### Case

#### Back ups don’t solve

**Stockton 11** [Paul, assistant secretary of defense for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs, “Ten Years After 9/11: Challenges for the Decade to Come”, <http://www.hsaj.org/?fullarticle=7.2.11>]

DoD has traditionally assumed that the commercial grid will be subject only to infrequent, weather-related, and short-term disruptions, and that available backup power is sufficient to meet critical mission needs. As noted in the February 2008 Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DoD Energy Strategy, “In most cases, neither the grid nor on-base backup power provides sufficient reliability to ensure continuity of critical national priority functions and oversight of strategic missions in the face of a long term (several months) outage.”

#### . Even with massive investment, they’re too unstable to run military bases – that’s Andres

#### B. They’re even easier to hack

Charles Barton 11, founder of the Nuclear Green Revolution blog, MA in philosophy, “Future storm damage to the grid may carry unacceptable costs”, April 30, <http://nucleargreen.blogspot.com/2011_04_01_archive.html>

Amory Lovins has long argued that the traditional grid is vulnerable to this sort of damage. Lovins proposed a paradigm shift from centralized to distributed generation and from fossil fuels and nuclear power to renewable based micro-generation. Critics have pointed to flaws in Lovins model. Renewable generation systems are unreliable and their output varies from locality to locality, as well as from day to day, and hour to hour. In order to bring greater stability and predictability to the grid, electrical engineers have proposed expanding the electrical transmission system with thousands of new miles of transmission cables to be added to bring electricity from high wind and high sunshine areas, to consumers. This would lead, if anything, to greater grid vulnerability to storm damage in a high renewable penetration situation. Thus Lovins renewables/distributed generation model breaks down in the face of renewables limitations. Renewables penetration, will increase the distance between electrical generation facilities and customer homes and businesses, increasing the grid vulnerable to large scale damage, rather than enhancing reliability. Unfortunately Lovins failed to note that the distributed generation model actually worked much better with small nuclear power plants than with renewable generated electricity. Small nuclear plants could be located much closer to customer's homes, decreasing the probability of storm damage to transmission lines. At the very worst, small NPPs would stop the slide toward increased grid expansion. Small reactors have been proposed as electrical sources for isolated communities that are too remote for grid hookups. If the cost of small reactors can be lowered sufficiently it might be possible for many and perhaps even most communities to unhook from the grid while maintaining a reliable electrical supply. It is likely that electrical power will play an even more central role in a post-carbon energy era. Increased electrical dependency requires increased electrical reliability, and grid vulnerabilities limit electrical reliability. Storm damage can disrupt electrical service for days and even weeks. In a future, electricity dependent economy, grid damage can actually impede storm recovery efforts, making large scale grid damage semi-self perpetuating. Such grid unreliability becomes a threat to public health and safety. Thus grid reliability will be a more pressing future issue, than it has been. It is clear that renewable energy sources will worsen grid reliability, Some renewable advocates have suggested that the so called "smart grid" will prevent grid outages. Yet the grid will never be smart enough to repair its own damaged power lines. In addition the "smart grid" will be venerable to hackers, and would be a handy target to statures. A smart grid would be an easy target for a Stuxnet type virus attack. Not only does the "smart grid" not solve the problem posed by grid vulnerability to storm damage, but efficiency, another energy approach thought to be a panacea for electrical supply problems would be equally useless. Thus, decentralized electrical generation through the use of small nuclear power plants offers real potential for increasing electrical reliability, but successful use of renewable electrical generation approaches may worsen rather than improved grid reliability.

#### Cyberterror coming against the grid now – we already know that they’ve been able to infiltrate the system

CNN 10-13 [Pam Benson – “Panetta: Cyber threat is pre 9/11 moment”, October 13th, 2012, http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/10/12/panetta-cyber-threat-is-pre-911-moment/?hpt=hp\_t3, Chetan]

The United States must beef up its cyber defenses or suffer as it did on September 11, 2001 for failing to see the warning signs ahead of that devastating terrorist attack, the Secretary of Defense told a group of business leaders in New York Thursday night. Calling it a “pre-9/11 moment,” Leon Panetta said he is particularly worried about a significant escalation of attacks. In a speech aboard a decommissioned aircraft carrier, Panetta reminded the Business Executives for National Security about recent distributed denial of service attacks that hit a number of large U.S. financial institutions with unprecedented speed, disrupting services to customers. And he pointed to a cyber virus known as Shamoon which infected the computers of major energy firms in Saudi Arabia and Qatar this past summer. More than 30-thousand computers were rendered useless by the attack on the Saudi state oil company ARAMCO. A similar incident occurred with Ras Gas of Qatar. Panetta said the attacks were probably the most devastating to ever hit the private sector. The secretary did not say who is believed responsible for those attacks, but senior defense officials who briefed reporters on the speech, said the United States knows, however they would not divulge the suspect. And he warned America's critical infrastructure - its electrical power grid, water plants and transportation systems - are threatened by foreign actors. "We know of specific instances where intruders have successfully gained access to these control systems," Panetta said. "We also know they are seeking to create advanced tools to attack those systems and cause panic, destruction and even loss of life."

#### Plan solves meltdowns no risk of accidents

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### Meltdown impacts won’t happen – empirics

**WNA ’11** [World Nuclear Association, “Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors”, (updated December 2011), <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf06.html>]

From the outset, there has been a strong awareness of the potential hazard of both nuclear criticality and release of radioactive materials from generating electricity with nuclear power. As in other industries, the design and operation of nuclear power plants aims to **minimise the likelihood of accidents**, and avoid major human consequences when they occur. There have been three major reactor accidents in the history of civil nuclear power - Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima. One was contained without harm to anyone, the next involved an intense fire without provision for containment, and the third severely tested the containment, allowing some release of radioactivity. These are the only major accidents to have occurred in over 14,500 cumulative reactor-years of commercial nuclear power operation in 32 countries. The risks from western nuclear power plants, in terms of the consequences of an accident or terrorist attack, **are minimal** compared with other commonly accepted risks. Nuclear power **plants are very robust**.

#### No Backlash

Sullivan 10 (Mary Anne Sullivan – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Daniel F. Stenger – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Amy C. Roma – Senior associate in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Are Small Reactors the Next Big Thing in Nuclear?, November 2010, Electric Light & Power, Nov/Dec2010, Vol. 88 Issue 6, p46)

Congress SMRs have enjoyed **bipartisan support** in Congress. The House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have approved similar legislation designed to promote the development and deployment of SMRs along the lines the DOE has proposed. Promoting SMR development in legislation has its price. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the Senate bill would cost $407 million over the next five years to support cost-sharing programs with private companies for the development of two standard SMR designs. Costs for the out-years were not included in the estimate, but the bill would require the DOE to obtain NRC design certifications for the reactors by 2018 and to secure combined construction and operating licenses by Jan. 1, 2021. If Congress can pass an energy bill, it seems likely the bill **will support SMRs**. Even in the absence of new authorizing legislation, however, **appropriations bills** that must be passed to **keep the government running** almost certainly will contain strong support for the DOE's research and development program for SMRs. SMRs respond to a critical suite of power needs: reliable, low-carbon, baseload generation at a manageable capital cost for even small utilities. But as with many other power solutions, much still needs to happen to realize the promise

### 2AC - Human Cap DA

#### Their D'Agostino, 10 says supercomputers exist now to map and interpret diseases that solves the impact – they’ll still be there post plan, no link

#### No reason plan trades off with these workers specifically, they work in different departments

#### BULLSHIT on their link evidence which is their McCormick card – it’s from an interview THEY CONDUCTED with extremely leadingquestions like ‘WHAT IS YOUR VIEW ON THE SUGGESSTION THAT THE DOD SHOULD PURSUE ITS OWN SMR APART FROM THE DOE”

#### DOE and NNSA labs are separate – no trade off, their ALoise evidence concedes that the DOE has already sharply reduced its workforce

#### SMRs solve water scarcity – turns disease

Palley 11[Reese Palley, The London School of Economics, 2011, The Answer: Why Only Inherently Safe, Mini Nuclear Power Plans Can Save Our World, p. 168-71]

The third world has long been rent in recent droughts, by the search for water. In subsistence economies, on marginal land, water is not a convenience but a matter of life and death. As a result small **wars have been fought, rivers diverted, and wells poisoned in what could be a warning of what is to come as industrialized nations begin to face failing water supplies.** Quite aside from the demand for potable water is the dependence of enormous swaths of industry and agriculture on oceans of water used for processing, enabling, and cleaning a thousand processes and products. It is interesting to note that fresh water used in both industry and agriculture is reduced to a nonrenewable resource as agriculture adds salt and industry adds a chemical brew unsuitable for consumption. More than one billion people in the world already lack access to clean water, and things are getting worse. Over the next two decades, the average supply of water per person will drop by a third, **condemning millions** of people **to** waterborne **diseases** and an avoidable premature death.81 So **the stage is set for water access wars between** the **first and the third worlds**, between **neighbors** downstream of supply, between **big industry** and big agriculture, between **nations**, between **population** centers, and ultimately between you and the people who live next door for an already inadequate world water supply that is not being renewed. **As populations inevitably increase, conflicts will intensify**.82 It is only by virtue of the historical accident of the availability of nuclear energy that humankind now has the ability to remove the salt and other pollutants to supply all our water needs. The problem is that **desalination is an intensely local process**. Some localities have available sufficient water from renewable sources to take care of their own needs, but not enough to share with their neighbors, and it **is here that the scale of nuclear energy production must be defined locally.** Large scale 1,000 MWe plants can be used to desalinate water as well as for generating electricity However we cannot build them fast enough to address the problem, and, if built they would face the extremely expensive problem of distributing the water they produce. Better, much better, would be to use small desalinization plants sited locally. Beyond desalination for human use is the need to green some of the increasing desertification of vast areas such as the Sahara. Placing twenty 100 MWe plants a hundred miles apart along the Saharan coast would green the coastal area from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea, a task accomplished more cheaply and quickly than through the use of gigawatt plants.83 This could proceed on multiple tracks wherever deserts are available to be reclaimed. Leonard Orenstein, a researcher in the field of desert reclamation, speculates: If most of the Sahara and Australian outback were planted with fast-growing trees like eucalyptus, the forests could draw down about 8 billion tons of carbon a year—nearly as much as people emit from burning fossil fuels today. As the forests matured, they could continue taking up this much carbon for decades.84 **The use of small, easily transported**, easily **sited**, and walk away **safe nuclear reactors dedicated to desalination is the only answer** to the disproportionate distribution of water resources that have distorted human habitation patterns for millennia. Where there existed natural water, such as from rivers, great cities arose and civilizations flourished. Other localities lay barren through the ages. We now have the power, by means of SMRs profiled to local conditions, not only to attend to existing water shortages but also to smooth out disproportionate water distribution and create green habitation where historically it has never existed. **The endless wars that have been fought**, first over solid bullion gold and then over oily black gold, **can now engulf us in the desperate reach for liquid blue gold. We need never fight these wars again as we now have the nuclear power to fulfill the** biblical **ability to “strike any local rock and have water gush forth**.”

#### Solves Nuclear War from water wars

Weiner 90 (Jonathan, Pulitzer Prize winning author, “The Next One Hundred Years”, p. 270)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

#### We don’t trade off with supercomputing disease personal – their ev says trades off with OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

#### Building new plants is vital to expanding the nuclear workforce

Howard, 7 – Vice President Office of the President Nuclear Energy Institute (Angie, 2/5. “Achieving Excellence in Human Performance: Nuclear Energy Training and Education.” <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2007/americannuclearsocietyextended>)

And, finally, Number Four—New Plant Pressures on Current Workforce. Yes, new plant activities are putting additional pressure on scarce utility human resources in areas like operations training, licensing and engineering, not to mention the project management and construction skills that will be needed. But, utility announcements of plans to build new plants and the resulting media coverage are raising the interest level of young people in careers in our industry. This new plant activity has also resulted in new job creation at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And vendors are aggressively hiring in nuclear-related disciplines. What young people are hearing is that, right now, 14 companies or consortia have publicly announced plans to apply for licenses for up to 33 new nuclear reactors. The first applications for a license to construct and operate a new nuclear plant will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission later this year.

#### No extinction – diseases favor limited lethality and medicine will check

Posner 4 (Richard, Judge – US Court of Appeals, Catastrophe: Risk and Response, p. 22-24)

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

#### -- Burn out stops disease

Lederberg 99 (Joshua, Professor of Genetics – Stanford University School of Medicine, Epidemic The World of Infectious Disease, p. 13)

The toll of the fourteenth-century plague, the "Black Death," was closer to one third. If the bugs' potential to develop adaptations that could kill us off were the whole story, we would not be here. However, with very rare exceptions, our microbial adversaries have a shared interest in our survival. Almost any pathogen comes to a dead end when we die; it first has to communicate itself to another host in order to survive. So historically, the really severe host- pathogen interactions have resulted in a wipeout of both host and pathogen. We humans are still here because, so far, the pathogens that have attacked us have willy-nilly had an interest in our survival. This is a very delicate balance, and it is easily disturbed, often in the wake of large-scale ecological upsets.

#### US-lead development of nuclear power solves poverty – clean, affordable energy is key

**Robinson and Orient 4** - Professor of Chemistry and Founder of Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine AND \*\* executive director of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (Arthur and Jane, 6/14. The New American, “Science, Politics and Death.” <http://www.thenewamerican.com/node/358>)

Easily usable energy is the currency of human progress. Without it, stagnation, regression and untold human deaths will result. The lamentations of the popular press notwithstanding, there is no shortage of energy. Scientists define everything that man can perceive in the natural world as forms of "energy," including all physical objects. These forms of energy differ, however, in how easily mankind can make use of them by means of current technology. Nuclear power plants convert mass into electrical energy. This converted "nuclear energy" is, by far, the safest, cleanest and least expensive energy source available with current technology. Its use improves the standard of living, increases the quality and length of human life, and maximizes technological progress. The United States was once the world leader in the production of useful energy. Had that American leadership continued, our country and our world would be very different. Technological miracles that are only dreams today would have already taken place. Moreover, very large portions of the world's poor and underdeveloped people would have been able to lift themselves from poverty - provided they had a laboratory of liberty in which to do so - and to escape the horrible conditions in which they lead lives of desperation, constantly at the edge of death. Many people strongly desire to help humanity. They spend their lives in efforts to increase the quantity and quality of human life. Most other people, even though they do not work actively toward these goals, share the same values. They passively support things that improve human life. Those who understand energy production and its link to technological progress and who have positive humanitarian values support nuclear power. They are also in favor of hydrocarbon power derived from coal, oil and natural gas, and of hydroelectric power. Their interest in solar power, biofuel power, wind power and other alternatives is less because those methods cannot yet generate large quantities of inexpensive useful energy.

#### Ongoing poverty outweighs nuclear war and genocide—only our impact evidence is comparative

Spina 00 (Stephanie Urso, Ph.D. candidate in social/personality psychology at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, Smoke and Mirrors: The Hidden Context of Violence in Schools and Society, p. 201)

This sad fact is not limited to the United States. Globally, 18 million deaths a year are caused by structural violence, compared to 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. That is, **approximately every five years, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths**, and **every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period**. This is, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war or genocide**, perpetuated on the weak and the poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. (See James Gilligan, Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic, New York: Vintage Books, 1997, 196).

### 2AC – Neo Lib

#### We aren’t neoliberal – countries are looking to transition to clean energy but they’re looking to the NRC to model SMR technology, we don’t FORCE anyone to adopt nuclear but allow the countries that do want it to adopt nuclear tech

#### Neolib’s key to solve poverty and authoritarianism

Bandow 1 (Doug, Senior Fellow @ Cato, “Globalization Serves the World's Poor,” April 25th, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=4310>)

Despite the worst efforts of violent protestors in Quebec, leaders of countries throughout the Western hemisphere concluded their Summit of the Americas by proposing a broad free-trade agreement. Bringing more of the world's poor into the global economy is the best hope for raising them out of poverty. Curiously, globalization has become the latest cause celebre of left-wing activists. These First-World demonstrators self-righteously pose as defenders of Third-World peoples, even as they advocate leaving the latter destitute. The process of development, of moving traditional, agricultural societies into the Industrial and Information age, is extraordinarily painful. It was difficult enough for Western societies, which took hundreds of years to develop. It is even harder for today's developing states, which are attempting to telescope the process into a few decades. But that pain must be endured to achieve a better life. Economist Joseph Schumpeter termed capitalism "creative destruction." Every innovation creates losers: automobiles ruined the buggy industry, computers destroyed the typewriter industry. It is fair to encourage the development of social institutions to ease the transition. It is not fair to shut off development. Some trendy Western activists wax eloquent on the wonders of rural living. Presumably they have never visited a poor country, let alone a poor countryside. For instance, when I traveled the hills of eastern Burma with the relief group Christian Freedom International, I found ethnic Karen villagers living in wooden huts open to rain and insects. There was neither electricity nor running water. People lacked latrines and let their livestock run loose; filth was everywhere. In such circumstances, life is hard, disease is rampant, and hope is nonexistent. No wonder people flee to the city. Not one Quebec protestor would likely choose such a "dignified" way of life. Indeed, the problems of globalization must always be "compared to what?" Yes, factories pay low wages in Third World countries. But workers in them have neither the education nor the skills to be paid at First World levels. Their alternative is not a Western university education or Silicon Valley computer job, but an even lower-paying job with a local firm or unemployment. The choice is clear: according to Edward Graham of the Institute of International Economics, in poor countries, American multinationals pay foreign citizens an average of 8.5 times the per capita GDP. Overall, the process of globalization has been good for the poor. During the 1980s, advanced industrialized countries grew faster than developing states. In the 1990s, as globalization accelerated, poor nations grew at 3.6 percent annually, twice that of their richer neighbors. Despite the illusion of left-wing activists that money falls from the sky, poverty has been the normal condition of humankind throughout most of history. As even Marx acknowledged, capitalism is what eliminated the overwhelming poverty of the pre-industrial world. That remains the case today. Resource endowment, population level and density, foreign aid transfers, past colonial status none of these correlate with economic wealth. Only economic openness does. The latest volume of the Economic Freedom in the World Report, published by the Cato Institute and think tanks in 50 other countries, finds that economic liberty strongly correlates with economic achievement. Policies that open economies strongly correlate with economic growth. By pulling countries into the international marketplace, globalization encourages market reforms. With them comes increased wealth. Concern over the distribution of income understandably remains, but if nothing is produced, there is nothing to distribute. And, in fact, globalization has shared its benefits widely. In a recent World Bank report, economists David Dollar and Aart Kraay conclude that the "income of the poor rises one-for-one with overall growth." Globalization also has important political ramifications. Freedom is indivisible; economic liberty tends to undercut political controls. Countries such as South Korea and Taiwan threw off authoritarian dictatorships once their burgeoning middle classes demanded political rights to match economic opportunities. International investment and trade also help dampen nationalism and militarism. Globalization is not enough: rising levels of foreign commerce did not prevent World War I, for instance. Yet investment and trade create important economic incentives for peace. They also put a human face on people who might otherwise seem to be the enemy. The result is a better environment in which to promote international harmony. Like most human phenomena, globalization has ill, as well as good, effects. But the latter predominate. In most ways for most people, globalization is a positive.

#### There’s no hegemony link – we don’t endorse or expand the type of economic imperialism that they’re talking about, but promite clearn enery, their Whiltgen eevidence is about things like oil interventions

#### SMR’s are key to successful desalination – solves water wars

Solan et al 10 – Assistant Professor of Public Policy & Administration and Director of the Energy Policy Institute at Boise State University (David, June. “Economic and Employment Impacts of Small Modular Nuclear Reactors.” Energy Policy Institute, Center for Advanced Energy Studies.

<http://epi.boisestate.edu/media/3494/economic%20and%20employment%20impacts%20of%20smrs.pdf>)

Besides electricity generation, additional applications may be well-suited for SMR systems in the future. While the applicability of nuclear energy to additional applications is not dependent on facility size, the actual use of large nuclear facilities does not occur due to economic considerations. Currently, only a few countries utilize nuclear energy for non-generation purposes, primarily desalination and district heating (IAEA, 2008). A brief overview of the application possibilities for SMRs is provided below. Desalination.&&The IAEA has identified desalination as possibly the leading non-electric civilian use for nuclear energy. Water scarcity is becoming an increasingly problematic global issue in both developed and developing countries. As noted in an IAEA (2007) report, Because of population growth, surface water resources are increasingly stressed in many parts of the world, developed and developing regions alike. Water stress is counter to sustainable development; it engenders disease; diverts natural flows, endangering flora and fauna of rivers, lakes wetlands, deltas and oceans; and it incites regional conflicts over water rights. In the developing world, more than one billion people currently lack access to safe drinking water; nearly two and a half billion lack access to adequate sanitation services. This would only get worse as populations grow. Water stress is severe in the developed world as well…In light of these trends, many opportunities in both developed and developing countries are foreseen for supply of potable water generated using nuclear process heat or off-peak electricity (p. 23).

#### Extinction

Weiner 90 (Jonathan, Pulitzer Prize winning author, “The Next One Hundred Years”, p. 270)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

#### Capitalism is inevitable

**Wilson 1** [John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 200 How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 15-16]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism—they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town—the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an [end page 15] ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the *Socialist Worker* to an uninterested public.

#### Perm do both - total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance – the alternative never solves

J.K. **Gibson-Graham 96**, Katherine Gibson and Julie Graham, Feminist Economic Geographers at the Australian National University in Canberra and University of Massachusetts Amherst, Authors of A Postcapitalist Class and Class and Its Others, 1996

[“End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0-8166-4805-0]

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

#### Perm do the plan and withdraw from impositions like the maintenance of a neoliberal subject

#### Can’t solve neoliberalism – the right will co-opt the plan’s invigoration of public spaces to prevent a genuine societal transformation

**Vincent 6** [[Jonathan Vincent](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/pedagogy/v006/6.1vincent.html#top) is a PhD candidate in American studies at the University of Illinois, where he teaches American literature and composition. “A Call to Arms in a Repressive Atmosphere of Educational Acquiescence”, Pedagogy 6.1 (2006) 189-198, JSTOR] //khirn

*Take Back Higher Education* labors tirelessly to map out a course for critical dissent, but that dissent must come with a caveat. As groups of younger educators like myself approach careers in the humanities, the political needs of our moment loom larger than mere recuperations of past political agendas are sufficient to address. Let me offer a few judgments that might at least complicate the unbridled optimistic enthusiasm generated by the book and shamelessly take my seat among the purgatory of cynics and skeptics banished so dramatically in the book's introduction. While it is seductive and intoxicating amid an accurately assessed milieu of atrophy to hope for a return "back" to once "vibrant" forms of political agency, we might want to reorient our gaze to consider just how profoundly successful conservative regimes of power have been at distilling notions like citizenship and *democracy* of their potency. The most cursory familiarity of republican rhetoric under our current presidential administration will reveal just how appropriated the values of leftist discourse have become. That the Girouxs feel confident in rallying the depleted leftist regiments around the weary banners of enlightenment rhetoric—democracy, freedom, rights, justice, equality, the public sphere, [End Page 196] social contract—should at least register a moment of cautious consideration. Neoconservative speechwriters and conservative-media spin machines have sufficiently hijacked precisely these bourgeois badges and emblems of participatory democracy and leftist struggle. Indeed, the Girouxs' nostalgia for the emancipatory moment of New Left activism might actually be impeding a deeper recognition of just how thoroughly contained an "outside" to power has become in an epoch constrained by what Michel Foucault (1990) has described as a "biopolitical" saturation of sites of resistance and the regulatory ontological composites of its political subjects. That is, the Girouxs might consider augmenting their political initiatives with the analysis of some postmodern theorists exiled for their complicity with "obtuseness" and "rhetorical cleverness" (98). The possibility of reversing or, at best, keeping at bay the tide of global capitalism from institutional outposts like the corporate university is, frankly, not very compelling, nor does it account for the way that those outposts are already constituted and structured by relations of power that precede and contain adversarial processes. In a recent piece in *Bad Subjects*, for example, Joe Lockard and Joel Schalit (2004: n.p.) demonstrate how many forms of protest have been championed by the Bush administration and the military as instances of the state's reflexivity. "For contemporary neo-liberalism," they argue, "civil protest constitutes the enunciation of a self-correcting mechanism where perfected repression derives from free expression." This "repressive tolerance" works to capture and distill the dialectical power of protest whereby "the state enables opposition only in order to moderate it." Protest in and of itself can, in many instances, work to validate and ensure the legitimacy of neoliberal philosophies of the state. The Girouxs' spirit of optimism about older forms of social activism really prevents them from eliciting any particular, specifically identifiable strategies for how these "challenges" will be accomplished. The few dismal examples of Web sites and discussion groups leave much to be desired against the onslaught of a new totalitarian machine that has mastered the discourse of older forms of leftism.[2](http://muse.jhu.edu.floyd.lib.umn.edu/journals/pedagogy/v006/6.1vincent.html#FOOT2)

**Globalization solves terrorism – discourages the bandwagon effect.**

Barber ‘**4,** U.S. Managing Editor, Financial Times, International Economy Publications, Gale Group, “Is continued globalization of the world economy inevitable?” 2004, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2633/is\_3\_18/ai\_n6276708/print

For all its merits, globalization must never be taken for granted. The continued integration of the world economy depends on support not only from rich beneficiaries in the west but increasingly from the still disadvantaged in Africa,India, and Latin America. Cultural barriers also pose increasingly powerful obstacles to globalization.The rise of Islamic fundamentalism offers an alternative vision of society, one which will appeal to all those left behind in countries with exploding populations and persistent high unemployment among young people. Yet there are still plenty of reasons for optimism. The benefits of globalization in terms of investment, jobs, and competition are there for all to see, on cable television screens as well as in the shops and soukhs. The forces in favor of globalization are far stronger than those pitted against.

#### Transitioning away from capitalism would collapse civilization and kill billions.

 **Rockwell 8** [Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2008 [“Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism,” Ludwig von Mises Institute, May 18th, Available Online at http://mises.org/story/2982, Accessed 10-04-2008 ]

Whatever the specifics of the case in question, socialism always means overriding the free decisions of individuals and replacing that capacity for decision making with an overarching plan by the state. Taken far enough, this mode of thought won't just spell an end to opulent lunches. It will mean the end of what we all know as civilization itself. It would plunge us back to a primitive state of existence, living off hunting and gathering in a world with little art, music, leisure, or charity. Nor is any form of socialism capable of providing for the needs of the world's six billion people, so the population would shrink dramatically and quickly and in a manner that would make every human horror ever known seem mild by comparison. Nor is it possible to divorce socialism from totalitarianism, because if you are serious about ending private ownership of the means of production, you have to be serious about ending freedom and creativity too. You will have to make the whole of society, or what is left of it, into a prison. In short, the wish for socialism is a wish for unparalleled human evil. If we really understood this, no one would express casual support for it in polite company. It would be like saying, you know, there is really something to be said for malaria and typhoid and dropping atom bombs on millions of innocents.

#### 8. Capitalism best ensures value to life

**Tracinski 8** Robert, editor of the Intellectual Activist, The Moral and the Practical,http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity

#### The alt causes global conflict -~-- we cannot turn of capitalism.

**Barnhizer 6** [David Barnhizer – Professor of Law at Cleveland State University, ‘Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream”,’ Georgetown International Environmental Law Review Summer 2006, Chetan]

The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. n60 The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior.

**Neoliberalism solves environmental collapse**

Christmann and Taylor 1 [American businessman and the head of a privately held multinationalcompany, Professor Christmann specializes in research of the globaleconomy (Petra and Glen, Globalization and the environment: Determinants of firm self-regulation in China. Journal ofInternational business studies, 32(3), 439-458, ABI/INFORM)http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=277452]

In contrast, globalization proponents contend that lower barriers to trade and foreign investment encourage firms to transfer environmental technologies and managemement systems from countries with stricter environmental standards to developing countries, which lack access to environmental technologies and capabilities (Drezner, 2000). Governmental failure to protect the environment, it is suggested in this line of argument, might also be ameliorated through self-regulation of environmental performance by firms in developing countries.Self-regulation refers to a firm’s adoption of environmental performance standards or environmental management systems (EMS) beyond the requirements of governmental regulations. Globalization can increase self-regulation pressures in several ways. First, globalization increases MNEs’ investment in developing countries where their subsidiaries can be expected to self-regulate their environmental performance more than domestic firms do. MNEs can transfer the more advanced environmental technologies and management systems developed in response to more stringent regulations in developed countries to their subsidiaries. MNEs also face pressures from interest groups to improve their worldwide environmental performance. Second, globalization might contribute to environmental performance as a supplier-selection criterion, which also pressures domestic firms in developing countries to self-regulate environmental performance…Globalization does not necessarily have negative effects on the environment in developing countriesto the extend suggested by the pollution-haven and industrial-flight hypotheses. Our study suggests that globalization increases institutional and consumer pressures on firms to surpass local requirements, even when they may be tempted by lax regulations and enforcement in countries offering themselves as pollution havens (Hoffman, 1999; Rugman and Verbeke, 1998).

#### Environmental collapse causes extinction

**Khoshoo ’97** (T. N. KHOSHOO, Secretary of the Department of Environment of India, ’97 (Conservation and Economic Evaluation of Biodiversity, ed. P Phushpangadon, K Ravi, V Santhogh, p. 414)

There are two major functions of biodiversity. Firstly**, the stability of the biosphere depends on it**, which leads to stability of climate, water, soil, chemistry of air, and health of the biosphere. Secondly, **the species on which the human race depends for food, fodder, fuel, fibre, medicine, etc**., by and large exist in Vavilovian Centres of Diversity and Origin (Vavilov, 1951) which are located mostly in the tropics and subtropics (Khoshoo, 1991**). These species constitute the basis of modern agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, fisheries, forestry, medicinals, fibre, many industrial products, etc**. Apart from these, there is the possibility of using many species in the future. **Thus conservation of biodiversity is not only critical to the health of the planet as a whole but also to the well being of all species including humankind**. Last but not least, there are also ethical and aesthetic aspects of biodiversity conservation.

#### Plan solves colonization

O’Neil 11[Ian, PhD from University of Wales, founder and editor of Astroengine, space producer for Discovery News “'Suitcase' Nuclear Reactors to Power Mars Colonies,” August 30th, <http://news.discovery.com/space/mars-colonies-powered-by-mini-nuclear-reactors-110830.html>]

Nuclear power is an emotive subject -- particularly in the wake of the Fukushima power plant disaster after Japan's March earthquake and tsunami -- but in space, it may be an essential component of spreading mankind beyond terrestrial shores. On Monday, at the 242nd National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society (ACS) in Denver, Colo., the future face of space nuclear power was described. You can forget the huge reactor buildings, cooling towers and hundreds of workers; the first nuclear reactors to be landed on alien worlds to support human settlement will be tiny. Think less "building sized" and more "suitcase sized." "People would never recognize the fission power system as a nuclear power reactor," said James E. Werner, lead of the Department of Energy's (DOE) Idaho National Laboratory. "The reactor itself may be about 1 feet wide by 2 feet high, about the size of a carry-on suitcase. There are no cooling towers. A fission power system is a compact, reliable, safe system that may be critical to the establishment of outposts or habitats on other planets. Fission power technology can be applied on Earth's Moon, on Mars, or wherever NASA sees the need for continuous power." The joint NASA/DOE project is aiming to build a demonstration unit next year. Obviously, this will be welcome news to Mars colonization advocates; to have a dependable power source on the Martian surface will be of paramount importance. The habitats will need to have a constant power supply simply to keep the occupants alive. This will be "climate control" on an unprecedented level. Water extraction, reclamation and recycling; food cultivation and storage; oxygen production and carbon dioxide scrubbing; lighting; hardware, tools and electronics; waste management -- these are a few of the basic systems that will need to be powered from the moment humans set foot on the Red Planet, 24 hours 39 minutes a day (or "sol" -- a Martian day), 669 sols a year. Fission reactors can provide that. However, nuclear fission reactors have had a very limited part to play in space exploration up until now. Russia has launched over 30 fission reactors, whereas the US has launched only one. All have been used to power satellites. Radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs), on the other hand, have played a very important role in the exploration of the solar system since 1961. These are not fission reactors, which split uranium atoms to produce heat that can then be converted into electricity. RTGs depend on small pellets of the radioisotope plutonium-238 to produce a steady heat as they decay. NASA's Pluto New Horizons and Cassini Solstice missions are equipped with RTGs (not solar arrays) for all their power needs. The Mars Science Laboratory (MSL), to be launched in November 2011, is powered by RTGs for Mars roving day or night. RTGs are great, but to power a Mars base, fission reactors would be desirable because they deliver more energy. And although solar arrays will undoubtedly have a role to play, fission reactors will be the premier energy source for the immediate future. "The biggest difference between solar and nuclear reactors is that nuclear reactors can produce power in any environment," said Werner. "Fission power technology doesn't rely on sunlight, making it able to produce large, steady amounts of power at night or in harsh environments like those found on the Moon or Mars. A fission power system on the Moon could generate 40 kilowatts or more of electric power, approximately the same amount of energy needed to power eight houses on Earth." "The main point is that nuclear power has the ability to provide a power-rich environment to the astronauts or science packages anywhere in our solar system and that this technology is mature, affordable and safe to use." Of course, to make these "mini-nuclear reactors" a viable option for the first moon and Mars settlements, they'll need to be compact, lightweight and safe. Werner contends that once the technology is validated, we'll have one of the most versatile and affordable power resources to support manned exploration of the solar system.

#### Colonization solves extinction

Schulze-Makuch and Davies 10 (Dirk Schulze-Makuch, Ph.D., School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Washington State University and Paul Davies, Ph.D., Beyond Center, Arizona State University, “To Boldly Go: A One-Way Human Mission to Mars”, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars108.html>)

There are several reasons that motivate the establishment of a permanent Mars colony. We are a vulnerable species living in a part of the galaxy where cosmic events such as major asteroid and comet impacts and supernova explosions pose a significant threat to life on Earth, especially to human life. There are also more immediate threats to our culture, if not our survival as a species. These include global pandemics, nuclear or biological warfare, runaway global warming, sudden ecological collapse and supervolcanoes (Rees 2004). Thus, the colonization of other worlds is a must if the human species is to survive for the long term. The first potential colonization targets would be asteroids, the Moon and Mars. The Moon is the closest object and does provide some shelter (e.g., lava tube caves), but in all other respects falls short compared to the variety of resources available on Mars. The latter is true for asteroids as well. Mars is by far the most promising for sustained colonization and development, because it is similar in many respects to Earth and, crucially, possesses a moderate surface gravity, an atmosphere, abundant water and carbon dioxide, together with a range of essential minerals. Mars is our second closest planetary neighbor (after Venus) and a trip to Mars at the most favorable launch option takes about six months with current chemical rocket technology.

**Globalization solves democracy – political climate, multinational corporations, NGOs.**

Chen 2K Jim, Professor of Law University of Minnesota Law School, November/December, 2000

Fordham International Law Journal, PAX MERCATORIA: GLOBALIZATION AS A SECOND CHANCE AT "PEACE FOR OUR TIME, 24 Fordham Int'l L.J. 217, Lexis

Globalization advances democracy not only by raising overall wealth, but also by improving the political climate within nations. The ability of multinational corporations and skilled workers to adopt "fight or flight" strategies encourages governments to adopt transparent policies and to broaden political participation. Businesses and nongovernmental organizations respond by cooperating with the government to form "transnational epistemic communities." Even where they are despised as scourges against local businesses, multinational corporations introduce moral values in countries that have yet to realize globalization's full benefits. At the opposite end of the ideological spectrum, even as unstable governments plunge into kleptocracy and anti-Western terrorists flourish, nongovernmental organizations have stepped into the resulting power vacuum in order to help police the morals of globalized society.

#### Democracy solves extinction

**Diamond 95** Larry Diamond, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, December, PROMOTING DEMOCRACY IN THE 1990S, 1995, p. http://www.carnegie.org//sub/pubs/deadly/diam\_rpt.html //

Nuclear, chemical and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty and openness. The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments.

#### Perm do the plan and reject all other instances of capitalism

#### Psychology makes the drive for growth inevitable—people aren’t satisfied with accepting less.

Friedman 5 — Benjamin M. Friedman, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, former Chair of the Department of Economics at Harvard University, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University, 2005 (“Rising Incomes, Individual Attitudes, and the Politics of Social Change,” *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*, Published by Knopf Publishing Group, ISBN 0679448918, p. 80-82)

The key is that while everybody of course wants to have more income [end page 80] so as to enjoy a higher standard of living, better health, and a greater sense of security, our sense of what constitutes “more” for any of these purposes is mostly relative. Whenever people are asked how well off they think they are, they almost always respond by comparing their lives to some kind of reference point. 4 Further, whether most people think what they have or how they live constitutes “more” or “less” depends on how their circumstances compare to two separate benchmarks: their own (or their family’s) past experience, and how they see people around them living. The principal driving force underlying the positive influence that economic growth has over people’s attitudes, and through the political process therefore over the character of their society, is the interaction between how each of these two resp ective points of comparison affects people’s perceptions. Obviously nothing can enable the majority of the population to be better off than everyone else. But not only is it possible for most people to be better off than they used to be, that is precisely what economic growth means. The central question is whether, when people see that they are doing well (in other words, enjoying “more”) compared to the benchmark of their own prior experience, or their parents’—or when they believe that their children’s lives will be better still— they consequently feel less need to get ahead compared to other people. If so, then the reduced importance they attach to living better than others leads in the end to more wide-ranging benefits, for the society as a whole, whenever general living standards are increasing. Happiness depends, of course, on more than just money and the things money can buy. In surveys, most people say that their sense of satisfaction with their lives depends most on the strength of their family relationships and personal friendships, or their health, or their education, or their religious attachment, or their feeling of connection to a broader community beyond their own family, or their sense of being engaged in purposeful and productive work, or even on their everyday work environment. 5 In many surveys the single most important influence on adults’ happiness is whether they are married. (People who are, or who are living together as if they were, are typically happier.) 6 People with “extrovert” personalities also tend to be happier on average, perhaps simply because they have more friends. 7 Money matters too, however. People with more income typically enjoy not just a higher standard of living in terms of food, clothing, and housing but also better health (in part because of better access to medical care, but also because they drink and smoke less and get more exercise). They also have better educations and a stronger sense of security in the face of major life uncertainties. Familiar popular images of the business rat race [end page 81] notwithstanding, people with higher incomes on average also have more leisure time, and they mostly spend it in activities that foster the friendships they then say (in surveys) matter far more than money. Having at least some financial resources is even helpful in maintaining marriages, perhaps because it allows young couples to live on their own instead of with their parents. 8 At any given time, within a given country, people with lower incomes are far more likely to say that they are unhappy. 9 But the essential point is that how much income it takes to enjoy advantages like these is a relative matter, and the most obvious benchmark people have in mind when they draw such comparisons is their own past experience. People who live better now than they did before, or better than they recall their parents living, are likely to think they are doing well. Those who look back on better times— better for them and their families, that is— think they are not. As a result, psychological studies have repeatedly confirmed that people’s satisfaction depends less on the level of their income than on how it is changing. 10 But rising incomes are, in turn, what economic growth is all about.\* \* (footnote) The idea that satisfaction depends primarily on changes in economic well-being (to the extent that economic factors are important in this regard) is hardly new. Adam Smith observed that “all men, sooner or later, accommodate themselves to whatever becomes their permanent situation.” Hence “between one permanent situation and another, there [is], with regard to real happiness, no essential difference” (The Theory of Moral Sentiments, p. 149). Moreover, Smith claimed no originality for this view but attributed it to the Stoic philosophers of ancient Greece.

#### Cap’s not the root cause

**Aberdeen, 03** (Richard, “THE WAY: A Theory of Root Cause and Solution”, http://richardaberdeen.com/essays/Etheway.html)

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon resorted to violence as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem.  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors.  These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation.  More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see Gallo Brothers for more details).  So-called “classes” of people, unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this.

#### The state of the world has never been better, we are increasing on all metrics

Brookings Institute ’11 (Brookings Institute, Global Think tank, “Poverty in Numbers: The Changing State of Global Poverty from 2005 to 2015 by the Brookings Institute”, <http://nextbigfuture.com/2011/02/poverty-in-numbers-changing-state-of.html>, February 26, 2011, LEQ)

By 2015, we will not only have halved the global poverty rate, but will have halved it again to under 10 percent, or less than 600 million people, with India and China responsible for three-quarters of the reduction in the world’s poor expected between 2005 and 2015. How many poor people are there in the world and how many are there likely to be in 2015? To calculate the number of people in the world living in extreme poverty, we update the World Bank’s official $1.25 a day poverty estimates for 119 countries, which together account for 95 percent of the population of the developing world. To do this, we take the most recent household survey data for each country, and generate poverty estimates for the years 2005 to 2015 using historical and forecast estimates of per capita consumption growth, making the simplifying assumption that the income distribution in each country remains unchanged. Global poverty figures are then calculated by adding together the number of poor from each country. (See the Appendix for a full account of our methodology.) Our results indicate that the world has seen a dramatic decrease in global poverty over the past six years, and that this trend is set to continue in the four years ahead. We estimate that between 2005 and 2010, the total number of poor people around the world fell by nearly half a billion people, from over 1.3 billion in 2005 to under 900 million in 2010. Looking ahead to 2015, extreme poverty could fall to under 600 million people—less than half the number regularly cited in describing the number of poor people in the world today. Poverty reduction of this magnitude is unparalleled in history: never before have so many people been lifted out of poverty over such a brief period of time. When measured as a share of population, progress remains impressive, but is more in line with past trends. In the early 1980s, more than half of all people in developing countries lived in extreme poverty. By 2005, this was down to a quarter. According to our estimates, as of 2010 less than 16 percent remained in poverty, and fewer than 10 percent will likely be poor by 2015. The first Millennium Development Goal defines a target (MDG1a) of halving the rate of global poverty by 2015 from its 1990 level. In an official report prepared for the U.N. MDG conference this past September, the World Bank stated that we are 80 percent of the way toward this target and are on track to meet it by 2015, though the Bank warned that “the economic crisis adds new risks to prospects for reaching the goal.” Our assessment is considerably more upbeat. We believe that the MDG1a target has already been met—approximately three years ago. Furthermore, by 2015, we will not only have halved the global poverty rate, as per MDG1a, but will have halved it again. Over the past half century, the developing world, including many of the world’s poorest countries, have seen dramatic improvements in virtually all non-income measures of well-being: since 1960, global infant mortality has dropped by more than 50 percent, for example, and the share of the world’s children enrolled in primary school increased from less than half to nearly 90 percent between 1950 and today.5 Likewise there have been impressive gains in gender equality, access to justice and civil and political rights. Yet, through most of this period, the incomes of rich and poor countries diverged, and income poverty has proven a more persistent challenge than other measures of wellbeing. The rapid decline in global poverty now underway—and the early achievement of the MDG1a target—marks a break from these trends, and could come to be seen as a turning point in the history of global development. Unlike previous decades, like the ’80s (when the poverty rate increased in Africa) and the ’90s (when it increased in Latin America and the former Soviet Union), poverty reduction is currently taking place in all regions of the world. The sharpest fall in poverty is occurring in Asia. South Asia alone is expected to see a reduction in the number of its poor of more than 430 million over the 10-year period we study, representing a fall in its poverty rate of over 30 percentage points. East Asia already recorded a vast drop in poverty between 1980 and 2005, and this trend is continuing: a further 250 million people in the region are expected to escape poverty by 2015, two-thirds of whom have likely already done so. For the first time, Sub-Saharan Africa’s poverty rate has fallen below 50 percent. The total number of poor people in the region is falling too, albeit slowly. Better still, by 2015, the poverty rate is expected to fall below 40 percent—a rate China did not achieve until the mid-90s.

**Neoliberalism checks war through interdependence and democracy**

**Griswold 06** director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute [Daniel T. Griswold, , 2006 CATO Institute, Peace on earth? Try free trade among men, <http://www.freetrade.org/node/282>)]

First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet.With trade comes more travel, more contact withpeople in other countries, andmore exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

**Neoliberalism solves human rights – international coalitions.**

Shelton ‘**2** Dinah, Professor of Law, Notre Dame Law School, Spring, 2002

GLOBALIZATION & THE EROSION OF SOVEREIGNTY IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR LICHTENSTEIN: Protecting Human Rights in a Globalized World”, 25 B.C. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 273, Lexis

The Article concludes that responses to globalization are significantly changing international law and institutions in order to protect persons from violations of human rights committed by non-state actors. To the extent that these changes have brought greater transparency to and participation in international organizations, globalization has produced unintended benefits and further challenges to the democratic deficit in global governance.At the same time, an emphasis on subsidiarity and a strengthening of weak states and their institutions may be necessary to ensure that globalization does not mean a decline in state promotion and protection of human rights. To ensure that such strengthening does not lead to further human rights violations, the international community should make concerted multilateral efforts to enhance its ability to respond to human rights violations, rather than unleashing each state to control what it views as the sins of the private sector.

**Neoliberalism not oppressive or exploitive – empirically proven**

**Bhagvati ‘4** (University Professor at Columbia University and Senior Fellow in International Economics at the Council on Foreign Relations [JagdishBhagwati, “In Defense of Globalization”. 2004. Overview, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/6769/in_defense_of_globalization.html>]

JagdishBhagwati takes conventional wisdom—that globalization is the cause of several social ills—and turns it on its head. Properly regulated, globalization, he says, is the most powerful force for social good in the world. Drawing on his unparalleled knowledge of international economics, Bhagwati dismantles the antiglobalization case. He persuasively argues that globalization often leads to greater general prosperity in an underdeveloped nation: it can reduce child labor, increase literacy, and enhance the economic and social standing of women.And to counter charges that globalization leads to cultural hegemony, to a bland “McWorld,” Bhagwati points to several examples, from literature to movies, in which globalization has led to a spicy hybrid of cultures. Often controversial and always compelling, Bhagwati cuts through the noise on this most contentious issue, showing that globalization is part of the solution, not part of the problem. Anyone who wants to understand what’s at stake in the globalization wars will want to read *In Defense of Globalization*. The first edition of *In Defense of Globalization* addressed the critiques that concerned the social implications of economic globalization.Thus, it addressed questions such as the impact on women’s rights and equality, child labor, poverty in the poor countries, democracy, mainstream and indigenous culture, and the environment. Professor Bhagwati concluded that globalization was, on balance, a force for advancing these agendas as well.Thus, whereas the critics assumed thatglobalizationlacked a human face, itactually had a human face. He also examined in depth the ways in which policy and institutional design could further advance these social agendas, adding more glow to the human face.

#### **Retaliation causes nuclear war**

Ayson 10 – Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington (Robert, July. “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects.” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Vol. 33, Issue 7. InformaWorld.)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, bothRussia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability?