### 2AC Energy Production

#### Plutonium-238 is nuclear power

**Nathan 11** [“Power pack: nuclear power in space”, 15 August 2011 | By Stuart Nathan, The Engineer]

But as we start to look at exploring more intensively in the Solar System and to plan again for Mars and lunar missions, space nuclear power is facing a problem, explained Tom Rice, business development manager of the National Nuclear Laboratory at the recent UK Space Conference. Previous nuclear power in space has used plutonium as its fuel, he said, and the changing landscape of the nuclear industry and research community here on Earth has meant that this is not so easy to come by any more. ’We need alternative fuels,’ he said, ’and the UK and Europe are active in the search for them.’

#### Counter-interpretation – energy production is conversion to electricity and this must be in the United States

PNL 78, Report Commissioned by the DOE Pacific Northwestern Laboratories "An Analysis of Federal Incentives Used to Stimulate Energy Production" March 1978 www.osti.gov/bridge/servlets/purl/7059750-iKeQE4/7059750.pdf

Energy production is defined as the transformation of natural resources into commonly used forms of energy such as heat, light, and electricity. By this definition, the shining of the sun or the running of a river are not examples of energy production, but the installation of solar panels or the construction of a hydroelectric dam are. Energy consumption is defined as the use of one of these common, "manufactured" forms of energy. Under this definition sunbathing is not energy consumption, but heating water by means of a solar panel is. In both definitions, the crucial ingredient is the application of technology and resources to change a natural resource into a useful energy form.

#### Aff ground – no extraction means no natural gas – they exclude Gen IV reactors

**World Nuclear Association 12** [March 2012, “Plutonium”]

Plutonium-238, Pu-240 and Pu-242 emit neutrons as a few of their nuclei spontaneously fission, albeit at a low rate. They and Pu-239 also decay, emitting alpha particles and heat. The decay heat of Pu-238 (0.56 W/g) enables its use as an electricity source in the radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs) of some cardiac pacemakers, space satellites, navigation beacons, etc. Plutonium has powered 24 US space vehicles and enabled the Voyager spacecraft to send back pictures of distant planets. These spacecraft have operated for 20 years and may continue for another 20. The Cassini spacecraft carries three generators providing 870 watts power as it orbits around Saturn.¶ A 1000 MWe light water reactor gives rise to about 25 tonnes of used fuel a year, containing up to 290 kilograms of plutonium. If the plutonium is extracted from used reactor fuel it can be used as a direct substitute for U-235 in the usual fuel, the Pu-239 being the main fissile part, but Pu-241 also contributing. In order to extract it for recycle, the used fuel is reprocessed and the recovered plutonium oxide is mixed with depleted uranium oxide to produce MOX fuel, with about 8% Pu-239 (this corresponds with uranium enriched to 5% U-235; see page on Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel).¶ Plutonium can also be used in fast neutron reactors, where all the plutonium isotopes fission, and so function as a fuel. As with uranium, the energy potential of plutonium is more fully realised in a fast reactor. Four of the six 'Generation IV' reactor designs currently under development are fast neutron reactors and will thus utilize plutonium in some way (see page on Generation IV Nuclear Reactors). In these, plutonium production will take place in the core, where burn-up is high and the proportion of plutonium isotopes other than Pu-239 will remain high.

#### No uniqueness for their limits – the majority of teams read the same aff

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations are a race to the bottom to arbitrary exclude the aff

### 2AC Procurement

#### We meet – plan is a financial incentive – acquiring is T

**US Code 3** Legal Information Institute, “41 USC § 131 – Acquisition”, November 24, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/41/131?quicktabs_8=1#quicktabs-8>

In division B, the term “acquisition”—¶ (1) means the process of acquiring, with appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of an executive agency, from the point at which the requirements of the executive agency are established in consultation with the chief acquisition officer of the executive agency; and¶ (2) includes—¶ (A) the process of acquiring property or services that are already in existence, or that must be created, developed, demonstrated, and evaluated;¶ (B) the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs;¶ (C) solicitation and selection of sources;¶ (D) award of contracts;¶ (E) contract performance;¶ (F) contract financing;¶ (G) management and measurement of contract performance through final delivery and payment; and¶ (H) technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency requirements by contract.

#### C/I – Financial incentives include procurement – its primarily geared to encouraging topical behavior

**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.

#### Their interpretation is arbitrary – spending money to incentivize industry responses is impossible to distinguish from the formal process of procurement – link turns limits offense because any random interpretation of words becomes a legit interpretation of the resolution

#### The Czinkota evidence says financial incentives include “providing land or buildings.” Later in the book it says overseas assignments are topical.

**Czinkota et al, 2009**

Associate Professor, McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University, Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 324

Foreign Service Premium A financial incentive to accept an assignment overseas, usually paid as a percentage of the base salary.

#### Ground – weak solvency mechanisms suck and purchasing provides great spending and process CPs while still allowing the aff to beat states -

#### Reasonability – have a very high standard for T at the NDT – it’s the last tournament – it wont guide research – force them to provide a SUBSTANTIAL difference between our interps to pull the trigger – causes substance crowd out

### 2AC ‘United States’

#### We meet – we procure energy in the United States. Also, Financial incentives modifies ‘in the United States’ – the procurement contracts are in the US.

#### Acquiring electricity from plutonium-238 is an incentive to produce energy – we just specify the type of nuclear reactor and say in the plan text that it’s for use in the US– whether or not it’s used is a solvency question. Deep exploration of space is an EFFECT of the plan not a MANDATE

#### If anything the mandate of the plan is for the initial craft will be an ASRG

**Clark 12** [“Nuclear-powered craft not picked in latest competition”, BY STEPHEN CLARK, SPACEFLIGHT NOW, August 28, 2012]

The nuclear power units, called ASRGs, use less plutonium than existing generators. NASA and the U.S. Department of Energy face a shortage of plutonium-238 nuclear fuel for robotic spacecraft, causing officials to turn to more efficient power generators.

#### The energy produced will be in the United States

**Clark 12** [“Nuclear-powered craft not picked in latest competition”, BY STEPHEN CLARK, SPACEFLIGHT NOW, August 28, 2012]

John Grunsfeld, head of NASA's science directorate, said the advanced nuclear generator was not a factor in the selection of InSight.¶ "The success of ASRGs is still very important for planetary science, so we're going to continue to push the development of those," Grunsfeld said.¶ Officials want to complete extensive ground testing and a low-cost flight demonstration before flying ASRGs on a multi-billion dollar flagship mission.

#### Counter-interpretation – the United States includes aerospace 100 miles above the US

**BSAF 13** [“How Far Do a Country’s Boundaries Extend and How Far Up Into the Atmosphere Does the Air Space Extend?”, Big Site of Amazing Facts, 2013]

Borders define geographic boundaries of political entities such as governments, sovereign states, and other subnational entities.¶ A country’s borders continue beneath the surface all the way to the earth’s core.¶ Above the ground, boundaries extend 100 miles (161 km) into the atmosphere.¶ That means that airlines must get permission to enter the air space of each country they fly over.¶ Natural borders are geographical features that present natural obstacles to communication and transport.¶ Existing political borders are usually a formalization of these historical, natural obstacles.

#### Accepted definitions for ‘outer space’ are well below that threshold – the initial electricity generation would begin ‘in the united states’ even if it was tested in outer space first

Physics.org No Date “A brief history of space” http://www.physics.org/article-questions.asp?id=61

The boundary of where space begins is not well defined. A common working definition is the Kármán Line at a height of 62 miles. This is where an aircraft would have to travel at a speed greater than orbital velocity to get enough lift from its wings to stay in the air.¶ The US defines an astronaut as someone who has flown above 50 miles, while NASA use 76 miles as their re-entry altitude, the point at which atmospheric drag is noticeable and the space shuttle can switch from steering with thrusters to maneuvering like a conventional aircraft.

#### Overlimiting – they exclude SMR’s and all military affs, because they’re bought in the US and then used in places outside of the US – mixes burdens by conflating solvency with topicality, because if the spacecraft fails we’re always in the US

#### Education – space key to understanding overall nuclear policy

Cook, 05 [“Making Space Nuclear Power A Reality”, Beverly A. Cook, Jet Propulsion Laborato y, California Institute of Technology, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, <http://trs-new.jpl.nasa.gov/dspace/bitstream/2014/39315/1/05-0101.pdf>]

VI. Conclusion¶ The public, in general, does not have a good understanding of the processes and procedures we utilize when¶ designing and operating nuclear systems. They do not understand the regulatory framework that requires those¶ processes to be used. They do not understand that the safety and reliability record of the nuclear industry in the U.S.¶ is achieved through rigor, not luck. The future in which nuclear technologies are safely managed and utilized is now.¶ I have always worked near and in nuclear facilities and my family has lived in the communities near those¶ facilities. The safe utilization of nuclear technology is something that affects me personally. The misuse of nuclear¶ systems would not be something that just happens to someone else, it would happen to the people most important to¶ me. The benefits of nuclear technology are something I see every day. It is our responsibility to convince the public¶ that rigorous processes are in place and implemented by people with a real and personal concern for the outcome,¶ with rigorous checks and balances, so that we can use the best technologies available to meet our science and¶ exploration goals. We will fulfill this responsibility by have qualified and experienced organizations and personnel¶ responsible for the design and operation of the space nuclear reactors. We are not asking the public and decision¶ makers to chose between safety and space science. Space nuclear reactors used for power and propulsion will be¶ safe and reliable. The decision is whether to invest in the technology, with all the rigor that is required, to meet the¶ science goals for the next phase of space exploration.

#### Reasonability – have a very high standard for T at the NDT – it’s the last tournament – it wont guide research – force them to provide a SUBSTANTIAL difference between our interps to pull the trigger – causes substance crowd out – arbitrary interpretations link turn your limits and predictiability offense because any random definition can be justified

### AT: Pu-238 Revival Now – Barriers

#### Framing issue: US going it alone doesn’t put any political pressure on the government to act – becoming dependent on Europe cements cooperation necessary to solve space exploration

No domestic restart – our Packard evidence is older but future predictive – it says that without Congress funding it, which none of their evidence says is happening, it’s liable to get shut down – moreover reactor shortages render it ineffective

#### 8 years away

**Ferro 3/14** [“NASA Resumes Production Of Plutonium-238 Space Fuel After 25 Years”, Popular Science]

In April, officials at the DOE finally announced production was underway, but getting supplies up to snuff could take up to eight years.

#### It’ll only produce 1.5 kg – for context, an unmanned probe to Pluto takes 11

**Dickinson 3/20** [“U.S. To Restart Plutonium Production for Deep Space Exploration”, Universe Today, David Dickinson, March 20, 2013]

Still, full target production of 1.5 kilograms per year may be some time off. For context, the Mars rover Curiosity utilizes 4.8 kilograms of Pu-238, and New Horizons contains 11 kilograms.

#### It’s just a test – and it’ll use neptunium-237

**Klotz 3/18** [Irene, Mar 18, 2013, “U.S. restarts plutonium production for space probes”]

In partnership with NASA, the Department of Energy irradiated the radioactive metal neptunium-237 with neutrons at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee for about a month and successfully produced a small amount plutonium.¶ "This is just a test," Green said, adding that a report from the Energy Department on production plans and costs should be finished before the end of the year.¶

#### That can be used to make nuclear weapons – and it destroys US leverage

**Corley 12** [New Scientist, August 11, 2012, “So long, plutonium”, Anne-Marie Corley, Features; No. 1014, lexis]

Then there are concerns over proliferation and political capital. While plutonium-238 cannot be used to make a nuclear weapon, it is a different story with neptunium-237. This is weapons-grade material: bombarded by fast neutrons, it is capable of sustaining a chain reaction without unstable heat decay. Edwin Lyman at the Union of Concerned Scientists based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, believes that given these safety and security issues, non-nuclear power generation systems should be a priority for space applications. “Alternatives need to be explored fully,” he says. “If the US proceeds with the restart, it will be more difficult for us to dissuade other countries from doing the same, should they decide they need to produce their own plutonium-238 supply.”

#### Future predictive - non-prolif resistant tech in the US will get shut down

**Packard 12** [“The US Space Program’s Plutonium-238 Crisis”, January 6th, 2012, Steve Packard, science popularize, engineer, maintainer of skeptical science websites, Depleted Cranium]

Restarting production in the US may prove more difficult than simply finding a suitable reactor. Producing the final Plutonium-238 tablets used for providing heat to RTG’s requires that the irradiated targets be dissolved, the plutionium-238 processed out and fabricated into the final RTG fuel. The material is very hot, both in terms of radioactivity and literally. Handling and processing it requires special facilities such as hot cells and plutonium chemical separation facilities. The United States has limited capabilities in this area, with most of the facilities capable of fabricating special nuclear materials shut down over “proliferation concerns.”

#### NASA and DOE won’t produce enough Plutonium-238 now

Deason ’12 – research assistant at Oregon State University in Space Nuclear Research

(Wes, “Plutonium In Space: Why and How?”, ANS Nuclear Café, 2-1-2012, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/02/01/11193/)

Unfortunately, plutonium-238 cannot be found naturally. This is because it is radioactive and will have almost completely decayed into a different element after a geologically short period of 1000 years. Thus, plutonium-238 must be produced using nuclear reactors. During the Cold War, when weapons-grade plutonium production was at full scale, plutonium-238 was a byproduct that could be saved and used for space power production. Since the 1990s, however, the United States has stopped production of weapons-grade plutonium, yet we continue to plan space missions that require the use of plutonium-238. NASA and the DOE have discussed plans to use national laboratory reactors to produce plutonium-238 for general purpose applications, but it is questionable if they will be able to supply a sufficient amount to meet national needs. Another concept, proposed by the Center for Space Nuclear Research (CSNR), uses flexible TRIGA research reactors to produce a higher quantity of Pu-238 per year at lower cost. For more information on low cost plutonium-238 production, contact the CSNR. Regardless of its source, Pu-238 remains an important tool for scientific research. Many space missions have been powered by plutonium-238, and future missions will continue to be enabled by it. Its long lasting heat generation—coupled with a dependable power conversion system—allows it to be used in many environments and configurations. The use of plutonium-238 can be expected to become even more important as space exploration pushes further outward to Mars, Jupiter, their moons, and beyond!

### Space Mil

#### X-37B and HTV-2

**National Defense 10** [National Defense, NDIA’s business and technology magazine, National Defense “Spate of Hypersonic Vehicle Tests Fuels Global Strike Debate” August 2010 By Stew Magnuson]

The military’s reusable space plane, the X-37B, and its classified payload lifted off in April only one day after the maiden flight of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency’s Hypersonic Technology Vehicle-2 suborbital glider. It flew nine minutes before operators lost its signal and were forced to abort the mission. These two vehicles, along with a hypersonic missile that made its first test flight one month later, the X-51 WaveRider, have all been mentioned as means to carry out the “prompt global strike” concept, which calls for the U.S military to deliver a conventional warhead anywhere on the planet in significantly shorter time spans than are currently possible. Intelligence can be fleeting. The location of a high-value target such as a terrorist leader can be confirmed, but he may move before an air strike is arranged. Or he could be located in a nation that doesn’t allow the Air Force to fly over its territory. U.S. Strategic Command has been looking into ways to deliver bombs on such targets for several years. The X-37B’s top-secret payload has nonproliferation experts wondering if it is meant to deliver weapons. Air Force leaders won’t say how high up the experimental spacecraft is, how much it costs, or exactly how long it will loiter before returning to Earth. And it definitely won’t reveal what it is carrying in its bay. “I think the secrecy is the key problem — not necessarily the technology, itself — it does allow people’s imaginations to run wild,” said Theresa Hitchens, director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research in Geneva, Switzerland. “The concept of 24/7 global strike capabilities makes almost everyone nervous, including U.S. allies,” Hitchens said. “Such capabilities could be highly destabilizing in a crisis; and also raise the risk of mistaken strikes because of the pressure to respond rapidly to intelligence without taking the time to closely verify that intelligence,” she told National Defense in an email. Diplomats based in Europe have asked Hitchens her opinion about the space plane, formally known as the orbital test vehicle. “The X-37B has caused quite a stir in China, at least in the Chinese press and there have been some pointed inquiries here,” she said. “The problem is primarily the heavy secrecy surrounding the experiment, which always causes the international community to become suspicious when it involves U.S. military space activities,” she added. She believes the X-37B is carrying National Reconnaissance Office payloads, which automatically makes the mission classified. NRO operates the nation’s spy satellites.

### 2AC Immigration – ESA

**There is no threat and at worst it will only mean cooperation**

**Burger et al. 10** – Kees Burger Development Economics, Corresponding author, Wageningen University, Hollandseweg, Jeroen Warner AND Eefje Derix Disaster Studies, Wageningen Universit “Governance of the world food system and crisis prevention” http://www.stuurgroepta.nl/rapporten/Foodshock-web.pdf

Both European water and agricultural policies are based on the belief that there will always be cheap food aplenty on the world market. A recent British report 23 reflects this optimism. Although production is now more prone to world market price shocks, their effects on farm incomes are softened by extensive income supports (van Eickhout et al. 2007). Earlier, in a 2003 report, a European group of agricultural economists wrote: Food security is no longer a prime objective of European food and agricultural policy. There is no credible threat to the availability of the basic ingredients of human nutrition from domestic and foreign sources. If there is a food security threat it is the possible disruption of supplies by natural disasters or catastrophic terrorist action. The main response necessary for such possibilities is the appropriate contingency planning and co-ordination between the Commission and Member States (Anania et al. 2003). Europe, it appears, feels rather sure of itself, and does not worry about a potential food crisis. We are also not aware of any special measures on standby. Nevertheless a fledgling European internal security has been called into being that can be deployed should (food) crises strike. The Maastricht Treaty (1992) created a quasi-decision-making platform to respond to transboundary threats. Since 9/11 the definition of what constitutes a threat has been broadened and the protection capacity reinforced. In the Solidarity Declaration of 2003 member states promised to stand by each other in the event of a terrorist attack, natural disaster or human-made calamity (the European Security Strategy of 2003). Experimental forms of cooperation are tried that leave member-state sovereignty intact, such as pooling of resources. The EU co-operates in the area of health and food safety but its mechanisms remain decentrslised by dint of the principle of subsidiarity. The silo mentality between the European directorates is also unhelpful, leading to Babylonian confusion. Thus, in the context of forest fires and floods the Environment DG refers to ‘civil protection’. The European Security and Defence Policy( ESDP) of 2006, which is hoped to build a bridge between internal and external security policy, on the other hand refers to ‘crisis management’, while the ‘security’ concept mainly pertains to pandemics (Rhinard et al. 2008: 512, Boin et al. 2008: 406).

**US-Indian relations are permanent – U.S. interest has too many strategic interests with India to jack shit up**

**Frontier Post 3-29** ( Arshad Mahmood, “US strategic tilt towards India”

With approximately 3.2 per cent of the total world area and 28 per cent of world population the geostrategic architecture of South Asia has always attracted the great global players including the U.S. Pakistan and India - two core regional actors - have historically been vital to Washington in meeting its strategic objectives. Ever since demise of former Soviet Union in 1991, the U.S regional policies have, however, been varying but generally remained Indian centric. Contrarily, the history of Pak-US relations has seen many ups and downs. Pakistan’s geostrategic location - where the interests of the great global players coincide - makes it a key factor in the regional and international politics. But despite its tremendous sacrifices Islamabad could not bridge the trust deficit gap with White House. The account of Pak-US relations provokes an important question in the mind of every Pakistani: ‘Is Pakistan an all time strategic partner of the U.S. or just a friend in (their) need?’ Weighing significance of both the states in meeting the U.S. long term strategic interests in South Asia, one can clearly observe a visible tilt in Washington’s policies towards India. In order to establish its root-cause, it’s rather imperative to conduct a philosophical debate of Pak-US relations in comparison with Indo-US bilateral ties in a realist paradigm. With the end of Cold War in 1991 the U.S. suddenly disengaged itself - to a larger extent - from the politics of South Asia. Later various regional and international dynamics drove Washington’s policymakers back to this region. During Cold War the only hitch in Indo-US relation was Indian relations with the Soviet Union which automatically got removed with the fall of communist empire. Contrarily, the vital role of Pakistan in beating Soviet armed forces in Afghanistan and its importance for the US. towards containment of USSR suddenly vanished. Though the U.S. administration remained aloof from South Asia after the fall of Kremlin Empire but the dramatic developments of May 1998 - Indo-Pak nuclear explosions - and the Kargil-1999 conflict suddenly transformed the low profile of South Asian region as the focus of the world attention especially the U.S. Due to personal intervention of President Clinton the danger of war was, though, averted but from Pakistan’s perspective the Kargil war was a complete failure. The conflict diplomatically isolated Pakistan as the world community believed that Pakistani forces were on the “wrong side of LoC” and made the U.S. to play its role in the regional politics. This changed scenario went in Indian favour. In May 2000, President Clinton paid a historic visit to the sub-continent. The visit was a formal U.S. strategic signal of its policy on South Asia. It was also the Washington’s proclamation of “discovery of India” as its long term strategic partner. Four points would reinforce these arguments: Firstly, he was the first American president to visit India and Pakistan in 22 and 30 years respectively; Secondly, he visited India for five days whereas had a just five hours stop-over in Pakistan; Thirdly, there was also a mark difference in his body language both toward India and Pakistan. With Vajpayee smiles, warmth and cordiality were visible symbols which ware replaced with grimace, cold and official posture in Pakistan; and, finally, the Washington agenda in India was vast ranging from transformation of bilateral socio-political and economic ties to cooperation regionally and internationally. In Pakistan, however, President Clinton just urged Musharraf to chalk out a roadmap for restoring democracy. Later, the event of 9/11 proved to be the most influential as regard to the US policy shift to whole of the world in general and South Asia in particular. Before September 11, 2011, Pakistan was a marginalized country having low priority on U.S. agenda whereas India was centre of its policy in South Asia. In the words of Stephen P Cohen, “The Bush administration built upon Clinton’s “discovery of India” and set out to create a comprehensive and positive relationship with New Delhi.” But the 9/11 brought dramatic change in the whole scenario. As stated by President Bush, “9/11 changed America”, the situation brought Pakistan back to centre stage - putting parts of the US-India agenda on hold - nevertheless only temporarily! Pakistan today is a frontline ally of the U.S. but both the states have several conflicting interests. Following the events of Raymond Davis, 2nd May 2011 and Salala attack, misperceptions between the two have tapped the extreme ends. The fiasco of Pak-US relations encompasses two key questions: how does the U.S. views his interests in Pakistan and what are the major challenges in the relationship of both the countries? Stephen P. Cohen during a seminar in Islamabad in 2003 identifies some U.S. areas of concern which include terrorism / extremism, nuclear programme, democratization and relations with India. As regard to the challenges: the broad nature of them include the prevalence of trust deficit, the U.S. perception considering Pakistan as part of problem rather than the solution, the tangent approaches which both the allies have adopted in the WOT, and the US-Indian friendly policy on Kashmir. Finally, with 2014 knocking at the door, the White House policy indicators - emerged from the declarations of Bonn Conference, launching of New Silk Initiative and the U.S. urge to talk to Taliban - suggest that the Obama administration is following the strategy of initially minimizing and ultimately edging out Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan. As regards to post - 2014 scenario, the U.S. proclaims to focus on economic uplift of the country through New Silk Initiative which is not only an effort of keeping China, Russia and Iran out of the game but also draw a dividing line in the time-tested Pak-China friendship. As regards to Indo-U.S. relations; Henry Kissinger had observed a decade ago that the United States and India have “no conflicting interest in the traditional and fundamental sense.” For last ten years the Indo-US relations have transformed from bilateral to multilateral dimension. The Indian bustling democracy and growing economy are the main converging points in their bilateral ties. India is the world largest democracy and has grown economically at an average of 7.7 percent in real terms over the last decade. It is not only the largest market for the U.S. but also possesses the potentials of becoming the global economic powerhouse in the next two decades. The salient contours of New Delhi and Washington areas of cooperation were spelled out by Robert O. Blake, the U.S. Assistant Secretary on South and Central Asian Affairs during a press briefing on the U.S. Policy Priorities in South and Central Asia on 23 September, 2011. He said, “President Obama has called (Indo-U.S. relations as) one of our defining partnerships for the 21st century.” The areas of cooperation between two embrace counter terrorism, trade and investment, economic partnership, job opportunities, infrastructure development, energy, clean water, and cold chain systems. Furthermore, they are also working on establishing Investment Forum, Foreign Direct Investment and state-to-state and city-to-city relationships through their respective Chambers of Commerce. With Pakistan there are no such arrangements. Furthermore, India has transformed from “estranged democracy” during Cold War to “engaged democracy” in the post-Cold War eras and with its record economic growth of 7.7 per cent over the last decade is an attractive market and investment partner for the U.S. That is why, on regional power political canvas, the U.S. views India as a potential counterweight to balance a rising China. Contrarily, Pakistan possesses a weak economy which survives on foreign aid and is conceived by New York as almost a failed state with unstable and corrupt democratic structure. Above all, the increasing strategic importance of the Indian Ocean, - connecting the oil-rich Persian Gulf with growing energy markets in East Asia - grants a clear edge to India over Pakistan in Washington’s Asia-Pacific strategy.

**Demand is low for unskilled labor, and there’s an excess of unkilled immigrant laborers**

**Park Place Economist ’99 (Describing Jaeger, an economist for the Bureau of Labor Statistics)**

David Jaeger, economist for the Bureau of Labor Statistics and proponent of immigration reform, claims that lax immigration policies have been the driving force behind the increasing wage disparity, and are responsible for the current 24% college-high school wage differential. Intuition would attribute this to the extensive number of immigrant laborers in the unskilled labor market resulting in excess supply. However, economic researcher Malcolm Gillis believes this increasing wage differential can be better explained via an economic phenomenon known as educational deepening. Adhering to the principle elements of developmental economics, educational deepening simply states that as an economy progresses, those less educated will be replaced in the workforce by those of higher educational attainment resulting in an inevitable decrease in the demand for unskilled laborers, regardless of national origin. In short, as America has steered away from “blue-collar” manufacturing industry and become a service economy, the demand for the less educated has decreased, while the demand for college graduates has increased.

#### CIR fails – Watered down

Morrison 12-9 – Bruce Morrison, a former U.S. Representative from Connecticut, was the chairman of the House immigration subcommittee and the author of the Immigration Act of 1990. December 9th, 2012, "One Bill of Compromises Isn’t the Answer” www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/12/09/understanding-immigration-reform/one-immigration-bill-of-compromises-isnt-the-answer

To many, “comprehensive immigration reform” means “fix it and forget it.” But doing it all in one bill reprises what got us in the current mess in the first place. After major reform bills in 1986 and 1990, the failing employment verification scheme and the clogged green card process were allowed to go unattended. The “enforcement only” 1996 law only froze the mess in place. Save the 'punishment' for those that do not comply with a system that works, not those ensnared in the current system that does not. **A huge compromise of all competing immigration fixes larded into one bill will involve compromises that do not serve the nation’s interests.** Instead we need to assemble the votes to do the two things that must be done — a broad earned legalization program for the 11 million now illegally resident in the country in conjunction with the assurance that this problem will not happen again. That assurance will come from a universal, electronic, identity-authenticating screening of all workers to ensure that they are authorized to work in the U.S. Because almost all who make unauthorized entries and overstays do so to seek and accept employment, no other tool will get the result we need to make legalization politically and philosophically justified — that we have fixed the source of the problem. And this also means using the employment relationship to roll-in legalization while rolling out universal verification. The key point is that prevention of illegal presence is the goal. Save the “punishment” for those that do not comply with a system that works, not those ensnared in the current system that does not. Our legal immigration system needs lots of fixing, like the increase of STEM green cards passed by the House last week and much more. But these fixes, including all future flows beyond the current one million annual immigrants and the millions who will be legalized, will get much easier to negotiate when the legalization-prevention barrier is removed.

#### Won’t pass – guest-workers

Nakamura 3-28 (David, Washington Post, “Guest-worker program dispute may delay immigration bill,” AZ Central, <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/free/20130328immigration-reform-guest-worker-program-dispute-may-delay-bill.html>)

A bipartisan deal on immigration is at risk of stalling because of a worsening dispute over a new guest-worker program, exposing fault lines between crucial interest groups and threatening to delay the unveiling of a Senate bill early next month. The impasse has prompted a bitter round of name-calling between labor and business groups, both of whom accuse the other of imperiling comprehensive immigration reform. As the standoff has deteriorated, the Obama administration has remained on the sidelines and declined to intervene — a calculated decision that the president’s influence would risk alienating Republican senators crucial to the process. The dispute over a program for foreign workers has emerged as perhaps the most serious obstacle to a final deal from a bipartisan group of eight senators, who are attempting to fashion model legislation for broad immigration reform. The same issue helped derail the last serious attempt at reform in 2007 with help from Obama, then a U.S. senator from Illinois. The current talks center on rules governing the “future flow” of migrants who come to the United States for low-paying, menial jobs. Republicans, citing business interests, want to give temporary work visas to up to 400,000 foreign workers a year, mostly at minimum wages. But unions and many Democrats, fearing the impact on American workers, want fewer workers and higher pay under the program. Senators involved in the immigration talks insist they remain on schedule to complete a bill, including a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants, in early April. Obama also expressed confidence this week that the guest-workers disagreement could be solved. “I don’t agree that it’s threatening to doom the legislation,” Obama said in an interview Wednesday with Telemundo, the Spanish-language TV network. “Labor and businesses may not always agree exactly on how to do this, but this is a resolvable issue.” But behind the scenes, negotiations over the guest-worker program — and the White House’s refusal to take a position — have soured relations between the AFL-CIO and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which only a month ago joined hands to publicly proclaim agreement on an overall plan. “Unions say they want a guest-worker program, but their behavior is to the contrary,” said Geoff Burr, vice president for federal affairs for the Associated Builders and Contractors. “They are insisting on a program that no employer would consider using.”

#### **Energy thumper**

Ben Geman (writer for The Hill) March 18, 2013 “The week ahead: Budget battles, gas exports take center stage” http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/288671-the-week-ahead-budget-battles-gas-exports-take-center-stage

This week is likely to bring floor debate in the House and Senate over competing federal budget plans that offer starkly different priorities on energy.¶ The GOP-crafted House plan would mandate approval of the Keystone XL oil sands pipeline and expand federal lands available for oil-and-gas leasing.¶ Senate Democrats, in contrast, are touting their plans’ investments in green energy research and addressing climate change.¶ Watch The Hill’s E2-Wire updates during the week.¶ Energy will also take center stage at a slew of Capitol Hill hearings. Among them:¶ On Tuesday, a subpanel of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee will look at Energy Department (DOE) review of natural-gas exports.¶ DOE is weighing an array of industry applications to greatly expand natural-gas exports — proposals that have touched off a political battle in Washington.

#### **Guns thumper**

Murray 3-28 (Mark, “First Thoughts: Obama jumps back into the gun debate,” NBC News, <http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/03/28/17501341-first-thoughts-obama-jumps-back-into-the-gun-debate?lite>)

Obama jumps back into the gun debate: With some GOP senators vowing to filibuster the legislation coming to the floor next month and with some analysts saying that reformers have already lost, President Obama today steps back into the gun debate with an event at the White House at 11:40 am ET. Per the White House, Obama will stand with mothers, law-enforcement officials, and Vice President Biden in urging Congress to take action on the upcoming Senate legislation, which includes universal background checks. As we have written before, those checks -- supported overwhelmingly in public opinion polls -- will ultimately define success or failure for gun-control advocates. Democrats, led by Sen. Chuck Schumer, are trying to get Republicans to back some type of compromise on background checks, given that the filibuster threat means 60 votes will be needed to even begin considering the legislation. That’s why Michael Bloomberg’s Mayors Against Illegal Guns is airing TV ads in key states to also apply pressure. Meanwhile, Politico reports that Sen. Chuck Grassley, the top GOP lawmaker on the Senate Judiciary Committee, is drafting his own Republican gun bill (without background checks), which “could further complicate what will already be a difficult lift for Democrats and the White House.” \*\*\* Obama, bipartisan group still optimistic on immigration reform: While Obama uses the bully pulpit today on guns, yesterday he used it on immigration by granting interviews to the top Spanish-language TV news outlets. “If we have a bill introduced at the beginning of next month -- as these senators indicate it will be -- then I'm confident that we can get it done certainly before the end of the summer,” Obama told Telemundo regarding the Senate bipartisan activity on immigration, per NBC’s Carrie Dann. “I'm optimistic,” he added. “I've always said that if I see a breakdown in the process, that I've got my own legislation. I'm prepared to step in. But I don't think that's going to be necessary. I think there's a commitment among this group of Democratic and Republican senators to get this done.” Speaking of that bipartisan group senators, four of them (Schumer, John McCain, Jeff Flake, and Michael Bennet) held a press conference yesterday in Arizona, where they also expressed optimism. “I’d say we are 90 percent there,” Schumer said, according to Roll Call. “We have a few little problems to work on; we’ve been on the phone all day talking to our other four colleagues who aren’t here. McCain chimed in: “Nobody is going to be totally happy with this legislation -- no one will be because we are having to make compromises, and that’s what makes for good legislation. It’s compromise that brings everybody together.”

#### NASA provides political cover – space science shields

**Downey 4** [“FLYING REACTORS: THE ¶ POLITICAL FEASIBILITY OF ¶ NUCLEAR POWER IN SPACE”, ¶ by ¶ James R. Downey, Lt Col, USAFR, ¶ Anthony M. Forestier, Wg Cdr. RAAF, ¶ David E. Miller, Lt Col, USAF, ¶ A Research Report Submitted to Air Force Fellows, CADRE/AR, ¶ Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, 2004]

**\*SNP = Space Nuclear Power**

Overall, it is fair to say that the only reason that DOD et al. have not in the recent past ¶ sought reactor based SNP systems is because of (1) the problematic political dimension, (2) the ¶ lack of a truly compelling mission that could overcome the political problem, and (3) the cost of¶ developing such a system. However, if JIMO proceeds as planned, NASA will develop a reactor ¶ based SNP system, providing an opportunity for the national security agencies to perhaps "hitch ¶ a ride" while allowing NASA to deal with the political issues under the guise of space science. ¶ So the fight is NASA’s, unless there is an emergent security issue calling out for SNP that DOD ¶ is poised to exploit.. NASA needs to confront committed opposition and win the public’s hearts ¶ and minds to support a space based version of those nuclear technologies they are wary of and ¶ uncomfortable with even in terrestrial applications.

#### Aerospace lobby supports the plan

PR NewsWire 9- Investment Needed to Combat Debris Threats to U.S. Space Assets April 28 http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/investment-needed-to-combat-debris-threats-to-us-space-assets-62012932.html

Space debris is a current and growing threat to U.S. exploration activities, and leaders must make situational awareness a top national priority, AIA President and CEO Marion Blakey said in congressional testimony Tuesday.

In written testimony submitted to the House Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee, Blakey detailed the challenges created by tens of thousands of man-made objects orbiting the Earth. These items, which include both functioning satellites as well as debris, must be carefully monitored to ensure the safety of humans traveling in space and aboard the International Space Station, as well as critical U.S. space assets.

"As the number of nations placing objects in space grows, risks to U.S. space systems and our ability to operate in space also increases," Blakey wrote. "Space technology is a critical infrastructure that contributes to a strong and secure America. It needs to be adequately protected."

Blakey submitted the testimony for a hearing titled "Keeping the Space Environment Safe for Civil and Commercial Users." The subcommittee is exploring ways to minimize the growth of future space debris as well as improving information to civil and commercial users to avoid in-space collisions. Recent incidents have brought attention to - and worsened - the space debris problem. In 2007 China destroyed one of its aging weather satellites with a ballistic missile. Earlier this year, U.S. and Russian satellites collided. Both incidents resulted in large debris fields in space. Crew aboard the space station sometimes have to scramble into the Soyuz spacecraft or even make evasive maneuvers as space debris threatens the orbiting laboratory.

Blakey called upon lawmakers to provide robust funding for space situational awareness and protection of U.S. space assets. This investment should advance our nation's capabilities, including hardening satellites from attack and establishing contingency plans to provide backup to space assets.

#### That rallies support

Lasker 8(John, IPS, “Aerospace Lobby Wages Its Own Election Campaign,” Sep 5, <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=43804>)

What is notable about AIA's claim is how it is being used - as part of a stepped-up campaign to convince politicians, voters and aerospace employees that "America's future depends on maintaining space leadership". It is a broad statement encompassing several aspects of the U.S. space industry, such as educating the aerospace workforce of the future. But some experts say it also means the U.S. needs to somehow find a way to protect its 400-plus satellites - an undertaking that could result in billions for aerospace industry defence contractors. A powerful lobby in Washington, the aerospace industry accounted for over 650,000 jobs and 184 billion dollars in sales in 2006. The AIA's president and CEO, Marion Blakey, was a former head of the Federal Aviation Administration. Her predecessor, John Douglass, is a former assistant secretary of the Navy, and was named one of Washington's top lobbyists last year by "The Hill", an influential congressional newspaper. Patrick McCartan, AIA's director for legislative affairs, is a former aide to Maine Senator Olympia Snowe. He, too, was ranked a "top rainmaker" by The Hill. With election season in full swing, the AIA is calling for "cutting-edge defence research", along with defence spending being "no less than 4 percent of the U.S. GDP", which was 13.8 trillion dollars for 2007, amounting to roughly 550 billion dollars. That is near the current level, if you include the spending for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is widely known that "Star Wars II" - resurrected this decade by George W. Bush administration "space hawks" - has been a cash cow for aerospace industry giants Lockheed Martin and Boeing, the Pentagon's top two defence contractors. Together, they currently have 73 lobbying groups working Capital Hill, according to Opensecrets.org, which tracks campaign funding and its relation to public policy. Also telling is the campaign money the aerospace industry has contributed during the 2008 election cycle. Historically, the industry has given more to Republicans than Democrats - millions more. Yet as of mid-summer, OpenSecrets.org reports the aerospace industry has split its staggering total of 6.9 million dollars down the middle: half to Democrats, and half to Republicans. "We have met with every campaign staff for months now - McCain, Obama and every other campaign," Matt Grimison, AIA's communications director, told IPS. "We are casting a wide net to make sure these issues are being considered by everybody."

#### **Floating city solves worker crisis – immigration regulations**

McKendrick, 2011 (Joe is a contributing editior and is an independent analyst who tracks the impact of information technology on management and markets. He is the author of the SOA Manifesto and has written for Forbes, ZDNet and Database Trends & Applications. He holds a degree from Temple University. smart planet, CBS Interactive has unveiled a new website dedicated to people who realize the need to make our world a better place to live, for all of us, and for generations to come. “Tech Skills shortage solution, set up workplace in international waters” <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/business-brains/tech-skills-shortage-solution-set-up-workplace-in-international-waters/20333?tag=content;siu-container>)

The Silicon Valley tech scene is again one of the brightest stars in the US economy, but its growth is hitting a ceiling: there just aren’t enough visionary entrepreneurs, skilled engineers, developers, technicians and other professionals to sustain growth. Hampering the ability to attract global talent — which has fueled the growth of the US tech industry in the past — is a limit on the number of foreign entrepreneurs or workers that can enter and work within the country. Currently, work visas are capped at 140,000 people a year. With recent economic conditions, there has been considerable pressure on Congress to maintain restrictions on the inflow of foreign workers.¶ One entrepreneur, however, has come up with an interesting workaround to the challenge: anchor a large ship off the coast of San Fransisco, in international waters, and recruit professionals from other nations to work on board.¶ Blueseed, a startup incubator (and startup itself), proposes to set such a ship afloat as a “high-tech visa-free entrepreneurship and technology incubator on an ocean vessel in international waters.” The ship will be positioned as “a short ferry ride away from Silicon Valley so that great ideas and talent from around the world can live, work, and play while having convenient access to the San Francisco Bay Area.” International entrepreneurs and professionals would be able to use tourist or short-term business visas — which are easier to obtain the work visas — to take regular jaunts to the mainland.

#### PC’s not real and thumpers disprove

Michael Hirsch (chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau) February 7, 2013 “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through.¶ Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits.

#### Winners win – momentum

Michael Hirsch (chief correspondent for National Journal, previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau) February 7, 2013 “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER¶ Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.¶ Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.¶ Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington.¶ Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories.¶ In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”

#### XO solves

Keegan Hamilton (writer for the Atlantic) 3/26, 2013 “How Obama Could (but Probably Won't) Stop Deporting Illegal Immigrants Today” http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/03/how-obama-could-but-probably-wont-stop-deporting-illegal-immigrants-today/274352/

If the current congressional push for immigration reform were to fail, however, a presidential pardon for undocumented immigrants with no criminal history might be Obama's last ditch alternative to prosecutorial discretion. Rather than scaling back on detentions, Obama could instantly--and permanently-- legalize millions of illegal immigrants. Beck, the Georgia law scholar, notes that the Constitution empowers the president to "grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."¶ The question, he says, is "whether coming into the country in violation of the immigration laws or overstaying a visa could be deemed an 'offense against the United States.'" But the president has broad powers of pardon, and it seems that Obama could exercise those powers here. Beck cites United States v. Klein, an 1871 Supreme Court case that involved a presidential pardon issued during the Civil War to confederates who rejoined the union and took an oath of loyalty.

#### Backlogs

David North, former Assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Labor and Center for Immigration Studies Fellow, April 7, 2010, “Would Legalization Backlogs Delay Other USCIS Applications? Probably,” Center for Immigration Studies, http://cis.org/north/legalization-backlogs

An interesting question has arisen as a result of a congressional hearing: would a massive legalization program, as many advocates want, slow the processing of applications filed routinely by citizens and legal aliens wanting immigration benefits? The numbers are daunting. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) currently faces six million applications a year according to one news story. The estimates of the number of illegal aliens in the nation runs to 11 or 12 million. Could USCIS handle both these multi-million caseloads with its current paper-based systems? There are many complaints that the backlogs are currently too long on the normal collection of six million cases a year. The government's expert on such things, Frank W. Deffer, Assistant Inspector General for Information Technology in the Department of Homeland Security, told a congressional committee on March 23: "adding 12 million more people to the system would be the mother of all backlogs. Clearly to us the systems could not handle it now."

### 2AC Keystone

#### Status quo solves energy leadership regardless of fusion

Steyer & Podesta, ‘12

[Tom, John, Wall Street Journal, 1-24, “We Don't Need More Foreign Oil and Gas,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203718504577178872638705902.html]

Under President Obama's leadership, we appear to be at the beginning of a domestic gas and oil boom. After a four-decade decline in oil production, the U.S. is now producing more than half of our oil domestically. This can free us from our addiction to foreign-sourced barrels, particularly if we utilize our dramatically larger and cheaper natural gas reserves. Natural gas now costs the equivalent of less than $15 per barrel, versus the $100-plus barrels we import from the Middle East. There are critical environmental questions associated with developing these resources, particularly concerning methane leakage and water pollution. Yet as long as we ensure high regulatory standards and stay away from the riskiest and most polluting of these activities, we can safely assemble a collection of lower-carbon, affordable and abundant domestic-energy assets that will dramatically improve our economy and our environment. Under President Obama's watch, increased domestic production from developing these reserves has already created 75,000 new gas and oil-production jobs since 2009. And we have much further to go. At the same time, the U.S. is well on its way to becoming a global clean-energy leader. America is the largest clean-energy investor, after reclaiming this title from China last year. Our companies make over 75% of all venture investments in clean technologies world-wide. Overall, because of U.S. public and private investments in clean energy—including renewables, efficiency, transportation and infrastructure—the clean economy grew by 8.3% from 2008 to 2009, even during the depths of the recession.

**Not existential—even minor defense is sufficient to ensure America survives**

**Friedman 6** – MIT security studies program (Ben, 2/19, The War on Hype, http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2006/02/19/INGDDH8E2T1.DTL&type=printable)

Most homeland security experts say that Hurricane Katrina's flooding of New Orleans shows how vulnerable we are to terrorists. In fact, it shows that most Americans have better things to worry about. By any statistical measure, the terrorist threat to America has always been low. As political scientist John Mueller notes, in most years allergic reactions to peanuts, deer in the road and lightning have all killed about the same number of Americans as terrorism.

In 2001, their banner year, terrorists killed one twelfth as many Americans as the flu and one fifteenth the number killed by car accidents.

Most experts dismiss this history. They contend that because both weapons technology and Sunni extremism are spreading, the terrorist danger is ahistorical. Although both these trends are real, we **should not leap to the conclusion** that the threat is growing or greater than more mundane dangers. There is no obvious reason to believe that Sept. 11 was the start of an era of ever deadlier terrorism, rather than its high-water mark.

Both terrorism and unconventional weapons have existed for a long time, but terrorists have **always done their damage conventionally**. Today the remnants of al Qaeda and its fellow-travelers appear to **lack** the organizational **capacity** to operate in the United States or harness complex weapons technologies.

This argument does not endorse complacency among government officials. Even a small threat of nuclear terrorism should provoke a better organized non-proliferation policy than the United States now has. Nor does this argument imply that another terrorist massacre in America is unlikely. If enough people try, eventually some attack may well succeed. But attacks are likely to be rare and conventional, on the scale of the London attacks, **not apocalyptic** nightmares.

Even if attacks killing thousands were certain, the risk to each of us would remain close to zero, far smaller than many larger risks that do not alarm us, or provoke government warnings, like driving to work every day. And if something far worse than Sept. 11 does occur, the country will recover. Every year, tens of thousands Americans die on the roads. Disease preys on us. Life goes on for the rest. The economy keeps chugging. A disaster of biblical proportions visited New Orleans. The Republic has not crumbled. The terrorist risk to the United States is serious, but far from existential, as some would have it.

**Most likely entry point for terrorist attack in US is Mexico- not Canada**

**Catholic Online, 10-30-12,** p. http://www.catholic.org/international/international\_story.php?id=48280

Terrorists are using Mexico as a staging area and entry point into the US for terrorist attacks. Representative Sue Myrick (R - NC) is asking the Obama administration to investigate the apparent problem.

LOS ANGELES, CA (Catholic Online) - Terrorists with ties to Hezbollah and Iran are infiltrating Lebanese communities in Mexico, hoping to blend into the population there. Teaming up with the all-too powerful drug cartels, terrorists are having themselves smuggled into the US in exchange for money and weapons which fuel cartel violence in Mexico.
The ties are blatant. Earlier this year, an Iranian operative was arrested for plotting to assassinate a Saudi Arabian diplomat in Washington. The would-be killer had hired Mexican cartel assassins to assist him. He was only one of several people who have been arrested both in the US and Mexico with ties to Iran and Hezbollah.

### EIS

#### Perm do the CP

#### Doesn’t solve –

#### A. One time consultation

**Wasserman 11** (Cheryl, Associate Director for Policy Analysis, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS” Ninth International Conference on Environmental Compliance and Enforcement 2011, <http://inece.org/conference/9/proceedings/57_Wasserman.pdf> MGE)

These distinctions can be important to the outcome of the EIA process. Too much emphasis on the adequacy of the EIA document or a one-time determination of “environmental feasibility” reinforces the inadequate attention to ongoing compliance with commitments. All too often EIA requirements fail because they are perceived and implemented as a one-time event.

#### B. Congress says no

**Koenig 2011** (Robert, 10/15, “Congress Seems Frozen as Climate Change evidence accumulates” <http://www.stlbeacon.org/issues-politics/280-washington/114206-congress-seems-frozen-as-climate-change-evidence-accumulates>)

Those waves had little impact on Capitol Hill, however. For the 112th Congress is awash in climate-change skepticism -- in some cases, outright denial. Even though some other nations have taken action, Congress has blocked significant U.S. action to slow the greenhouse gas emissions that most experts believe hasten the process of climate change. "We are the single country in the world that is supposed to be scientific and technically adept, but has a major movement that denies" climate change, said Peter Raven, president emeritus of the Missouri Botanical Garden and an internationally known botanist. Raven, a former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a recipient of the National Medal of Science and a member of the National Academy of Sciences, believes the scientific evidence for global climate change is "overwhelming." He served on a National Research Council panel that warned earlier this year -- in the final report of the America's Climate Choices project -- that every ton of greenhouse gases emitted into the atmosphere intensifies the risks related to climate change. The report called for more action to try to limit the extent of climate change and prepare to adapt to its impacts. "The conclusion of the scientific community is clearly that the climate is changing rapidly -- not only in temperature but in other ways as well -- and that human beings are the major factor driving it," Raven told the Beacon. But that conclusion appears to have little impact in the current Congress, especially in the U.S. House. There, leaders of the Energy and Commerce Committee have mounted a campaign this year to block or roll back several Environmental Protection Agency regulations on emissions -- some of which exacerbate climate change. While the House has passed several bills to stop such EPA rules, the Senate so far has blocked them. While he says that intelligent people can disagree on what steps should be taken to slow global warming, Raven worries that "if we make those [issues] political footballs, we would be fostering a kind of anti-science or even anti-intellectual attitude that will make it very difficult for us to be world leaders in science and technology." Some lawmakers in Washington agree with him. U.S. Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Ca., the top Democrat (and former chairman) on the Energy and Commerce Committee, told the Center for American Progress: "I have never been in a Congress where there was such an overwhelming disconnect between science and policy."

#### Delays

**Greenwire 2009** (“NEPA reviews shouldn't delay stimulus projects, experts say” March 24th, http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2009/03/24/2)

If the economy flounders despite the massive stimulus package, don't blame the federal law that forces government agencies to review their projects' environmental impacts. So say National Environmental Policy Act experts like Nicholas Yost, who led the drafting of NEPA regulations during the Carter administration. The preparation of environmental impact statements under NEPA takes almost three-and-a-half years -- much longer than Yost and others say is needed. The process, they say, can be sped up with strict deadlines, strong leadership from agency chiefs and increased resources and personnel to do reviews.

#### Perm do the plan and require an EIS for individual drilling projects

#### Links to politics

**Rosenbaum 2005** - Professor of Political Science at Univ of Florida (Walter A, *Environmental Policymaking*, Ed. Hatch, p200-201)

In many instances, the EIS process is an early warning system for environmental advocacy and science communities, even though public involvement in the process is often more restrictive than its authors intended. The statutory and regulatory requirements for early public disclosure and review of the agency EIS statements often provide interested and affected parties with a translation of agency programs into comprehensible and relevant language which, in turn, incites political mobilization. This public disclosure is valuable not only to the Washington-based national organizations (that sometimes employ specialized staff for EIS oversight) but especially to smaller state and local organizations otherwise lacking the resources to acquire and interpret the complex and often (deliberately) mystifying, bureaucratic, syntax-adorning program descriptions.

**No impact**

**Goldstein 2011**, Professor IR at American University [Joshua S. Goldstein, Professor emeritus of international relations at American University, “Thing Again: War,” Sept/Oct 2011,

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think\_again\_war?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full]

Nor do shifts in the global balance of power doom us to a future of perpetual war. While some political scientists argue that an increasingly multipolar world is an increasingly volatile one -- that peace is best assured by the predominance of a single hegemonic power, namely the United States -- **recent geopolitical history** suggests otherwise. Relative U.S. power and worldwide conflict have **waned in tandem** over the past decade. The exceptions to the trend, Iraq and Afghanistan, have been lopsided wars waged by the hegemon, not challenges by up-and-coming new powers. The best precedent for today's emerging world order may be the 19th-century Concert of Europe, a collaboration of great powers that largely maintained the peace for a century until its breakdown and the bloodbath of World War I.

### AT: Neoliberalism 2AC

#### Alt fails – entrenches neoliberalism as monolithic entity and ignores postliberal transition

Tsianos et al. ‘8 Vassilis, teaches sociology at the University of Hamburg, Germany, Dimitris Papadopoulos teaches social theory at Cardiff University, Niamh Stephenson teaches social science at the University of New South Wales. “Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century” Pluto Press

Postliberalism appropriates this solution - and in this sense postlib- eralism is also the heir to the crisis of sovereignty and relies on the same organisational substratum as transnationalism. But postliberalism attempts to initiate a strategic rearrangement of the transnationalist horizontal and networked organisation of space: in the midst of an even plane of global action it establishes vertical aggregates of power. The break occurs when postliberalism leaves nationalist imperialist geopolitics behind irrevocably. Instead it uses the global transnational space to install dominant hegemonic alliances which cannot be simply reduced to the imperialist geopolitics of entire nation states. Rather these new postliberal aggregates reconnect different segments of nation states and different social actors who have emerged in the phase of transnational governance into new condensations of power. Although postliberal sovereignty feeds on the horizontal transnational order of power, it introduces a new hegemonic strategy with a project of global corporativism. Postliberalism involves the verticalisation of horizontal transnational geopolitics. Transnationalism is the legal algorithm of post-Fordist, neoliberal globalisation. And in this sense, transnationalism is hegemonic on a global scale. What postliberal sovereignty does now is to hegemonise hegemony, that is, to insert and realise conflict in the hegemonic project of transnational neoliberalism. In the years from 1970 to 2000, we used to think of the neoliberal globalisation which transnational governance made possible as a more or less unified project of domination on a planetary scale (Held, 1995; Urbinati, 2003). However, the concept of postliberal sovereignty is an attempt to contest this position and to trace the internal conflicts and ambivalences of this project. The globalisation of transnational neoliberalism can no longer be characterised as a bloc of global power; this notion does not help us to understand or to gain any purchase on the political constitution of the present. Although it is the hegemonic form of geopolitics today, the globalisation of transnational neoliberalism is not unified. Rather it contains conflicting alliances of diverse interests which try to dominate the process of transnational neoliberal globalisation. In this sense, postliberal vertical aggregates attempt to appropriate the space which was created by transnational governance and in so doing they conflict with other vertical aggregates attempting to do the same. The concept of postliberal sovereignty gives us the possibility to move beyond a simplistic understanding of globalisation as a matter of dominant neoliberal forces being opposed by the rest of the world. Rather global domination is itself a diverse and conflicted process. The conflict emerges through the formation of vertical aggregates which try to seize more power with the global unfurling of transnational neoliberalism.

#### Alt doesn’t create a movement – neolib entrenched

Comaroff, 2011 (September, John, Harold H. Swift Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the University of Chicago, The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, “The End of Neoliberalism? “What Is Left of the Left,” p. 142-146)

While the world economic crisis of 2008–2009 might have killed off neoliber- alism as a global ideological project—patently, in the noun form—it is highly likely to leave the capillaries of the beast, less Leviathan than Great White Shark, largely intact. Indeed, the “meltdown” and its aftermath may see the planet less, not more, open to alternatives to the neoliberal tendency, albeit with significant “corrections” as some economists were already calling them more than a year back. I am reminded here, simultaneously, of Reinhart Koselleck and the Manchester School of Anthropology in Central Africa. Koselleck, in his study of the Enlightenment and the pathogenesis of modern society, drew attention to the dialectics of crisis, critique, and correction; for its part, the Manchester School demonstrated the capacity of cycles of rupture and their repair to reproduce social systems and the order of values on which they are predicated (see, for example, Gluckman 2004; Turner 1996). Crisis, self-evidently, is always reproductive. But it frequently is. As Mike Davis (1995) once noted, “apocalypse” is often absorbed quickly into the history of the everyday, a process he describes as the “dialectic of ordinary disaster.” As talk has grown of “green shoots” sprouting in the wake of the economic devastation of the past two years or so, there have been signs of both crisis-driven critique in pursuit of “correction” and a return to the “ordinary.” Discourses of correction have come from both liberal and conservative sources. In a special edition of Harper’s in 2008, James Galbraith, Joseph Stiglitz, and others—most of them with impeccable liberal credentials—suggested a range of strategies to ensure that capitalism might reemerge relatively unscathed. They prescribed cures such as reforming the tax system, banning stock options as incentives, bringing into line the self-interest of the banking sector with those of the economy and society at large, and finding regulatory means to harness both the risk-laden excesses of the finance industry and the tendency to favor short-run profiteering over longer- term wealth production. Only one contributor to the debate, Eric Janszen— ironically, a venture capitalist—took a more radical line. He argued for a return to industrial capitalism, pointing out that all recent bubbles and busts are owed to government creating conditions for mammoth, “metastasiz[ing]” markets in financial speculation. Janszen apart, these efforts to “save capitalism” were symptomatic of a rush of similar liberal writings on the topic. Few of them—the notable exception being Gillian Tett’s extraordinary Fool’s Gold (2009)—delved deeply into the archaeol- ogy of the crisis itself or, more generally, into the inner workings of a global political economy whose complexity has increased exponentially over the past couple of decades. As a result, most have sought solutions along its outer surfaces. They have posited adjustments that might limit the material excesses of the neo- liberal tendency and, in particular, the market instabilities and conflicts of interest to which those excesses give rise. This, itself, is a function of the pervasive prac- tice of explaining all economic processes these days by recourse to one or another kind of utilitarian theory, which is why the four causes of the apocalypse, as John Lanchester (2009) has pointed out, are almost invariably taken to be “greed, stu- pidity, government, and the banks,” not anything in the structure of contemporary capitalism itself. The pursuit of explanations and panaceas in such terms, as we might expect, has its parallel on the Right, most notably perhaps in Richard Posner’s A Failure of Capitalism (2009), a salvo from the Halls of Friedmania. Note that Posner did not title the book “the failure”—using a definite article—but merely “a failure.” Posner, predictably and—in light of Tett’s account—spuriously, argues that individuals in the finance industry acted rationally in the years before the crisis. That crisis, in his view a fully fledged “depression,” is blamed, again predictably, on bad government and ill-considered, perfectible forms of deregu- lation. His “corrections,” though, belong to the same genus as those proffered by liberal economists: establish new forms of regulation that reduce the conflict between the rational self-interest of economic actors and the commonweal—the invisible old hand here, of course, being the economist of invisible hands, Adam Smith. In the final analysis, from this vantage, the point is to perfect free market economies by establishing the regulatory environment most conducive to a suc- cessfully deregulated world. In the meantime—and this is where the “dialectic of the ordinary” becomes salient—for all the talk of the urgent need for “correction,” we have seen a tangible return to business as usual, even bad-faith business. This is in spite of the fact that deeper crises appear inevitable, that employment statistics are worsening, that rates of poverty and inequality are rapidly rising, and so on. The buzzword in the City of London, in late June 2009, was “BAB”: “bonuses are back.” And, with them, the forms of finance capital from which they emanate. As Jonathan Freedland (2009), also commenting on Britain, wrote, “Nine months ago”—in 2008—“the financial crisis seemed certain to bring a revolution in our economy. . . . Change had to be on the way.” But now “look what has happened. . . . [Just] when the world seemed ready to bury the neoliberal regime . . . we have returned to [its ways and means].” In sum, despite the stream of assertions during 2010 that the crisis would have deep transformative effects, putting an end to the “neoliberal regime,” most indicators suggest otherwise. For one thing, the massive infusions of money into the banking industry and mega-business on the part of national governments have occurred without the regulatory initiatives that were promised to follow. Yet again, public funds are being diverted into the private sector, underscoring the fact that capital continues to take its profits but not shoulder its losses, a curious, perverse denouement to the rise of Ulrich Beck’s Risk Society (1992). To be sure, state intervention in the U.S. economy after 2008 has never pointed in the direction of a “New New Deal,” as some Panglossian commentators on the Left thought it might. Just the reverse. It has been intended to save the corporate world, not secure civil society or ordinary citizens from the predations of the market; the pledge of measures that might protect those citizens immiserated by the crash, measures never substantial to begin with, has gone largely unrealized. We are plainly not witnessing a return to social democracy, let alone the genesis of a new age of nationalization; note, in this respect, how many of the nation-states of the global North are moving (further) to the right. Which may be why there have been so few legislative enactments anywhere promulgated to curb the practices that sparked the meltdown in the first place: per contra, while market forces have made it harder to negotiate toxic assets and to take some of the more extravagant gambles in the business of finance, the investment industry is widely reported not merely to have returned to its old ways, but to be inventing new “products” without palpable constraint. The derivatives trade, it seems, is rising again. So, too, are the ramparts around “economic liberalism.” A recent article in The Economist (2009) argues that, notwithstanding “the biggest economic calamity in 80 years . . . the free-market paradigm . . . deserves a robust defence.” These are not the only signs that the capillaries of the neoliberal tendency and the “free-market paradigm” continue to embrace us. There are many others. Some are obvious, like the continuing dominance of the corporate sector: its relative immunity from most legal challenge, even when its enterprises violate the being, bodies, belongings, or bioenvironment of ordinary citizens; its enjoyment of favor- able taxation regimes and, increasingly, the use of laws of eminent domain to expand its horizons; the protection of its physical, financial, and intellectual prop- erty, sometimes by recourse to police violence, as an ostensible function of the collective good; its capacity to influence the disposition of the public treasury and public policy and, reciprocally, to have insurgent action directed against it pros- ecuted as common crime—for example, in mass protests against the privatization of such “natural” assets as water and land. Other signs are less obvious, like the growing hegemony of legal orders, founded on constitutions of distinctly neolib- eral design, that favor individual rights over collective well-being; that limit the responsibility of government to protect or provision its citizens; that tend to criminalize race, poverty, and counterpolitics, in part by outlawing the salience of social cause or consequence; that subject what were once everyday democratic processes to the finality of judicial action, thereby juridifying politics to the exclu- sion of other forms of social action; that displace the “hot” sovereignty of the people into the “cold” sovereignty of the law; and that treat all citizens as rational, self-interested, rights-bearing actors and the world as a community of contract. (For more on neoliberal constitutionalism, see, for example, Schneiderman [2000] and Comaroff and Comaroff [2006].) I could go on in this vein. To do so, however, would be to risk stating the obvi- ous. But allow me one observation. Perhaps the most significant capillaries of the neoliberal that remain with us have to do with the state and governance. Foucauldians would prefer “governmentality” here; they have a point. Broadly speaking, neoliberal etatism seems to be surviving well, even strengthening, in most places. As Foucault explained in The Birth of Biopolitics (2008), the rise of neoliberalism—his use of the noun—marked a radical transformation: whereas before, the state, among its various bureaucratic operations, “monitored” the work- ings of the economy, its “organizing principle” is now the market. Government actually has become business. And nation-states have become holding companies in and for themselves. In the upshot, the categorical distinction between politics and economics, that classical liberal fiction, is largely erased. Effective gover- nance, in turn, is measured with reference to asset management, to the attraction of enterprise, to the facilitation of the entrepreneurial activities of the citizen as homo economicus, and to the capacity to foster the accumulation—but not the redistribution—of wealth. Under these conditions, heads of state begin to resemble, and often actually are, CEOs who treat the population as a body of shareholders; vide the likes of Silvio Berlusconi, who explicitly speaks of Italy as a company, or Dmitri Medvedev, head of Gazprom, Russia’s mightiest business and a major instrument of the country’s foreign policy. There is a more profound point here. Once upon a time, antineoliberal theory posited an opposition between the state and the free market, arguing that the antidote to the latter lay in the active inter- vention of the former. But the opposition is false, just another piece of the detri- tus of the modern history of capital. As states become mega-corporations (Kremlin, Inc.; Britain, PLC; South Africa, Pty Ltd.; Dubai, Inc.)—all of them, incidentally, branded and legally incorporated—they become inextricably part of the workings of the market and, hence, no longer an “outside,” an antidote, or an antithesis from which to rethink or reconstruct “the neoliberal paradigm.” This, in part, is why government is increasingly reduced to an exercise in the technical management of capital, why ideologically founded politics appear dead, replaced by the politics of interest and entitlement and identity—three counterpoints of a single triangle. And this is why the capillaries of neoliberal governance seem so firmly entrenched in the cartography of our everyday lives, there to remain for the foreseeable future—to the degree that any future is foreseeable.

#### Perm do the plan and address the root cause—either the perm solves or the alt does nothing

#### Framework – the k needs to prove the whole plan is bad– any other interp moots aff offense and decreases policy education

#### Certainty key

**NETS 11** [Session Summary: Opening Plenary¶ Monday, February 7, 2011, Nuclear and Emerging Technologies for Space, The NETS-2011 Opening Plenary welcomed a highly distinguished panel of speakers to discuss ¶ historical space nuclear programs, The distinguished panelists and their topics of discussion included:¶ Historical Perspectives on Space Nuclear Power and Propulsion¶ H. Finger, retired, formerly held several key positions within AEC and NASA¶ Potential Mission Applications for Space Nuclear Systems¶ J. Casani , NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Special Assistant to the Director¶ Current NASA Interest in Space Nuclear Power and Propulsion¶ J. Adams, Deputy Director, Planetary Science Division, NASA Headquarters¶ Radioisotope Power Systems: The Quiet Technology¶ R. Lange, U.S. DOE, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Business and Technical Support¶ Viable Development Strategies for Space Fission Power and Propulsion¶ (oral presentation only; no presentation file available)¶ M. Griffin, former NASA Administrator and King-McDonald Eminent Scholar for Mechanical and ¶ Aerospace Engineering at the University of Alabama in Huntsville]

Dr. Michael Griffin, former NASA Administrator, concluded the opening plenary by presenting ¶ viable development strategies for space fission power and propulsion. Several speakers had ¶ previously noted that “the days of Apollo are over.” Dr. Griffin clarified that we do have an ¶ Apollo-era checkbook, but we lack the Apollo-era focus in which technology development was ¶ performed along parallel paths rather than in series. If we look at the NASA budget over the ¶ past 15 years and compare it to the 15 years of the Apollo program (1959-1974), we see that ¶ current-day funding exceeds that of the Apollo-era. The last 10 years of funding exceeded that ¶ of the 10 years of the lunar Apollo program (1969-1979). So, why haven’t we been as ¶ successful? We have not experienced a lack of funding, but a lack of vision over time. Shifts in ¶ funding allocation have undermined recent programs, such as Constellation. We need to ¶ establish a viable development strategy. Programs must be finished, and they need to have a ¶ demonstrated need. Historical ¶ evidence indicates that missions ¶ drive the technology; technology ¶ does not drive missions. There is a ¶ high barrier to entry for space nuclear ¶ power systems – budget, technology, ¶ policy, public image, development ¶ time, etc. However, flying a manned ¶ mission to Mars without nuclear ¶ power is like crossing the oceans in a ¶ sailing ship -- “…we need to go to ¶ nuclear like the early explorers ¶ needed steamships.” The key ¶ question, of course, is how we go ¶ about doing this. Dr. Griffin ¶ suggested that nuclear power and propulsion be linked to a stable, long term, public program. ¶ The technology requires stable funding and support, as it takes time to develop complex ¶ systems. This support should be long term, on the order of a decade or more. It should be ¶ supported by a public program, vice the private sector, as it has high risk, and the payoff is over ¶ a long period of time. A private enterprise requires a market and a reasonable rate of return ¶ and payback time, and nuclear power and propulsion systems will take a bit longer for the ¶ investment to pay off. Dr. Griffin noted, “Some things are important for society to do that do not ¶ look good on a balance sheet – space nuclear power and propulsion is one of these.”

#### Unconditional Funding key – Steadfast government commitment crucial to effective science signal

**Slazer 12** [“Perspectives on NASA’s strategic direction”, Frank Slazer, an executive with nearly 30 years of experience on space policy issues and programs, Space Review, September 10, 2012, Vice President of the Space Systems Division of the Aerospace Industries Association.]

Although there is widespread support for strong space science programs at NASA, considerable stress can sometimes be placed on space science programs to cut costs and speed development. It’s important to remember that as the scientific community looks to answer bold, paradigm-shifting questions, the complexity of space science missions can grow to meet these challenges. As space science missions become more sophisticated, the need for steadfast US government commitment becomes all the more critical to success. The resolve of the US government must remain strong to stay the course through to success. Many space science missions face enormous technical challenges in accomplishing technical feats that have never been done before. They must also grapple with limited capacity of affordable, domestic space launch systems to low Earth orbit. Couple these challenges with an occasional launch failure and annual budget constraints, and an environment has been created in which space science missions face a considerably daunting future. Look no further to the Earth observation community for evidence of an increasingly difficult situation for space science. The National Research Council recently reported, “that the nation's earth observing system is beginning a rapid decline in capability, as long-running missions end and key new missions are delayed, lost, or cancelled.” With such an increasingly difficult environment coalescing on space science, it is all the more necessary for the US government to maintain a steady resolve for future mission development. The space industrial base that has enabled incredible US achievements in space science can only be sustained for future missions if a steady commitment is maintained by the US government to continue these missions.

### States CP

#### Congress key – recalcitrance

**Chow 11** [“Mars Mission May Be Curtain Call for Plutonium-Powered Spacecraft”, Denise Chow, M.A. Journalism from NYT, SPACE.com Staff WriterDate: 22 November 2011]

But the funds for NASA and the DOE are appropriated by two separate congressional subcommittees, and key lawmakers have failed to reach an agreement that would grant the DOE the necessary financing to restart production of plutonium-238.¶ "I believe there are certain individuals on the congressional committees controlling the Department of Energy who are set against this," Stern said. "They're in a position to make sure it doesn’t happen, and they've been very effective for years now. We now have to have the Russians get us to the space station, we can't explore the moon the way it was when I was a boy, and now we're going to take away our ability to explore the deep-outer solar system. It's very disappointing, and it's debilitating to the U.S. As to the people who are roadblocks to this, they need to be exposed. This is unpatriotic."

#### NASA key – international and agency coordination

**Slazer 12** [“Perspectives on NASA’s strategic direction”, Frank Slazer, an executive with nearly 30 years of experience on space policy issues and programs, Space Review, September 10, 2012, Vice President of the Space Systems Division of the Aerospace Industries Association.]

NASA Partnerships¶ NASA’s unique capabilities and competencies are world renowned, and incredibly important to other agencies within the US government. NASA’s role in reimbursable government agreements is important to the continued operation of several critical government programs. Of special importance remains NASA’s reimbursable work with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) on weather satellites. As the developer of the nation’s weather satellites, NASA plays an essential part in protecting our safety and our economy from natural catastrophes. Additionally, NASA is also a key partner in the operation of the Landsat program at the US Geological Survey at the Department of Interior. Landsat is a vital Earth observation system for US Government land and coastal surveys. NASA also maintains a partnership with the Department of Energy to ensure the nation’s deep space exploration systems have access to non-weapons grade plutonium-238. Without such fuel, space exploration to the outer planets and beyond becomes impossible. AIA encourages the continuation of these reimbursable agreements to meet important national needs.

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue – no decision makers controls state policy, kills logic which justifies infinite intrinsicness – no solvency advocate kills fairness and undermines core research skills – kills real world education

#### Perm do both – state action provides cover and acts like a mandate for Obama

#### States links to politics

Kiely ‘12 [[EUGENE KIELY](http://www.factcheck.org/author/eugene-kiely/), Washington assignment editor USA today, February 17, 2012 Factcheck.org “Did Obama ‘Approve’ Bridge Work for Chinese Firms?” http://www.factcheck.org/2012/02/did-obama-approve-bridge-work-for-chinese-firms/]

Who’s to blame, if that’s the right word, if the project ends up using manufactured steel from China? The National Steel Bridge Alliance blames the state railroad agency. The Alliance for American Manufacturing says the federal Buy American laws have been “weakened with loopholes and various exemptions that make it easier for bureaucrats to purchase foreign-made goods instead of those made in American factories with American workers.” So, how did **Obama get blamed** for the decisions by state agencies and for state projects that, in at least one case**, didn’t even use federal funds?** The answer is a textbook lesson in how **information gets distorted** when emails go viral. We looked at the nearly 100 emails we received on this subject and found that Obama wasn’t mentioned at all in the first few emails. Typical of the emails we received shortly after the ABC News report aired was this one from Oct. 11, 2011: “I just got an email regarding Diane Sawyer on ABC TV stating that U. S. Bridges and roads are being built by Chinese firms when the jobs should have gone to Americans. Could this possible be true?” The answer: Yes, it’s true. End of story, right? Wrong. Days later, emails started to appear in our inbox that claimed ABC News reported that Chinese firm were receiving stimulus funds to build U.S. bridges — even though the broadcast news story didn’t mention stimulus funds at all. (The report did include a clip of Obama delivering a speech on the need to rebuild America’s bridges and put Americans to work, but said nothing about the president’s $830 billion stimulus bill.) Still, we received emails such as this one on Nov. 4, 2011, that included this erroneous claim language: “Stimulus money meant to create U.S. jobs went to Chinese firms. Unbelievable….” **It didn’t take long for Obama to be blamed**. That same day — Nov. 4, 2011 — we received an email that made this leap to Obama: “SOME CHINESE COMPANIES WHO ARE BUILDING ‘OUR’ BRIDGES. (3000 JOBS LOST TO THE CHINESE FIRM)…..AND NOW OBAMA WANTS ‘MORE STIMULUS MONEY’…..THIS IS NUTS ! ! ! If this doesn’t make you furious nothing will….” This year, Obama’s name started to surface in the subject line of such critical emails — raising the attack on the president to yet another level and perhaps ensuring the email will be even more widely circulated. Since Jan. 17, we have gotten more than a dozen emails with the subject line, “ABC News on Obama/USA Infrastructure,” often preceded with the word “SHOCKING” in all caps. The emails increasingly contain harsh language about the president. Since Jan. 11, 23 emails carried this added bit of Obama-bashing: “I pray all the unemployed see this and cast their votes accordingly in 2012!” One of those emails — a more recent one from Feb. 8 — contained this additional line: “Tell me again how Obama’s looking out for blue collar guys**. He** cancels pipelines, and **lets Chinese contractors build our bridges…” And so it goes, on and on. All from a news report that blamed state officials — not Obama — for spending taxpayer money** on Chinese firms to build U.S. bridges.