued to point toward a tight race or even a slight Obama lead in Colorado and PPP showed a tied race in North Carolina, where Obama’s absence seems consista discernible Romney advantage. While Romney is doing better in the national polls than he is in the battlegrounds, the implication that Obama is fighting against a strong national current that is no longer supported by the national polls. While Romney led by as much as 1.5 points in national surveys after the first debate, 16 national pollsters have weighed-in since the final presidential debate and there’s no way to interpret them as anything other than a dead-heat, let alone after considering the state-level data. Yesterday, National Journal found Obama leading by 5--Obama's best result since the debate. Before the final presidential debate, one could credibly argue that Obama was beneath 48 percent in Ohio, that Romney had taken a lead in each of the southeastern battlegrounds and that Colorado was a coin flip, that there was still time left for Romney to puncture Obama’s tenuous Midwestern firewall, and that Romney held a clear enough advantage in the popular vote to presume that Romney could find a way to a victory in the Electoral College. Over the last week, the case for each of these arguments has deteriorated or even evaporated. Instead, Obama's standing in the Midwest and especially Ohio appears intact, the polls suggest that the other "paths" to an Obama victory are still open, and Romney's time is running short. His chances increasingly hinge on the polls just being wrong. It can happen, but it's not the norm.

Yes, the election is not over and things can change. But that doesn’t mean new information changes the election.

Nate Cohn, 10/27/12, 2004 And The Possibility Of A Shift In Ohio , www.tnr.com/blog/electionate/109242/2004-and-the-possibility-shift-in-ohio

With just ten days to go, it’s an open question whether Mitt Romney can make a comeback in Ohio. As Nate Silver noted today, the polls are getting accurate at this late stage, and the odds strongly favor Obama maintaining a lead in Ohio polls heading into Election Day. That might be especially true this year, since the polls have been remarkably consistent, Obama has already banked a lead among early voters, and it's hard to imagine advertisements making a late difference after months of airing beyond saturation levels. If Obama still leads by 2 or 3 points in Ohio in ten days, the risk of a Romney victory would hinge on the possibility of a systemic error in the polls. It happens, but not especially often. Still, while the odds are against a late Romney turnaround, it's not impossible. It’s worth recalling the Ohio polls from this time in 2004, which showed Kerry tied or slightly ahead. Starting with the polls conducted over these very dates eight years ago, Bush took a slight and consistent lead in Ohio and never relented. From this point onward, Kerry only led in one poll of Ohio (Gallup, of course), where the RealClearPolitics average showed Bush holding a 2.1 point lead on Election Day. A similar lurch toward the right would bring about a tied race in the Buckeye State in 2 Whether the movement in the polls was attributable to a genuine shift in the race or something else is impossible to say. But 2004 reminds us that late movement in the numbers is still possible, even if it's generally unlikely and even in the most pivotal state. Still, it's unlikely that Romney will go into Election Day as a favorite in Ohio. If Ohio lurches two points toward Romney, that would only indicate a tied race and Obama would still have a 50-50 shot. As a result, Obama is a clear favorite. If the polls stay where they are, which is the likeliest scenario, Obama would be a heavy favorite on Election Day, with Romney's odds reduced to the risk of systemic polling failure. Harry Reid can tell you all about the risk of systemic polling failure, but it's still an unlikely scenario. There's also the chance that the race tightens, but, even then, Obama would still have a 50-50 shot. Viewed collectively, Obama's odds look pretty good--but there's still ten days to go and '04 reminds us that those ten days can occassionally make a difference.

No path to a Romney victory

AP 10-30

Associated Press, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5iR9-DW5gBTWktJV5EQtQKjYnpSDw?docId=3c915c7449cb4041b7964f5b802fde51

Romney has fewer options. He must carry Florida and Virginia, where Republicans are feeling good about his standing, as well as wrest control of Ohio, and then also win Nevada, Colorado or New Hampshire. If he loses Ohio, Romney must make up for the state’s 18 electoral votes by cutting his way through Obama-leaning territory. After ducking questions earlier this week, Romney said he would not eliminate or underfund the agency. At the top of that target list are Wisconsin, carried by Democrats in six straight presidential elections and where Obama has the edge, and Iowa, a perennial swing-voting state. Romney’s campaign began airing advertisements last week in Minnesota, arguing he was staking a claim in likely Obama territory. But even GOP strategists acknowledged the move was aimed at hitting voters in western Wisconsin and pressuring Obama to follow suit. By Friday, Obama’s campaign had done just that, although the president has a healthy lead in both polling and organization in Minnesota. “We have to keep working those other states, in case Ohio doesn’t come through,” said veteran GOP presidential strategist Charlie Black, who is advising Romney’s campaign. Ohio is a lynchpin for both candidates. Obama was in strong standing in the state before the three presidential debates. But Romney’s strong performance in the debates helped him gain ground. But Republicans and Democrats alike now say that any momentum Romney had in Ohio from those debates has run its course, and the state gain is leaning toward Obama. New public polls show a tight race. Operatives in both parties point to the last debate six days ago, and Obama’s criticism of Romney’s opposition to the automotive industry bailout. They say the criticism was effective in branding Romney as out of touch with working-class voters in a state whose manufacturing economy relies heavily on the car and auto parts industries. The president started running a new TV ad in the state assailing Romney’s position on the aid. Obama’s internal polling in Ohio has shown a slight increase in support from white, working-class voters, an important part of Ohio’s largely blue-collar electorate. “That is a killer,’” Tad Devine, a top aide to 2004 and 2000 Democratic nominees, said of the heat Romney is taking for his bailout position. “And it’s going to have the biggest impact in the decisive state in the outcome of the election.” Out of necessity, Romney is refusing to cede ground in Ohio, where no Republican has lost and then gone on to win the presidency. He hunkered down in the state for two days last week, and running mate Paul Ryan headlined eight events in the state over the weekend. The impending storm that’s set to hit the East Coast led Romney to cancel Virginia campaigning on Sunday and join Ryan in Ohio. In Ohio alone, Romney and allied groups were spending nearly $9 million on television ads, compared with Obama and his allies’ $6 million, and showed no signs of letting up in the final week. Elsewhere, Obama is looking to stunt any Romney inroad with suburban women, a pivotal constituency, in Colorado and Virginia, by casting the Republican as an extremist on abortion and hammering him on his opposition to federal money for Planned Parenthood. In Nevada, Romney is banking on the support of fellow Mormons, and noting the high unemployment and foreclosure rates, to overtake Obama. But the president’s team is appearing ever more confident of winning the state, partly because of the backing of a booming Hispanic population. Florida, the biggest battleground prize with 29 electoral votes, is viewed by both sides as a tight. Democrats acknowledge that Romney’s standing has improved because of his debate performances and could move out of reach for Obama in the coming days.

## At: Russia Relations

Relations collapse inevitable—election irrelevant

Bovt 9/12/12

Georgy Bovt is a political analyst.

http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/whether-obama-or-romney-the-reset-is-dead/467947.html

Whether Obama or Romney, the Reset Is Dead During every U.S. presidential election campaign, there is a debate in Russia over whether the Republican or Democratic candidate would be more beneficial for the Kremlin. Russian analysts and politicians always fail to understand that Americans have shown little interest in foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. Even when foreign policy is mentioned in the campaign, Russia is far down the list as a priority item. The volume of U.S-Russian trade remains small. The recent Exxon-Rosneft deal notwithstanding, U.S. interest in Russia's energy projects has fallen, particularly as the Kremlin has increased its role in this sector. To make matters worse, the United States is determined to establish clean energy and energy independence, while Russia's gas exports are feeling the pinch from stiff competition with the U.S. development of shale gas production. Of course, traditional areas of cooperation remain: the transit of shipments to and from Afghanistan through Russia, Iran's nuclear program and the struggle against international terrorism. But the transit route into Afghanistan cannot, by itself, greatly influence bilateral relations as a whole, and progress on the other two points seems to have reached a plateau beyond which little potential remains for bringing the two countries into closer cooperation. On the positive side, a new visa agreement came into force this week that will facilitate greater contact between both countries' citizens. But it will be years before that significantly influences overall U.S.-Russian relations. A new agreement regarding child adoptions has also been implemented after a few disturbing adoption stories prompted Russia's media, with the help of government propaganda, to spoil the U.S. image in Russia. Meanwhile, both U.S. President Barack Obama and Republican candidate Mitt Romney support the U.S. missile defense program in principle, although the exact form and scope of its deployment differ among the candidates. Even though President Vladimir Putin, during his interview with RT state television last week, expressed guarded optimism over the prospect of reaching an agreement on missile defense with Obama, Russia seems to underestimate the degree to which Americans are fixated on missile defense as a central component of their national security. It is highly unlikely that any U.S. administration — Democratic or Republican — will ever agree to major concessions on missile defense. It even seemed that Kremlin propagandists were happy when in March Romney called Russia the United States' No. 1 foe. They were given another present when Obama, addressing the Democratic National Convention last week, said Romney's comment only proved that he lacked foreign policy experience and was locked in Cold War thinking. For the next two months, however, the two candidates are unlikely to devote much attention to Russia. Russia's internal politics will also be one of the key factors shaping future U.S.-Russian relations. The two-year jail sentence slapped on three members of Pussy Riot for their anti-Putin prayer in Moscow's main cathedral has already become a subject of discussion between Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Even the most pragmatic "pro-reset" U.S. administration would criticize to one degree or another Russia's poor record on human rights. It appears that Russia is moving increasingly toward confrontation rather than rapprochement with the West. The Kremlin now seems fully committed to spreading the myth that the U.S. State Department is the cause behind most of Russia's domestic problems and is bent on undermining its national security by deploying missile defense installations in Europe and by supporting the opposition. There are other disturbing signals as well. Take, for example, the United Russia bill that would prohibit Russian officials from owning bank accounts and property overseas, with particular attention paid to their holdings in the West. The ideological underpinning of this bill is that assets located in the West are tantamount to betrayal of the motherland. Then there is Russia's opposition to the U.S. Magnitsky Act. The Kremlin interprets this initiative as yet another confirmation of its suspicions that Washington is conspiring against it and that the bill's real U.S. motive is to blackmail Russian officials by threatening to freeze their overseas bank accounts and property. An increase in these anti-Western attitudes does not bode well for U.S.-Russian relations, even if Obama is re-elected in November. Regardless of which candidate wins, the reset is bound to either slowly die a natural death under Obama or be extinguished outright under Romney. As a result, the most we can likely expect from U.S.-Russian relations in the next four years is cooperation on a limited range of mundane issues.

Romney’s anti-Russia policy is just rhetoric

**LA Times 12** (Maeve Reston and Seema Mehta, “Mitt Romney struggles to differentiate his foreign policy from the president's”, 5/31, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/may/31/nation/la-na-romney-foreign-policy-20120531)

In 2008, Romney called for more collaboration with China and Russia. In a debate four months ago, he put Russian leader Vladimir Putin in the same category — among the "world's worst actors" — as Cuba's Fidel Castro and Iran's Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. He labeled Russia the United States' "No. 1 geopolitical foe," in a March interview on CNN. The latter statement drew widespread scorn as a throwback to Cold War-era politics.¶ Yet Russia represents another instance in which Romney and Obama don't differ much, despite the rhetoric. Romney has assailed Obama as trying to appease the Russians by scrapping a George W. Bush-era plan to build a missile-defense system in Eastern Europe, and replacing it with a different plan to be completed by 2020. Yet Romney says he is willing to commit to the same timeline.

Romney won’t change policy

**NYT 12**(New York Times, Peter Baker, “Romney and Obama Strain to Show Gap on Foreign Policy”, 7/28, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/29/us/politics/obama-and-romney-strain-to-assert-foreign-policy-differences.html?pagewanted=all>)

Mr. Romney has called Russia “our No. 1 geopolitical foe” and declared Mr. Obama’s effort to improve relations a failure. Mr. Romney promises to challenge Mr. Putin’s authoritarianism. But he has not suggested cutting off cooperation between the countries’ space programs or counterterrorism agencies, nor shutting down the Afghanistan supply route through Russia negotiated by Mr. Obama. He supports Mr. Obama’s drive to normalize trade relations, though with a human rights amendment the president initially resisted.¶ Mr. Romney’s visit to Poland is intended to highlight what he called Mr. Obama’s “sudden abandonment of friends in Poland” under Russian pressure by canceling Mr. Bush’s missile defense program partly based there. But Mr. Obama did not abandon missile defense

**Relations useless**

**Ostapenko 9**---Trend Daily News staff writer (E., 7/7, “Normalization In U.s.-russian Relations Not To Change Political Situation In World: Analyst At French Studies Institute”, http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/83734/-normalization-in-u-s-russian-relations-not-to-change-political-situation-in-world-analyst-at-french-studies-institute-.html)

Normalization of relations between the United States and Russia will not assume a global significance and will not change the situation in the world, since today Russia does not play the role it played formerly, Dominic Moisi, analyst on Russian-American relations, said. "There is a country that is essential for the future of the world, it is not Russia, but it is China," Moisi, founder and senior advisor at the French Institute for International Relations (IFRI), told Trend News in a telephone conversation from Paris

Speaking of the growing role of China, Moisi said that the Chinese are soon going to be the number two economy in the world. Russian economy can not compete. As another important aspect of the increasing weight of China in the world, Moisi considers the absence of problems with the aging of population, unlike European countries, including Russia.