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### Grid

#### Generators aren’t enough

King 2011 (Marcus King, LaVar Huntzinger, and Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations,” CNAS Analysis and Solutions, http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf)

Having a reliable source of electricity is critically important for many DoD installations. Fort Meade, Maryland, which hosts the National Security Agency’s power intensive computers, is an example of where electricity is mission critical. Installations need to be more robust against interruptions caused by natural forces or intentional attack. Most installations currently rely on the commercial electricity grid and backup generators.¶ Reliance on generators presents some limitations. A building dedicated generator only provides electricity to a specific building when there is a power outage. Typically, diesel standby generators have an availability of 85 percent when operated for more than 24 hours [38]. Most DoD installations keep less than a 5-day supply of fuel.¶ Small nuclear power plants could contribute to electrical energy surety and survivability. Having nuclear power plants networked with the grid and other backup generating systems could give DoD instal- lations higher power availability during extended utility power outages and more days of utility-independent operation. Existing large commercial nuclear power plants have an availability of over 90 percent. When a small nuclear power plant is networked with existing backup generating systems and the grid, overall availability values could be as high as 99.6 percent [39]. Since proposed small reactors have long refueling intervals (from 4 to 30 years), if power from the commercial grid became unavailable, a small reactor could provide years of electrical power independent of the commercial grid [4].

#### Drones are no big deal- people actually effected support them bc they don’t want terrorist criminals running rampant in their communities

Yousefzai 2012 (Zmarak Yousefzai practices national security litigation in Washington, DC for an international law firm. He was born and raised in the tribal areas between Afghanistan and Pakistan, October 15, 2012, “Voice of a native son: Drones may be a necessary evil,” Foreign Policy, http://afpak.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/10/15/voice\_of\_a\_native\_son\_drones\_may\_be\_a\_necessary\_evil)

The biggest debate surrounding the Afghanistan-Pakistan region today concerns the U.S. drone program in Pakistan's tribal regions, which target the militants who terrorize and kill local residents, and who attack American soldiers inside Afghanistan. Ironically, the anti-war group CODEPINK -- members of which visited Pakistan last week to protest drone strikes -- along with much of the American left, the Pakistani establishment, and the Taliban are all on the same side in their opposition to drone strikes. While silent on the many more targeted killings of innocent civilians by Taliban militants in the tribal areas between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Pakistani establishment and the American left both loudly criticize U.S. drone strikes, albeit for different reasons. Pakistani officials cite Pakistan's sovereignty as their main justification for opposing drone strikes. But sovereignty is neither the actual reason for their anger, nor is it a legitimate argument against drone strikes. The actual reason is that the United States blames Pakistan for its failure to clear militants out of the Federally Administered Tribal Area (FATA) near the Pakistan-Afghanistan border. FATA serves as a base for militants and is therefore the target of drone strikes. In return, Pakistan uses anti-drone campaigns to stir up anti-Americanism through the media and insists on its national sovereignty over FATA. Pakistan's sovereignty claim itself is completely invalid. Pakistan does not now nor has it ever had a complete sovereign control -- as modern nation-states define the term -- over FATA. In fact, it is precisely Pakistan's lack of sovereign control over FATA that allows the militants, many of whom are not Pakistanis, to operate so openly there and invite drone strikes. And that is the best case scenario for Pakistan; the worst case, many believe, is that Pakistan houses and trains these militants in FATA. Indeed, we just saw a fitting example of Pakistan's lack of sovereignty over FATA last week. An anti-drone march to the FATA area of Waziristan on October 7 led by Pakistan's leading politician, Imran Khan, and accompanied by CODEPINK members, failed to reach Waziristan. The march was halted when the Pakistan security forces could not guarantee the safety of the participants. Moreover, there is at least some evidence that the drone attacks are taking place with Pakistan's consent. If the Pakistani government was seriously against drone strikes, it could take a number of actions against the United States, including blocking the NATO supply route that goes through Pakistan, the way it did in late 2011 when NATO forces mistakenly killed 24 Pakistani soldiers at two military posts near the border with Afghanistan. For CODEPINK and the American far left, the opposition to drone strikes rests on the idea that drones kill innocent civilians. The recently published "Living Under Drones," a report based on 130 interviews with family members of drone strike victims, studied the negative impact of drone strikes on civilians. But the debate on the drones' effectiveness and its impact on civilians is far from settled. For example, a February 2012 investigation by the Associated Press, which interviewed people inside FATA, reported that civilian casualties from drones are far lower than Pakistan civil society figures, journalists, and party officials assert publicly. Another study, relying on open-source data on reported U.S. drone strikes and terrorist activity in FATA between March 2004 and 2010, also found a negative correlation between drone strikes and militant violence. The strikes have also killed high-level Taliban leaders, like Baddrudin Haqqani and Baitullah Mehsud, and key Al-Qaeda militants, like Abu Kasha Al-Iraqi and Saleh Al-Turki. The New America Foundation estimates that around 84% of the people killed in drone strikes from 2004 to the present were al-Qaeda or Taliban militants. The drone accuracy rose to an amazing 95% in 2010. It is perhaps for these reasons that polls show that the residents of FATA, who are the target of drones, are less opposed to drones than the rest of Pakistanis who are not the target of drones. FATA residents are eight times more supportive of drones than are the rest of Pakistanis. Moreover, a mere 48% of FATA residents believe that drones kill innocent civilians, compared to 89% of people in the rest of Pakistan. Surveys consistently find that FATA residents fear bomb blasts by Taliban and the Pakistani military more than they do drone strikes. According to the Community Appraisal and Motivation Program (CAMP), a Pakistan-based research group, when asked open-ended questions about their greatest fears, very few FATA residents ever mention drones. Even the Peshawar Declaration, a conference organized and attended by leaders of these tribal areas, showed strong support for drone strikes. That being said, there is little doubt that civilians have died in drone attacks. But that just raises the bigger question: is there a better alternative to drone strikes for counterterrorism in northwest Pakistan? To answer that question, we can look to the Swat Valley, just north of Waziristan, where 14-year-old Malala Yousafzai was shot in the head by Taliban militants last Tuesday for advocating for girls' education. Swat, like Waziristan, has been a stronghold of the Taliban. But unlike Waziristan, Swat has not seen any drone strikes. Instead, in Swat, the only available alternative approach was taken. For much of 2007 and 2008, the people of Swat were left at the mercy of the Taliban, who operated with impunity and killed, tortured, wounded, and displaced countless people. Then, after being pressured by the United States, the Pakistani military entered Swat and conducted an operation to root out the Taliban. The military operation resulted in thousands of deaths, many more wounded, and over one million people displaced, with a quarter million refugees crammed into mere 24 camps -- the worst crisis since Rwanda in 1994, according to the United Nations. The operation also resulted in the destruction of hundreds of schools and egregious human rights violations by the Pakistani military - some of which I witnessed personally. By comparison, there are far fewer cases of displacement, civilian deaths, and other destruction in Waziristan where drone strikes are used. Nevertheless, by yet another comparison of hypocrisy, those who are loudest about casualties from U.S. drone strikes have rarely protested the far higher numbers of civilian casualties as a result of Pakistan Army operations or Taliban violence in the Swat Valley and FATA. Silenced in this double standard are the varying motives of different parties as well as the voice of the Pashtun people in these tribal areas. At least one voice -- that of this native Pashtun -- is speaking out to say that there are serious downsides to these drone strikes, but they may be a necessary evil and the lone option to combat those who are responsible for the severe suffering of our people - like Malala Yousafzai.

### 2AC Consumption K

#### Ours is the only effective engagement with energy policy

Hager 1992 (Carol J. Hager, professor of political science at Bryn Mawr College, Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990,” Polity, JSTOR)

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list. These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics. Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48 Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishmento f a temporary parliamentaryco mmissiont o studye nergyp olicy,w hichf or the first time would draw all concernedp articipantst ogetheri n a discussiono f both short-termc hoicesa nd long-termg oals of energyp olicy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49T hese commissionsg ave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernizationa nd technicali nnovation in energy policy. Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurizationd evices. With proddingf rom the energyc ommission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements . They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection. III. Conclusion The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general. One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at Systemkritik.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic. Parliamentary Politics In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry. Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program. This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda. Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators. The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria. Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic. In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56 In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

#### Ontology/epistemology don’t come first or indict our scholarship

Owen 2002 (David Owen, reader of political theory at the University of Southampton, Millennium, Volume 31, Number 3, pg. 655-657)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action, event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

#### Nuke technocracy solves

Nordhaus and Shellenberger 2011 (Ted Nordhaus, chairman of the Breakthrough Instiute, and Michael Shellenberger, president of the Breakthrough Insitute, MA cultural anthropology from University of California, Santa Cruz, February 25, 2011, http://thebreakthrough.org/archive/the\_long\_death\_of\_environmenta)

Tenth, we are going to have to get over our suspicion of technology, especially nuclear power. There is no credible path to reducing global carbon emissions without an enormous expansion of nuclear power. It is the only low carbon technology we have today with the demonstrated capability to generate large quantities of centrally generated electrtic power. It is the low carbon of technology of choice for much of the rest of the world. Even uber-green nations, like Germany and Sweden, have reversed plans to phase out nuclear power as they have begun to reconcile their energy needs with their climate commitments.¶ Eleventh, we will need to embrace again the role of the state as a direct provider of public goods. The modern environmental movement, borne of the new left rejection of social authority of all sorts, has embraced the notion of state regulation and even creation of private markets while largely rejecting the generative role of the state. In the modern environmental imagination, government promotion of technology - whether nuclear power, the green revolution, synfuels, or ethanol - almost always ends badly.¶ Never mind that virtually the entire history of American industrialization and technological innovation is the story of government investments in the development and commercialization of new technologies. Think of a transformative technology over the last century - computers, the Internet, pharmaceutical drugs, jet turbines, cellular telephones, nuclear power - and what you will find is government investing in those technologies at a scale that private firms simply cannot replicate.¶ Twelveth, big is beautiful. The rising economies of the developing world will continue to develop whether we want them to or not. The solution to the ecological crises wrought by modernity, technology, and progress will be more modernity, technology, and progress. The solutions to the ecological challenges faced by a planet of 6 billion going on 9 billion will not be decentralized energy technologies like solar panels, small scale organic agriculture, and a drawing of unenforceable boundaries around what remains of our ecological inheritance, be it the rainforests of the Amazon or the chemical composition of the atmosphere. Rather, these solutions will be: large central station power technologies that can meet the energy needs of billions of people increasingly living in the dense mega-cities of the global south without emitting carbon dioxide, further intensification of industrial scale agriculture to meet the nutritional needs of a population that is not only growing but eating higher up the food chain, and a whole suite of new agricultural, desalinization and other technologies for gardening planet Earth that might allow us not only to pull back from forests and other threatened ecosystems but also to create new ones.¶ The New Ecological Politics¶ The great ecological challenges that our generation faces demands an ecological politics that is generative, not restrictive. An ecological politics capable of addressing global warming will require us to reexamine virtually every prominent strand of post-war green ideology.¶ From Paul Erlich's warnings of a population bomb to The Club of Rome's "Limits to Growth," contemporary ecological politics have consistently embraced green Malthusianism despite the fact that the Malthusian premise has persistently failed for the better part of three centuries. Indeed, the green revolution was exponentially increasing agricultural yields at the very moment that Erlich was predicting mass starvation and the serial predictions of peak oil and various others resource collapses that have followed have continue to fail.¶ This does not mean that Malthusian outcomes are impossible, but neither are they inevitable. We do have a choice in the matter, but it is not the choice that greens have long imagined. The choice that humanity faces is not whether to constrain our growth, development, and aspirations or die. It is whether we will continue to innovate and accelerate technological progress in order to thrive.¶ Human technology and ingenuity have repeatedly confounded Malthusian predictions yet green ideology continues to cast a suspect eye towards the very technologies that have allowed us to avoid resource and ecological catastrophes. But such solutions will require environmentalists to abandon the "small is beautiful" ethic that has also characterized environmental thought since the 1960's. We, the most secure, affluent, and thoroughly modern human beings to have ever lived upon the planet, must abandon both the dark, zero-sum Malthusian visions and the idealized and nostalgic fantasies for a simpler, more bucolic past in which humans lived in harmony with Nature.

#### Util good- Calculation is good and doesn’t devalue life

Revesz 2008 Richard L. Revesz (Dean and Lawrence King Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, JD Yale Law School) and Michael A Livermore. (JD NYU School of Law, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Integrity, and Managing director of the NYU Law Review). Retaking Rationality How Cots-Benefit Analysis Can Better protect the Environment and Our Health. 2008. P. 1-4.

Governmental decisions are also fundamentally different from personal decisions in that they often affect people in the aggregate. In our individual lives, we come into contact with at least some of the consequences of our decisions. If we fail to consult a map, we pay the price: losing valuable time driving around in circles and listening to the complaints of our passengers. We are constantly confronted with the consequences of the choices that we have made. Not so for governments, however, which exercise authority by making decisions at a distance. Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of governmental decisions is that they require a special kind of compassion—one that can seem, at first glance, cold and calculating, the antithesis of empathy. The aggregate and complex nature of governmental decisions does not address people as human beings, with concerns and interests, families and emotional relationships, secrets and sorrows. Rather, people are numbers stacked in a column or points on a graph, described not through their individual stories of triumph and despair, but by equations, functions, and dose-response curves. The language of governmental decisionmaking can seem to—and to a certain extent does—ignore what makes individuals unique and morally important. But, although the language of bureaucratic decisionmaking can be dehumanizing, it is also a prerequisite for the kind of compassion that is needed in contemporary society. Elaine Scarry has developed a comparison between individual compassion and statistical compassion.' Individual compassion is familiar—when we see a person suffering, or hear the story of some terrible tragedy, we are moved to take action. Statistical compassion seems foreign—we hear only a string of numbers but must comprehend "the concrete realities embedded there."' Individual compassion derives from our social nature, and may be hardwired directly into the human brain.' Statistical compassion calls on us to use our higher reasoning power to extend our natural compassion to the task of solving more abstract—but no less real—problems. Because compassion is not just about making us feel better—which we could do as easily by forgetting about a problem as by addressing it—we have a responsibility to make the best decisions that we can. This book argues that cost-benefit analysis, properly conducted, can improve environmental and public health policy. Cost-benefit analysis—the translation of human lives and acres of forest into the language of dollars and cents—can seem harsh and impersonal. But such an approach is also necessary to improve the quality of decisions that regulators make. Saving the most lives, and best protecting the quality of our environment and our health—in short, exercising our compassion most effectively—requires us to step back and use our best analytic tools. Sometimes, in order to save a life, we need to treat a person like a number. This is the challenge of statistical compassion. This book is about making good decisions. It focuses on the area of environmental, health and safety regulation. These regulations have been the source of numerous and hard-fought controversies over the past several decades, particularly at the federal level. Reaching the right decisions in the areas of environmental protection, increasing safety, and improving public health is clearly of high importance. Although it is admirable (and fashionable) for people to buy green or avoid products made in sweatshops, efforts taken at the individual level are not enough to address the pressing problems we face—there is a vital role for government in tackling these issues, and sound collective decisions concerning regulation are needed. There is a temptation to rely on gut-level decisionmaking in order to avoid economic analysis, which, to many, is a foreign language on top of seeming cold and unsympathetic. For government to make good decisions, however, it cannot abandon reasoned analysis. Because of the complex nature of governmental decisions, we have no choice but to deploy complex analytic tools in order to make the best choices possible. Failing to use these tools, which amounts to abandoning our duties to one another, is not a legitimate response. Rather, we must exercise statistical compassion by recognizing what numbers of lives saved represent: living and breathing human beings, unique, with rich inner lives and an interlocking web of emotional relationships. The acres of a forest can be tallied up in a chart, but that should not blind us to the beauty of a single stand of trees. We need to use complex tools to make good decisions while simultaneously remembering that we are not engaging in abstract exercises, but that we are having real effects on people and the environment. In our personal lives, it would be unwise not to shop around for the best price when making a major purchase, or to fail to think through our options when making a major life decision. It is equally foolish for government to fail to fully examine alternative policies when making regulatory decisions with life-or-death consequences. This reality has been recognized by four successive presidential administrations. Since 1981, the cost-benefit analysis of major regulations has been required by presidential order. Over the past twenty-five years, however, environmental and other progressive groups have declined to participate in the key governmental proceedings concerning the cost-benefit analysis of federal regulations, instead preferring to criticize the technique from the outside. The resulting asymmetry in political participation has had profound negative consequences, both for the state of federal regulation and for the technique of cost-benefit analysis itself. Ironically, this state of affairs has left progressives open to the charge of rejecting reason, when in fact strong environmental and public health pro-grams are often justified by cost-benefit analysis. It is time for progressive groups, as well as ordinary citizens, to retake the high ground by embracing and reforming cost-benefit analysis. The difference between being unthinking—failing to use the best tools to analyze policy—and unfeeling—making decisions without compassion—is unimportant: Both lead to bad policy. Calamities can result from the failure to use either emotion or reason. Our emotions provide us with the grounding for our principles, our innate interconnectedness, and our sense of obligation to others. We use our powers of reason to build on that emotional foundation, and act effectively to bring about a better world.

#### Alt fails-

#### Consumption is too engrained

Matsuyama 2002 (Kiminori Matsuyama, professor of Economics at Northwestern University, 2002, “The Rise of Mass Consumption Societies,” http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/~kmatsu/Mass%20Consumption%20Society-jpe.pdf)

Although Katona stressed that this is a phenomenon unique to the American society, virtually all the industrialized countries have gone through similar transformation after WWII.1 Rostow (1960), in developing his thesis of stages of economic growth, named the last of the five stages, “the age of high mass consumption.” He argued that not only the United States, but also Canada, Australia, Western European countries, and Japan had reached this stage. Fourastié (1979) discussed similar development in postwar France, from 1946 to 1975, the period that many French writers call Les Trente Glorieuses after the title of his book. Many Japanese also commented on a new feature of postwar booms in the fifties and sixties; Contrary to the prewar booms, which were mostly driven by military demand, they were driven, or at least supported, by consumer demands, particularly for home electronic appliances.2¶ One piece of the evidence that these authors routinely present is the penetration rates of consumer goods. Figure 1 illustrates the typical pattern in a stylized way. Each curve shows the fraction of households using a particular consumer good. For example, the use of vacuum cleaners, washing machines, telephones, was restricted to a small section of the population before WWII, but spread to the low-income households during the fifties and sixties. Many other consumer goods, such as television sets, cars, and air-conditioners follow similar paths, with some lags.3 This pattern is so similar across many industrialized countries that the penetration rates of representative goods have become the popular yardstick for comparing the standards of living across societies. One key feature of this pattern is that not only the market for each consumer good takes off, but also each takeoff is followed by one after another. The pattern shown in Figure 1 will be called “Flying Geese” in this paper.4 As many countries have experienced this transformation, the very notion of necessities and luxuries has changed. Many consumer goods that have penetrated into the majority of households, such as vacuum cleaners, washing machines, telephones, televisions, refrigerators, automobiles, air-conditioners, are now generally regarded as necessities in rich societies, and yet, they were all considered as luxuries only a half century ago. To quote Katona again,¶ “We are rich compared with our grandparents and compared with most other peoples of the world. In fact, however, we are still a middle-class society, enjoying middle-class comforts. .... The drudgery of seeking subsistence has been supplanted for millions of people, not by abundance and indulgence, but rather by a new concept of what are necessities and needs.” (italics added)¶ The notion of necessities and luxuries not only has changed over time. It also varies from countries to countries. Many goods that are taken for granted in rich countries remain luxuries in many parts of the world. The question of why some countries have failed to become mass consumption societies is at least as important as the question of why some succeeded.

#### Human nature

Barnhizer 2006 (David Barnhizer, Professor of Law at Ohio State University, Articles Editor of the Ohio State Law Journal and then served as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow in Colorado Springs Legal Services Office, a Ford Urban Law Fellow, and a Clinical Teaching Fellow at the Harvard Law School, Senior Advisor to the International Program of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Senior Fellow for Earth Summit Watch, and General Counsel for the Shrimp Tribunal. He has served as Executive Director of The Year 2000 Committee, 2006 “waking from sustainability’s “impossible dream”” Georgetown environmental law review)

Devotees of sustainability pin their hopes on an awakening by an enlightened populace that will rise up and insist that business and government behave in ways that reflect the idea that "[a] sustainable society is one that can persist over generations, one that is far-seeing enough, flexible enough, and wise enough not to undermine either its physical or its social systems of support."81 This awakening is not going to happen. There will never be a populist revolution in the way humans value the environment, social justice, and other matters of moral consequence. We frequently "talk the talk," but rarely "walk the walk."82 This discrepancy is partly an individual failure, but it is even more a result of the powerful forces that operate within our culture. Residents of Western cultures are shaped by the system in which they live. They will never possess either the clarity of agenda or the political will essential to a coherent and coordinated shift in behavior due to a combination of ignorance, greed, sloth, and inundation by political and consumerist propaganda. This combination means there will be no values shift welling up from the people and demanding the transformation of our systems of production and resource use.

#### Psychological ties to supply and demand ensures the alternative will cause conflict.

Alejandro Nadal, 2010, Professor at the Centre for Economic Studies of El Colegio de Mexico, “Is De-Growth Compatible With Capitalism?,” <http://triplecrisis.com/is-de-growth-compatible-with-capitalism/>

The problem with this perspective is that the cause of growth becomes psychological, a question of mentalities and even fashion. The idea that growth could originate from endogenous forces in capitalist economies is ignored. Growth is not only a cultural phenomenon or a feature of a maniac mentality. It is the direct consequence of how capitalist economies operate. This is true of capitalism as it operated in Genoa in the sixteenth century, and it is true today with the mega-corporations that rule global markets. The purpose of capital is to produce profits without end, that’s the meaning of its particular form of circulation. Its purpose is not to produce useful things or useless stuff, its object is to produce profits without end and produce more capital. This is the engine of accumulation and it is fuelled by inter-capitalist competition. In the words of Marx’s Grundrisse, “Conceptually, competition is nothing other than the inner nature of capital, its essential character, appearing in and realized as the reciprocal interaction of many capitals with one another, the inner tendency [presents itself] as external necessity. Capital exists and can only exist as many capitals, and its self-determination therefore appears as their reciprocal interaction with one another.” By the forces of competition, “capital is continuously harassed: March! March!” Thus, Marx’s analysis shows convincingly that capital can only exist as private centres of accumulation that are driven by (inter-capitalist) competition. This is why, in its quest to expand and survive (as an independent centre of accumulation) capital is continuously opening new spaces for profitability: new products, new markets. The corollary of this is that the only way in which we can get rid of “growth mania” is by getting rid of capitalism. It is not possible to have capitalism without growth. Is there a technological fix out of this? In other words, can we have such an efficient technological infrastructure (in buildings, energy and transport systems, manufacturing, etc.) that even with growth the ecological footprint could be reduced? This remains to be seen, but one phenomenon seems to conspire against this: the rebound effect. As technologies become more efficient and unit costs become smaller, consumption increases. Either existing consumers deepen their consumption, or more people have access to the objects or services being put on the marketplace. The end result is that the positive effects of greater efficiency are cancelled by deepening consumption rates. And let’s not forget what happens when consumption stops or slows down: those centres of accumulation cannot sell their commodities, inventories grow, unemployment soars and we have recessions, depressions and crises. From the side of production, for those individual centres of accumulation every gadget, every nook and cranny in the world, or any vast expanse of geographical space is a space waiting to be occupied for profits. From pep pills to tranquilizers, food and water, health and even genetic resources or nano-materials, to the anxious eyes of capital all of these dimensions are but spaces for profitability. Talk about investing in “natural capital” as a way out to the dilemma is devoid of any sense. It could very well be that, in the words of Richard Smith we either save capitalism or save ourselves, we cannot do both.

#### Transition causes extinction

Barnhizer 2006 David, Prof of Law, Cleveland State U, ‘Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream”,’ Geo Int’l Envtl L Rev, pg. l/n

The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. 60 The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior. Many developing country groups involved in efforts to protect the environment and resist the impacts of free trade on their communities have been concerned with the harmful effects of economic change. Part of the concern is the increased scale of economic activity. Some concerns relate to who benefits and who loses in the changing context imposed by globalization. These concerns are legitimate and understandable. So are the other deep currents running beneath their political positions, including those of resistance to change of any kind and a [\*621] rejection of the market approach to economic activities. In the system described inaccurately as free market capitalism, economic activity not only breaks down existing systems, it creates new systems and--as Joseph Schumpeter observed--continually repeats the process through cycles of "creative destruction." 61 This pattern of creative destruction unfolds as necessarily and relentlessly as does the birth-maturation-death-rebirth cycle of the natural environment. This occurs even in a self-sufficient or autarkic market system capable of managing all variables within its closed dominion. But when the system breaks out of its closed environment, the ability of a single national actor to control the system's dynamics erodes and ultimately disappears in the face of differential conditions, needs, priorities, and agendas. Globalization's ability to produce wealth for a particular group simultaneously produces harms to different people and interests and generates unfair resource redistribution within existing cultures. This is an unavoidable consequence of globalization. 62 The problem is that globalization has altered the rules of operation of political, economic, and social activities, and in doing so multiplied greatly our ability to create benefit and harm. 63 While some understandably want the unsettling and often chaotic effects of globalization to go away, it can only be dealt with, not reversed. The system in which we live and work is no longer closed. There are few contexts not connected to the dynamics of some aspect of the extended economic and social systems resulting from globalization. This means the wide ranging and incompatible variables of a global economic, human rights, and social fairness system are resulting in conflicts and unanticipated interpenetrations that no one fully understands, anticipates, or controls. 64 Local [\*622] self-sufficiency is the loser in this process. It can remain a nostalgic dream but rarely a reality. Except for isolated cultures and niche activities, there is very little chance that anyone will be unaffected by this transformational process. Change is the constant, and it will take several generations before we return to a period of relative stasis. Even then it will only be a respite before the pattern once again intensifies.

#### Management solves extinction

Levy 1999 (Dr Neil Levy, fellow of the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at Charles Sturt University, 1999“Discourses of the Environment” p. 215)

If the ‘technological fix’ is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our uses of resources, we are nevertheless unable to simply leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is no us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result form a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternative which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formiulated by ecologists, environmentalist, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province for Foucault’s specific intellectual, the one who works ‘within specific sectors, at the precise points where their won conditions of life or work situate them’ (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as ‘the strategists of life and death’ than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man’s ‘politics places his existence as a living being in question’ (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the fate of our species, and of those with whone we share this planet, will be decided.

#### Consumption key to growth

Greenstone 2011 (Michael Greenstone, Director of The Hamilton Project, Senior Fellow at Brookings and 3M Professor of Environmental Economics at MIT, and Adam Looney, Policy Director at The Hamilton Project and Senior Fellow at the The Brookings Institution, May 2011, “A Strategy for America’s Energy Future: Illuminating Energy’s Full Costs,” http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads\_and\_links/05\_energy\_greenstone\_looney.pdf)

The development and exploitation of inexpensive energy sources has been a key driver of economic development and quality of life. The story of the expansion of the U.S. economy, and of the advances and innovations that have made life better for Americans, leaps from one energy-harvesting invention to another: the cotton gin, the steam engine, the light bulb, the internal combustion engine, the turbine, the mechanized factory, the electrified city, and the computer. The development of coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear power made all this progress possible and has helped support activity that is integral to our economy and quality of life.¶ Windmills and watermills, the first modes of generating mechanical energy, were used almost entirely for rudimentary tasks such as grinding grain and pumping water. The development of the steam engine in Britain in the mid- eighteenth century gave birth to industry by powering factories and cotton mills. In the late nineteenth century, the internal combustion engine, which runs our entire modern motor vehicle fleet, was invented. Around the same time, the light bulb was developed, allowing businesses to keep their doors open even after the sun had set, making it possible for employees to extend their work days.¶ Today our economy is heavily reliant on electric power to run businesses and maintain quality of life. Data centers and server farms in the United States require massive amounts of energy. In 2006, they consumed 61 billion kWh of electricity (1.5 percent of total U.S. electricity consumption)—more than was consumed by the nation’s televisions (EPA 2007). Oil fuels more than 90 percent of the nation’s vehicle motor fleet and is a critical fuel input for the entire transportation network. The benefits that energy provides, from home heating to facilitation of trade, are integral parts of our way of life. The United States consumes about one-fifth (21 percent) of the world’s energy, despite having less than 5 percent of the world’s population (EIA 2010a).¶ But U.S. dominance in energy use is about to change. The developing world—especially China and India—are rapidly increasing the amount of energy they consume as their economies grow and their citizens aspire to better living conditions (Figure 2). As important as access to plentiful energy is to maintaining the standard of living in the United States, access to energy has taken on an even more vital role in emerging markets as those markets transition to a higher standard of living and more energy-intensive economies.

#### Growth solves environment

Zey 1997 (Michael Zey, Professor of Management at Montclair State University, 1997, The Futurist, “The Macroindustrial Era: A New Age of Abundance and Prosperity”, March/April, http://www.zey.com/Featured\_2.htm)

This brings me to one of my major points about the necessity of growth. A recurring criticism of growth - be it industrial, economic, or technological - centers around its negative consequences. A good example of this is the tendency of economic and industrial growth to generate pollution. However, I contend that growth invariably provides solutions to any problems it introduces. The following examples will illustrate my point. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, studies show that, after a country achieves a certain level of prosperity, the pendulum begins to swing back toward cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about $4,000 (in 1993 dollars), it produces less of some pollutants per capita. The reason for this is quite simple: Such a nation can now afford technologies such as catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat and eliminate a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environmental damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as eastern Europe can be traced largely to their economic woes. Hence he concludes that, in order to ensure environmental safety, "we need a sound economy on a global basis." Thus, the answer to pollution, the supposed outgrowth of progress, ought to be more economic growth. Such economic growth can be accelerated by any number of actions: the transfer of technology, the sharing of scientific know-how, and economic investment. The World Bank estimates that every dollar invested in developing countries will grow to $100 in 50 years. As their wealth increases, these countries can take all the necessary steps to invest in pollution-free cars, catalytic converters, and other pollution-free technologies, such as the cleanest of all current large-scale energy sources, nuclear power. They can also afford to invest in bioremediation - the utilization of viruses to literally eat such impurities as oil spills and toxic waste. Russia is actively growing and exporting microorganisms that eat radioactive and metallic wastes from such sources as uranium, plutonium, magnesium, and silver

### Radioactivity

#### Fossil fuels worse- Don’t evaluate uranium in a vacuum

Hinkle 2012 (A. Barton Hinkle, journalist, July 2, 2012, “Don’t Judge Uranium Mining in a Vacuum,” Reason, http://reason.com/archives/2012/07/02/dont-judge-uranium-mining-in-a-vacuum)

Should Virginia lift its ban on uranium mining? The question has generated a lot of heat, but not much light. Last week, this column looked at uranium mining in isolation, and made three points: ¶ The recent report by the National Academy of Sciences was too vague to be of much use, and the use to which it has been put by opponents is misleading.¶ Opponents of lifting the moratorium throw around a lot of numbers that sound scary but mean little.¶ The uranium industry in Canada, where more uranium has been produced than in any other country on the planet, has an excellent environmental, health, and safety record, according to a review of the literature by the Canadian government.¶ That last point is worth dwelling on. Among many other things, the Canadian government – not the industry, the government—says “uranium mining and processing workers were as healthy as the general Canadian male population.” And: “Radon exposure to members of the public from [government]-regulated [mining] activities is virtually zero.” And: "Do uranium mines and mills increase radon levels in the environment? No." And: "Studies and monitoring have shown that there are no significant impacts to the health of the public living near uranium mines and mills." ¶ Also: "Studies carried out over several decades have repeatedly demonstrated that people who live near [uranium mines and processing facilities] are as healthy as the rest of the general population." And: “It is completely safe to consume fish, game and fruit from regions near operating uranium mines and mills.” And just for good measure: “No increased risk to children living near nuclear power plants or uranium mining, milling, and refining sites was detected.”¶ In short, then, there is very little to fear from uranium mining or nuclear power when considered in isolation. But we must not consider the issue in isolation – because the fossil-fuel alternatives are, in fact, considerably worse.¶ Just ask Joseph Romm, who studies energy issues at the Center for American Progress – a liberal think tank founded and run by former Clinton and Obama staffers. “There is no question,” Romm has said, that “nothing is worse than fossil fuels for killing people.”¶ He is not alone. In 2010 – admittedly, before the tsunami-caused disaster at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant in Japan – the OECD’s Nuclear Energy Agency produced a report comparing the risks from nuclear power with those from other energy sources. It found that, “contrary to many people’s perception, nuclear energy presents very much lower risks. For example, more than 2,500 people are killed every year in severe energy-related accidents…. In contrast, there has only been one severe accident in nuclear power plants over this period of time (Chernobyl) resulting in 31 [direct and nearly immediate] fatalities.” ¶ The OECD says the total number of Chernobyl-related fatalities could rise as high as 33,000 over the next seven decades, “but we note that the OECD Environment Directorate estimates that 960,000 premature deaths resulted from levels of particulates in the air in the year 2000 alone, of which energy sources accounted for about 30 percent.” That works out to a 9:1 ratio in nuclear power’s favor. ¶ Then there’s The Washington Post, which reported – after Fukushima – that “making electricity from nuclear power turns out to be far less damaging to human health than making it from coal, oil, or even clean-burning natural gas, according to numerous analyses. That’s even more true if the predicted effects of climate change are thrown in.” ¶ How much less damaging? This much: “Compared with nuclear power, coal is responsible for five times as many worker deaths from accidents, 470 times as many deaths due to air pollution among members of the public, and more than 1,000 times as many cases of serious illness, according to a study of the health effects of electricity generation in Europe.” ¶ But what about radiation? Well. According to a 2007 piece in Scientific American, “Coal Ash Is More Radioactive than Nuclear Waste.” In fact, “the fly ash emitted by a power plant – a by-product of burning coal for electricity – carries into the surrounding environment 100 times more radiation than a nuclear power plant producing the same amount of energy.” ¶ Gerald Marsh concurs. Two years ago the retired nuclear physicist told Popular Mechanics, “The amount of radiation put out by a coal plant far exceeds that of a nuclear power plant, even if you use scrubbers.”¶ And again, remember: All these effects are in addition to anthropogenic climate change, which environmentalists insist is the greatest existential threat facing humanity – at least when they are not ignoring the issue in order to frighten people about the supposed perils of uranium mining.

### Heg K

#### No impact – threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

Kaufman, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware, ‘9

(Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, 400 – 434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence.

A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

### Tech Optimism

#### We’re not nuclear optimism- it’s supported based on science and checked by pessimists

Adams 2010 (Rod Adams, Technological Realism Should Replace Optimism, Pro-nuclear advocate with small nuclear plant operating and design experience. Former submarine Engineer Officer, <http://atomicinsights.com/2010/05/technological-realism-should-replace-optimism.html>)

As a “served engineer” on a nuclear powered submarine, I learned a long time ago that things go wrong, even with the very best technology. The recognition of inevitable “problems” should not deter technical development and should not make people afraid to develop new products and services, but it should add a healthy dose of humility backed up by continuous efforts to prepare for the worst. My experiences have taught me to be uncomfortable with any proclamation of inevitable progress. I have worked on IT projects, been a full participant in the digital revolution, operated a custom plastics manufacturing company, and watched the nuclear industry work to regain respectability after some serious missteps in its early development history. Progress is hard work and there are often failures that reset the development cycle just as it seems ready to take off. Too many technology observers and pundits point to Moore’s Law as some kind of a general rule for technical developments. Moore’s Law is a very particular pronouncement – in 1965, Gordon Moore recognized that there was a recognizable path forward that would allow manufacturers to double the number of transistors that could be inexpensively placed on a chip every year for the next ten years and he recognized that he could apply that law to the 15-20 years of chip development that had already happened. He modified his prediction in 1975 to increase the doubling time to two years instead of one. He predicted that the implementation of that path would allow an increasing quantity of processing power, assuming that it would be possible to keep all of the transistors firing at the same rate as before. Moore’s Law does not apply to software development, to steel making, to underwater sensors, to remote manipulators, to wind energy collection systems, or to the rate of IP data transmission using satellite networks. It is not even infinitely applicable to semiconductor based processors – there are physical limits to the size of transistors and connecting wires that will eventually provide an asymptote that levels out the growth of processing power. I have never had much “faith” in technology. I like technology. I use lots of technology; my children have occasionally called me “Inspector Gadget” because of all of the tools (my wife and children sometimes call them “toys”) I have accumulated over the years. However, I understand the limits of the technology that I use. I read the manuals, heed the warnings, plan for failure, and worry about the potential consequences of inappropriately using technical devices. I know that no technology can overcome physical barriers; nothing I or anyone else can do will provide power from the wind when it is not blowing and nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable chemical combustion to provide reliable heat energy without both a source of oxygen and a place to dump the waste products. Nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable oil extraction from a dry well. I also know that not everything that breaks can be fixed, even if there is an unlimited amount of time and money. Some breaks and fissures can never be welded shut or forced to heal. This is where I believe that humble engineers and technicians who are not driven by sales numbers have a huge role to play. Their (our) natural pessimism can help to reduce the consequences of always listening to the optimists, the people who say “damn the torpedoes”, “failure is not an option”, or “whatever it takes”. Failure is always possible. Before stretching limits it is important to recognize the consequences of the failure to determine if they are acceptable. If the reasonably predictable “worst possible event” results in consequences that cannot be accepted, the prudent course of action is to avoid the action in the first place. I place deepwater drilling for oil and gas into that category. It is pretty obvious that the possible consequences are unacceptable and that technological development has not yet found a way to mitigate those consequences. I am not sure what the limits of “deepwater” should be, but it is apparent that 5,000 feet is beyond the limit. I do not place operating nuclear energy production facilities in that category. However, there are very definitely some kinds of nuclear plants – like very large graphite-moderated, water-cooled reactors operated by people who override safety systems and ignore warning indications – that have proven that they can cause consequences that are not acceptable. The real value comes in determining what the reasonably predictable consequences might be and what failure modes are reasonable to assume. For people who have no firm foundation in real world mechanics, chemistry and physics, it is possible to spin all kinds of scary scenarios that depend on a series of impossible events. (Note: Just because I believe that there is always something that can go wrong, I do not believe that all things are possible.) My prescription for progress is not “faith” in engineers or technologists. It is for people to approach challenges with knowledge, a questioning attitude, humility and a willingness to expend the resources necessary to operate safely. A thirst for maximizing short term profits or an attitude of blind optimism are both incompatible with performing difficult tasks in potentially dangerous environments.

### 2AC Microgrids CP

#### Links to politics

#### DOD renewable initiatives fail

Andres and Breetz 2011 (Richard B. Andres, Professor of national Security Strategy at the national War College and a Senior fellow and energy and environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic research, institute for national Strategic Studies, at the national Defense University, and Hanna L. Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, February 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,” National Defense University Strategic Forum, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/strforum/sf-262.pdf)

In recent years, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has become increasingly interested in the potential of small (less than 300 megawatts electric [MWe]) nuclear reactors for military use.1 DOD’s attention to small reactors stems mainly from two critical vulnerabilities it has identified in its infrastructure and operations: the dependence of U.S. military bases on the fragile civilian electrical grid, and the challenge of safely and reliably supplying energy to troops in forward operating locations. DOD has responded to these challenges with an array of initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable and alternative fuels. Unfortunately, even with massive investment and ingenuity, these initiatives will be insufficient to solve DOD’s reliance on the civilian grid or its need for convoys in forward areas. The purpose of this paper is to explore the prospects for addressing these critical vulnerabilities through small-scale nuclear plants.

#### Micro-grids fail-

#### Unreliable

BIESI 2011 (Brookings Institution Energy Security Initiative, The Hoover Institution Shultz-Stevenson Task Force on Energy Policy, October 2011, "Assessing the Role of Distributed Power Systems in the U.S. Power Sector," media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/Distributed-Energy.pdf)

Microgrid¶ Generation technologies are central to discussions around distributed energy systems. However, controls, infrastructure and demand side management are also an integral part of the broader discussion. The term ‘microgrid,’ is used to refer to a smaller version of a main or central electrical grid that much like its larger counterpart, consists of interconnected electrical loads and distributed energy generation resources that are typically controlled by a central control system. A microgrid may operate independently as its own self-contained entity, or may be interconnected with an adjoining central utility grid or neighboring microgrid. ¶ The concept of the microgrid is often associated with a power system in developing countries where the centrally managed grid is weak or inadequate. However, microgrid architectures are deployed in the United States including in various communities such as university campuses, hospitals, industry and military. Fully 74 percent of the global microgrid market dollars were spent in North America in 2010. 40¶ Although not a specific technology in itself, the notion of the microgrid is a system comprised of software, controls and hardware infrastructure including sensors, inverters, switches and converters. The microgrid and its primary components form the platform that is necessary for the integration of distributed generation resources with the local loads consuming the energy. The benefits of such architectures lie in the fact that they can be locally operated and controlled independent of a centrally managed utility. Such architecture enables distributed power systems, whether they operate on a stand-alone basis, or as an integrated component of a larger central grid.¶ 1.4 Functional Risks of DPS Technology Despite the policy support and cost declines in technology, DPS applications are constrained by several fundamental technical and functional factors. These factors give rise to risks associated with power quality, “dipatchability” and reliability. Some of the most important technical risks of widespread DPS deployment and integration are listed below. ¶ Power Quality¶ Some DPS technologies rely on power electronic devices, such as AC-to-DC or DC-to-AC converters. If such devices are not correctly set up, the integration of DPS power can result in a harmonic distortion and in operational difficulties to loads connected to the same distribution systems. 41¶ Reactive Power Coordination¶ With the proper system configuration and network interface, DPS can bring relief to the power system by providing close proximity power support at the distribution level. However, some renewable generation sources such as wind can worsen the reactive coordination problem. Wind generators have asynchronous induction generators designed for variable speed characteristics and, therefore, must rely on the network to which they are connected for reactive power support.42¶ Reliability and Reserve Margin¶ Intermittent power generation such as solar and wind is non-dispatchable. It is thus necessary to maintain sufficient generation reserve margins in order to provide reliable power generation. If there is a high level of distributed generation deployment, reserve margin maintenance can be a problem.

### 2AC Politics- Immigration

#### Won’t pass

Gonzalez 1/5 (Daniel González, “'Cliff' fight, gun control pushing immigration reform out of spotlight,” The Town Talk, http://www.thetowntalk.com/article/20130105/NEWS/130105020?nclick\_check=1)

Although Obama says he wants to jump right into immigration reform, he and Congress will have to focus their attention for months on several unresolved issues left over from the New Year’s Day deal to avert the “fiscal cliff,” including a March1 deadline to avoid billions of dollars in across-the-board spending cuts and a late February/early March deadline to raise the debt ceiling.¶ “That is problem Number 1 for immigration reform. That will dominate the agenda for the time being,” said Louis DeSipio, a political-science professor at the University of California-Irvine.¶ Immigration reform also will have to compete with gun-control legislation. After the shooting in Newtown, Obama appointed Vice President Joe Biden to head an anti-violence commission to come up with new gun-control measures by the end of this month.¶ “That is going to put more pressure on Congress,” DeSipio said.¶ Gun control, plus the divisive atmosphere demonstrated by the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-run Senate during the fiscal-cliff debate, “makes it more and more unlikely that Congress will actually be able to debate a comprehensive immigration-reform bill,” he said.

#### Obama doesn’t want it to

Munro 12/31 (Neil Munro, reporter for the Daily Caller, December 31, 2012, "Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest" dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/?print=1)

President Barack Obama promised Dec. 30 to introduce an immigration bill during 2013, but activists on all sides of the debate are trying to understand his strategy.¶ **He may be gunning for a victory in the mid-term elections by introducing** a bill so radical that it will **spark an emotional controversy from whites**, which would then **spur many angry Latino**s to vote Democratic in the 2014 midterm elections, said Robert de Posada, former head of a GOP-affiliated group, The Latino Coalition.¶ **“The word that I’ve heard from many, is [that** he will] submit a very, very liberal plan that most Republicans will not support, that most southern and moderate Democrats will not support**,”** he said.¶ When the bill fails**, “they can announce once again that they tried [and that Latinos] need to rally in the next election**,” said Posada, who helped President George W. Bush win 40 percent of the Latino vote in 2004, during the housing boom.

#### Hagel thumps the DA

Wong 1/6 (Scott Wong and Manu Raju, “Chuck Hagel takes fire from Capitol Hill,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/01/chuck-hagel-takes-fire-from-capitol-hill-85805.html)

Senate Democrats and Republicans are far from sold on President Barack Obama’s expected nomination of Chuck Hagel as secretary of defense.¶ In fact, Obama’s decision to tap the Vietnam veteran and outspoken former Republican senator is likely to spark another nasty fight with Congress right on the heels of the fiscal cliff showdown and just before another likely battle royal over the debt ceiling.¶ Republicans on Sunday unleashed a fresh barrage of attacks amid reports Obama would nominate Hagel on Monday for the top job at the Pentagon.¶ The new Senate minority whip, Texas Republican John Cornyn, said he’s firmly against Hagel’s nomination. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), an Air Force reservist who serves on the Armed Services Committee that will consider the nod, said Hagel would hold the “most antagonistic” views toward Israel of any defense secretary in U.S. history.¶ And despite heaping praise on Hagel when he retired from the Senate after the 2008 elections, Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Sunday failed to extend an olive branch to the Nebraska Republican, instead suggesting there would be “tough questions” ahead.¶ Even Senate Democrats are privately signaling they‘re not yet on board with the Hagel pick, and that the White House has a lot of work to do to get him across the finish line.¶ The nomination comes at a tricky time for the administration — just as the fights over raising the debt ceiling and government appropriations are set to begin. And it could put a number of at-risk or pro-Israel Democrats in tough political spots — especially if the nomination fight grows even more contentious.¶ Democrats are also scratching their heads over why Obama appears willing to go to the mat for Hagel, while abandoning his push for a close friend and member of his inner circle, U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice, to become secretary of state. Rice, an unabashed Democrat, abandoned her bid after withering GOP criticism over the deadly attacks on the U.S. Consulate in Libya.¶ Though different in substance, the controversy over Rice’s remarks is not unlike the current pushback over Hagel’s past foreign policy positions and controversial remarks. But Hagel lacks a natural constituency in the Senate, given that he’s grown alienated from the GOP, yet Democrats are suspicious of his record.¶ “It is a strange signal for the White House to send that they are willing to fight for Hagel but not Rice,” one Senate Democratic aide said Sunday. “Democrats are not currently unified behind Hagel, and it will take some real work by the administration to get them there, if it’s even possible.”¶ Senior Republicans agreed, noting that after Hagel infuriated Republicans and Democrats alike over the years, there isn’t a natural base for him.¶ “I can’t imagine why [Obama] would choose to burn his political capital on this nomination. For what? There is no constituency for Chuck Hagel,” one senior GOP aide said. “Obama will expend every ounce of political capital he has to get him across the finish line. Dems will hate this.”

#### Debt ceiling- top of the agenda

Nelson 1-2 [Colleen McCain Nelson 1-2-2013 Wall Street Journal “The Fiscal Cliff: Lack of Grand Bargain Complicates Obama's Priorities” ProQuest]

For President Barack Obama, the new year was supposed to bring an end to fiscal-cliff negotiations and the opportunity to begin work on a second-term agenda.¶ But the failure to craft a grand bargain to address the country's fiscal woes means that contentious discussions about spending cuts and the debt ceiling will continue in 2013 -- potentially diminishing the time and goodwill Mr. Obama needs to pursue his policy priorities.¶ Critics of the budget compromise already are signaling that hard feelings about this protracted process could linger, creating an uncertain path for the president as he tries to build support for proposals including an immigration-law overhaul, tax-code changes, energy legislation and other issues.¶ Still, the White House deal with Congress appears to have bolstered Mr. Obama's position in some ways. The president won a concession from Republicans in Congress on a central tenet of GOP ideology, which holds that tax rates should never rise. Moreover, Mr. Obama's success on that point came with a flourish -- a show of overwhelming support in the Senate, on a vote of 89-8.¶ Conservative opposition in the House failed to stop the deal, and that chamber approved the package late Tuesday.¶ Speaking minutes after the House vote, Mr. Obama said: "Thanks to the votes of Democrats and Republicans in Congress I will sign a law that raises taxes on the wealthiest 2% of Americans while preventing a middle-class tax hike that could have sent the economy back into recession."¶ Mr. Obama said he would like to take additional steps to reduce the nation's deficit, "with a little bit less drama, a little less brinksmanship." After his speech, Mr. Obama planned to fly to Hawaii to rejoin his family on vacation. Tuesday's developments not only suggest that the White House can strike deals with congressional Republicans in what has seemed like an ossified Washington political culture, but also that Mr. Obama has momentum in pursuing his goals. Mr. Obama appears to have a channel to negotiate with the GOP, by having Vice President Joe Biden work with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.).¶ The cost to Mr. Obama is some complaining from the political left, which among other things notes that he has abandoned his campaign pledge to raise tax rates on household incomes above $250,000 in favor of the negotiated level of $450,000 for couples.¶ The White House believes the compromise is a victory for the president.¶ A person familiar with the discussions noted that Mr. Obama faced determined Republican opposition and still managed to forge an agreement that raises tax rates for the first time in a generation.¶ "The president has delivered on a major campaign promise and broken Republicans' backs on a 20-year pledge" to oppose tax rate increases, a White House official said.¶ But some Republicans have said that Mr. Obama fouled the water during the fiscal-cliff talks with combative, cajoling tactics. The president drew Republican ire Monday when he held a campaign-style event as the fiscal-cliff deadline loomed and passage of a deal remained uncertain.¶ Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) called the gathering a "cheerleading rally." Sen. Bob Corker, a Tennessee Republican, accused the president of heckling Congress.¶ The White House said the appearance had been long in the works and was meant to highlight the real-world consequences of going over the fiscal cliff.¶ Rep. Mike Rogers (R., Mich.) said the president has focused his efforts during the past few weeks on railing against Congress and Republicans in particular instead of launching a dialogue.¶ "The president just doesn't play well with others," he said. "I do think he's up for a bumpy road, given his tactics."¶ Historically, second-term presidents have had a limited window to roll out major policy proposals before lame-duck status sets in and passing significant legislation becomes a steeper challenge. With that in mind, Mr. Obama has said he would roll out proposals aimed at reducing gun violence and overhauling immigration laws early this year.¶ The White House view is that Mr. Obama would have been ill-positioned to pass policy priorities if the country was still preoccupied with the effects of having gone over the fiscal cliff.¶ But now, because lawmakers postponed for two months the spending cuts that were set to take effect Wednesday, fiscal issues will continue to consume much of the political oxygen in the near future. So will talks about whether to raise the nation's statutory borrowing limit.

#### Winners win- Second term depends on bold legislative moves

Ignatius 11/7 (David Ignatius, longtime writer and reporter, studied political theory at Harvard College and economics at Kings College, Cambridge, November 7, 2012, “A time for Obama to be bold,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/president-obama-go-big/2012/11/07/dbf545f8-28fc-11e2-bab2-eda299503684\_story.html?hpid=z4)

Barack Obama will be getting advice by the boatload over the next few weeks, but the best guidance may be what emerges from Caro’s biography “The Passage of Power”: Think big. Find strategies and pressure points that can break the gridlock in Congress, which was as rigid in 1963 as it is today. Surprise your adversaries with bold moves and concessions that create new space on which to govern.¶ As I watched Tuesday’s triumph, it seemed obvious that Obama needs the policy equivalent of David Plouffe, his senior campaign adviser. Plouffe’s genius was to decide early on that the race depended on nine battleground states; if he could deliver those states by a relentless and sometimes ruthless assault, he would win the larger victory. He was like a general who concentrates his forces at the points of greatest vulnerability and then prevails through sheer force of will.¶ Obama’s performance as president has often lacked this decisive, strategic quality. The notes are there but not the policy “music.” In both foreign and domestic policy, the impression of Obama, after his blunderbuss, first-year battles on health care and the Israeli-Palestinian issue, has been of a careful president who reacts to events, waits for others to make the first moves and plays to avoid losing rather than to win.¶ Well, Mr. President, what the hell’s the presidency for?¶ A strategic second term would begin by identifying a list of necessary and achievable goals, and then pursuing them with the unyielding manipulative skill of a Lyndon Johnson. On the top of everybody’s list would be a budget deal. Everybody knows, more or less, what it will require: changes in Social Security and Medicare that slow the growth of entitlement spending; reform of the tax code that produces a fairer and simpler system that raises revenue without limiting growth.¶ A road map is there in the Simpson-Bowles deficit-reduction plan, and Obama administration officials have been thinking privately for months about how to tweak the plan so it’s better and fairer. Mitt Romney’s generous concession speech Tuesday night opened a possible door, and the president should follow up his statement that he will “look forward to sitting down with Governor Romney to talk about where we can work together to move this country forward.” The president and his new Treasury secretary (Jack Lew?) should take the next step and ask Romney to help close the budget deal the country needs.¶ In foreign policy, Obama will need to be equally strategic. What does he want to accomplish? My list: a deal with Iran that verifiably limits its nuclear program and avoids war; a deal in Afghanistan that averts civil war when U.S. forces leave in 2014; a deal for a political transition in Syria (a shorthand Syria summary would be to organize the opposition so that it’s strong enough to bargain, then help win a Nobel Peace Prize for Vladimir Putin). And, finally, a deal to create a Palestinian state so that Israel has secure borders and the Arab world can get on with the process of becoming modern and democratic.¶ All these primary foreign policy goals are “deals,” and it follows that the president needs a dealmaker as secretary of state. Who could do that, after Hillary Clinton leaves, probably at the end of January? John Kerry is an experienced man who thinks outside the box and is willing to take risks. Even if the president is said to have found him somewhat windy as the stand-in for Romney during debate preparation, Kerry has shown over the past four years a willingness to negotiate with adversaries, in secret, to achieve results.¶ A longtime Democratic adviser argues that Obama needs the “Bolten Plan,” as in Josh Bolten, the White House chief of staff who mobilized the machinery of government to get it moving in the same direction in George W. Bush’s second term. This will never be a happy model for Democrats, but it captures an important point: A successful second term is less about ideology than about results.¶ Think big. Take risks. Get it done. Maybe someone should slip a note in Obama’s desk drawer that asks: What would Lyndon Johnson have done to make it happen?

**Congress loves the plan- they requested it**

Matthews 2010 (William Matthews, February 15, 2010, “The Nuclear Option,” Defense News, http://www.defensenews.com/article/20100215/DEFFEAT01/2150310/The-Nuclear-Option)

The electric grids that the United States depends on for computers, communications gear and command centers are increasingly unreliable. They're strained by growing civilian demand, enfeebled by aging equipment and vulnerable to cyber and other attacks.¶ So the military is considering generating its own electricity, possibly with nuclear energy.¶ The push comes partially from the U.S. Congress, which last fall ordered the Defense Department to study the feasibility of building nuclear power plants on military installations. A report is due to lawmakers June 1.

#### Nuke lobby

Samuelsohn 2011 (Darren Samuelsohn, March 16, 2011, “Nuclear industry lobbyists' clout felt on Hill,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0311/51367.html)

Facing its biggest crisis in 25 years, the U.S. nuclear power industry can count on plenty of Democratic and Republican friends in both high and low places.¶ During the past election cycle alone, the Nuclear Energy Institute and more than a dozen companies with big nuclear portfolios have spent tens of millions of dollars on lobbying and campaign contributions to lawmakers in key leadership slots and across influential state delegations.¶ The donations and lobbying funds came at a critical moment for the nuclear industry as its largest trade group and major companies pushed for passage of a cap-and-trade bill.¶ While that effort failed, the money is sure to keep doors open on Capitol Hill as lawmakers consider any response to the safety issues highlighted by multiple nuclear reactor meltdowns in Japan in the aftermath of last week’s monster earthquake and tsunami.¶ “The bottom line is you’ve got a variety of industrial interests that care about nuclear power and have a heck of a lot of money to spend if their business and their bottom line is put in political jeopardy,” said Dave Levinthal, communications director at the Center for Responsive Politics. “As Congress is talking about potentially diving deeper, these companies bring a lot of resources and a heck of a lot of cash to bear if tDhis fight goes forward.”¶ NEI, the industry’s biggest voice in Washington, for example, spent $3.76 million to lobby the federal government and an additional $323,000 through its political action committee on a bipartisan congressional slate, including 134 House and 30 Senate candidates, according to data compiled by the CRP.¶ Alex Flint, NEI’s senior vice president for government affairs, said the spending is a byproduct of record high demand for his industry.¶ “The fact that the day after the election, both the president and [House Speaker John Boehner] said nuclear was an area where it’s something they can agree, it’s made us that much more in demand,” Flint said. “Our lobbying expenses have gone up more in large part because we have more people talking to more members of Congress.”

#### Relations resilient

Garretson 2010 – former Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) International Fellow in India, Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) New Delhi. Previously the Chief of Future Science and Technology Exploration for Headquarters Air Force, former Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Service Academy Research Associate, recipient of the National Space Society’s (NSS) Space Pioneer Award

Peter A. Garretson “Sky’s No Limit: Space-based Solar Power, the Next Major Step in the Indo-US Strategic Partnership” http://www.idsa.in/sites/default/files/OP\_SkysNoLimit.pdf

Despite the concerns of sceptics, the Indo-US strategic partnership seems to rest on very sound fundamentals that are not likely to change over several decades. First, is a shared cultural history in colonialism, with the attendant struggle for freedom, and the important influence of the enlightenment thought, British political organisation, commerce and trade routes and prominence of the English language in matters of science, state-craft and commerce. Second, the significant and growing bilateral trade. Third is the asymmetric but aligned economic needs–where India needs investment today to maintain a high rate of growth for development and cohesion, and the US is looking for high growth places to invest, and places that provide both a market for its own goods and a costcompetitive manufacturing base to manufacture the ideas it conceives and finances. Fourth is the large and politically active diaspora that is actively seeking to build closer ties. Fifth is a shared interest in limiting the damage of those extremists that undermine pluralism and sew extremism and violence. Finally, both wish to take part in the the economic rise of a vibrant Asian market where a normative rule set prevails that allow all members to benefit from the use of global commons and work on collective problems and human security is possible. Within this framework, both nations see the need to make space for and engage China as it evolves as a responsible stakeholder with greater transparency, but to ensure that accommodation takes place respecting important equities of themselves and their neighbours, and is free of any element of coercion.

## \*\*\*1AR\*\*\*

### Russia

#### Framework- Overemphasis on method destroys their scholarship

Wendt 2002 Wendt, Handbook of IR, 2002 p. 68

It should be stressed that in advocating a pragmatic view we are not endorsing method-driven social science. Too much research in international relations chooses problems or things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’. But the point of IR scholarship should be to answer questions about international politics that are of great normative concern, not to validate methods. Methods are means, not ends in themselves. As a matter of personal scholarly choice it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes us. But since we do not know how far that is, if the goal of the discipline is insight into world politics then it makes little sense to rule out one or the other approach on a priori grounds. In that case a method indeed becomes a tacit ontology, which may lead to neglect of whatever problems it is poorly suited to address. Being conscious about these choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.

### Security

#### Bandwagoning is more common than counter-balancing.

Bradley A. Thayer (Associate Professor in the Dept. of Defense and Strategic Studies at Missouri State University) 2007 American Empire: A Debate, “Reply to Christopher Layne” p 106

Third, countries want to align themselves with the United States, Far from there being a backlash against the United States, there is worldwide bandwagoning with it. The vast majority of countries in international politics have alliances with the United States. There are approximately 192 countries in the world, ranging from the size of giants like Russia to Lilliputians like Vanuatu. Of that number, you can count with one hand the countries opposed to the United States—China, Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela. Once the leaders of Cuba and Venezuela change, there is every reason to believe that those countries will be allied with the United States, as they were before their present rulers—Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez—came to power. North Korea will collapse someday, removing that threat, although not without significant danger to the countries in. the region. Of these states, only China has the potential power to confront the United States. The potential power of China should not be underestimated, but neither should the formidable power of the United States and its allies. There is an old saying that you can learn a lot about someone by looking at his friends (or enemies). It may be true about people, but it is certainly true of the United States. Of the 192 countries in existence, a great number, 84, are allied with the United States, and they include almost all of the major economic and military states.

#### No spiral of security – states underestimate threats

Randall L. Schweller (Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University) 2004 “Unanswered Threats A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing,” International Security 29.2 (2004) 159-201, Muse

Despite the historical frequency of underbalancing, little has been written on the subject. Indeed, Geoffrey Blainey's memorable observation that for "every thousand pages published on the causes of wars there is less than one page directly on the causes of peace" could have been made with equal veracity about overreactions to threats as opposed to underreactions to them.92 Library shelves are filled with books on the causes and dangers of exaggerating threats, ranging from studies of domestic politics to bureaucratic politics, to political psychology, to organization theory. By comparison, there have been few studies at any level of analysis or from any theoretical perspective that directly explain why states have with some, if not equal, regularity underestimated dangers to their survival. There may be some cognitive or normative bias at work here. Consider, for instance, that there is a commonly used word, paranoia, for the unwarranted fear that people are, in some way, "out to get you" or are planning to do one harm. I suspect that just as many people are afflicted with the opposite psychosis: the delusion that everyone loves you when, in fact, they do not even like you. Yet, we do not have a familiar word for this phenomenon. Indeed, I am unaware of any word that describes this pathology (hubris and overconfidence come close, but they plainly define something other than what I have described). That noted, international relations theory does have a frequently used phrase for the pathology of states' underestimation of threats to their survival, the so-called Munich analogy. The term is used, however, in a disparaging way by theorists to ridicule those who employ it. The central claim is that the naïveté associated with Munich and the outbreak of World War II has become an overused and inappropriate analogy because few leaders are as evil and unappeasable as Adolf Hitler. Thus, the analogy either mistakenly causes leaders [End Page 198] to adopt hawkish and overly competitive policies or is deliberately used by leaders to justify such policies and mislead the public. A more compelling explanation for the paucity of studies on underreactions to threats, however, is the tendency of theories to reflect contemporary issues as well as the desire of theorists and journals to provide society with policy- relevant theories that may help resolve or manage urgent security problems. Thus, born in the atomic age with its new balance of terror and an ongoing Cold War, the field of security studies has naturally produced theories of and prescriptions for national security that have had little to say about—and are, in fact, heavily biased against warnings of—the dangers of underreacting to or underestimating threats. After all, the nuclear revolution was not about overkill but, as Thomas Schelling pointed out, speed of kill and mutual kill.93 Given the apocalyptic consequences of miscalculation, accidents, or inadvertent nuclear war, small wonder that theorists were more concerned about overreacting to threats than underresponding to them. At a time when all of humankind could be wiped out in less than twenty-five minutes, theorists may be excused for stressing the benefits of caution under conditions of uncertainty and erring on the side of inferring from ambiguous actions overly benign assessments of the opponent's intentions. The overwhelming fear was that a crisis "might unleash forces of an essentially military nature that overwhelm the political process and bring on a war thatnobody wants. Many important conclusions about the risk of nuclear war, and thus about the political meaning of nuclear forces, rest on this fundamental idea."94 Now that the Cold War is over, we can begin to redress these biases in the literature. In that spirit, I have offered a domestic politics model to explain why threatened states often fail to adjust in a prudent and coherent way to dangerous changes in their strategic environment. The model fits nicely with recent realist studies on imperial under- and overstretch. Specifically, it is consistent with Fareed Zakaria's analysis of U.S. foreign policy from 1865 to 1889, when, he claims, the United States had the national power and opportunity to expand but failed to do so because it lacked sufficient state power (i.e., the state was weak relative to society).95 Zakaria claims that the United States did [End Page 199] not take advantage of opportunities in its environment to expand because it lacked the institutional state strength to harness resources from society that were needed to do so. I am making a similar argument with respect to balancing rather than expansion: incoherent, fragmented states are unwilling and unable to balance against potentially dangerous threats because elites view the domestic risks as too high, and they are unable to mobilize the required resources from a divided society. The arguments presented here also suggest that elite fragmentation and disagreement within a competitive political process, which Jack Snyder cites as an explanation for overexpansionist policies, are more likely to produce underbalancing than overbalancing behavior among threatened incoherent states.96 This is because a balancing strategy carries certain political costs and risks with few, if any, compensating short-term political gains, and because the strategic environment is always somewhat uncertain. Consequently, logrolling among fragmented elites within threatened states is more likely to generate overly cautious responses to threats than overreactions to them. This dynamic captures the underreaction of democratic states to the rise of Nazi Germany during the interwar period.97 In addition to elite fragmentation, I have suggested some basic domestic-level variables that regularly intervene to thwart balance of power predictions.

### Russia

#### We don’t demonize Russia- realist lens is best

Adomanis 2011 (Mark Adomanis, Harvard then Oxford, November 22, 2011, “Two Recent Examples of Russia as a Non-ideological Power,” http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2011/11/22/two-recent-examples-of-russia-as-a-non-ideological-power/2/)

I’ve\* long thought that this is all a lot of hogwash, and that if you look at the totality of post-2000 Russian foreign policy it is hard to ascertain any sort of consistency whatsoever beside a persistent and robust defense of Russia’s interests. Indeed compared to the increasingly shrill and incoherent ideology of American foreign policy, what strikes me about Russia’s foreign policy is the near-total absence of ideology and the overwhelming precedence of old-school realism.¶ Russia, of course, tends to polarize people and the battle lines on this particular issue, as on most others relating to the country, have long been drawn and have hardened and calcified over time in much the same way that the Western Front did in the First World War.¶ Well, while I was doing my quick early-morning scan of the headlines I happened upon two articles that, I think, show quite nicely how Russia’s foreign policy is a highly flexible, adaptable, and decidedly non-ideological one.¶ The first is from the Associated Press:¶ In a boost to Israel, Russia joined the U.S. and Britain on Tuesday in backing the Jewish state’s view that the Middle East cannot be turned into a nuclear arms-free zone without progress on regional peace.¶ The three nations — who are charged with registering new members to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — also blunted Arab efforts to get them involved creating such a zone, telling an International Atomic Energy Agency meeting that was the sole responsibility of countries in the region.¶ The three-nation statement was made at a rare venue — a meeting bringing Israel and the Arab states together for a discussion of how to work toward establishing a Mideast nuclear-arms free zone. While nearly 100 nations attended the forum, it was primarily meant to allow those two opposing camps to exchange views on the issue — one of many dividing Israel from its Arab neighbors.¶ This certainly doesn’t mean that Russia has suddenly become vehemently pro-Israel, but it also pretty clearly shows that it has no real stake in being deliberately “pro-Arab” either. Unlike the US, which has a public commitment to keeping Israel more militarily powerful than any other country in the region and which has expended endless diplomatic resources to defend its conduct, Russia will back either the Israelis or the Arabs depending on where its interests lie on a particular issue. Indeed, Russia reiterated it’s longstanding opposition to Israeli settlements in Jerusalem just last week but has, in the not too distant past, signed a military cooperation deal and bought $400 million worth of UAVs. Russia’s policy is a lot of things, but it’s obviously not straightforward (just try to keep track of its constant back-and-forth over Iran) and it’s not based on a particular “pro-autocracy” ideology.¶ The other example comes from Tajikistan, where a Russian and Estonian pilot were released after Moscow exerted extraordinarily heavy, and brash, diplomatic pressure:¶ A Tajik court has freed a Russian and an Estonian pilots whose jailing this month led to a major row with Moscow. Russia’s Vladimir Sadovnichy and Alexei Rudenko from Estonia were jailed for eight-and-a-half years for smuggling and illegally crossing the border. But the men, who both denied the charges, have now been released at the request of the prosecutor and following heavy pressure from the Kremlin.¶ Many Tajik migrants were rounded up in Moscow after the initial guilty ruling.¶ And in another, apparently tit-for-tat, move, Russia’s chief medical officer last week expressed concern about whether ethnic Tajik workers in Russia were carrying the HIV virus that causes Aids. Migrant work in Russia is a vital source of income for many nationals from Tajikistan, the poorest former Soviet Republic.¶ As another news report indicated: ”About 1 million Tajik nationals — nearly every seventh Tajik citizen — are engaged in seasonal jobs in Russia, and the remittances they send back to their impoverished homeland contribute greatly to Tajikistan’s economy.”¶ I would note that Tajikistan is part of Russia’s “near-abroad” and that it is (to put things mildly) neither democratic nor pro-Western. Yet here we can clearly see that Russia, which places a very heavy rhetorical and practical emphasis on “protecting its citizens,” played a pretty vicious game of hardball. I’m not defending Russia’ conduct in this instance, I think it’s pretty clearly unethical to punish random Tajik migrant workers for the actions of their unelected and unaccountable government, merely pointing out that Russia acts irascibly to defend its interests independent of whether a country is democratic or not.¶ This might all seem rather basic and even self-evident, but one does not need to search very far to find examples of prominent journalists and analysts arguing that Russia’s

rather brusque treatment of the Baltics and Georgia is evidence of the Kremlin’s hateful ideological predisposition against democracy. Well judging by the extremely harsh treatment of Tajikistan over what is, in the grand scheme of things, a rather minor diplomatic disagreement, I don’t think that analysis stands up to any scrutiny.¶ One can (accurately, I think) argue that Russia’s foreign policy is somewhat overbearing, uncompromising, and overly harsh, but it seems impossible to find any consistent ideological motivation. Compared to the insane and insistent ideology that emanated from the Soviet Union until the very end, this is something for which we can be thankful.¶ \* I am hardly alone in this belief and am not arguing that I am. Daniel Larison, among many other writers more talented and erudite than me, has long persuasively argued that Russia’s foreign policy is best understood through a realist lens.

### K- Tech Solves

#### We’re not nuclear optimism- it’s supported based on science and checked by pessimists

Adams 2010 (Rod Adams, Technological Realism Should Replace Optimism, Pro-nuclear advocate with small nuclear plant operating and design experience. Former submarine Engineer Officer, <http://atomicinsights.com/2010/05/technological-realism-should-replace-optimism.html>)

As a “served engineer” on a nuclear powered submarine, I learned a long time ago that things go wrong, even with the very best technology. The recognition of inevitable “problems” should not deter technical development and should not make people afraid to develop new products and services, but it should add a healthy dose of humility backed up by continuous efforts to prepare for the worst. My experiences have taught me to be uncomfortable with any proclamation of inevitable progress. I have worked on IT projects, been a full participant in the digital revolution, operated a custom plastics manufacturing company, and watched the nuclear industry work to regain respectability after some serious missteps in its early development history. Progress is hard work and there are often failures that reset the development cycle just as it seems ready to take off. Too many technology observers and pundits point to Moore’s Law as some kind of a general rule for technical developments. Moore’s Law is a very particular pronouncement – in 1965, Gordon Moore recognized that there was a recognizable path forward that would allow manufacturers to double the number of transistors that could be inexpensively placed on a chip every year for the next ten years and he recognized that he could apply that law to the 15-20 years of chip development that had already happened. He modified his prediction in 1975 to increase the doubling time to two years instead of one. He predicted that the implementation of that path would allow an increasing quantity of processing power, assuming that it would be possible to keep all of the transistors firing at the same rate as before. Moore’s Law does not apply to software development, to steel making, to underwater sensors, to remote manipulators, to wind energy collection systems, or to the rate of IP data transmission using satellite networks. It is not even infinitely applicable to semiconductor based processors – there are physical limits to the size of transistors and connecting wires that will eventually provide an asymptote that levels out the growth of processing power. I have never had much “faith” in technology. I like technology. I use lots of technology; my children have occasionally called me “Inspector Gadget” because of all of the tools (my wife and children sometimes call them “toys”) I have accumulated over the years. However, I understand the limits of the technology that I use. I read the manuals, heed the warnings, plan for failure, and worry about the potential consequences of inappropriately using technical devices. I know that no technology can overcome physical barriers; nothing I or anyone else can do will provide power from the wind when it is not blowing and nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable chemical combustion to provide reliable heat energy without both a source of oxygen and a place to dump the waste products. Nothing that I or anyone else can invent will enable oil extraction from a dry well. I also know that not everything that breaks can be fixed, even if there is an unlimited amount of time and money. Some breaks and fissures can never be welded shut or forced to heal. This is where I believe that humble engineers and technicians who are not driven by sales numbers have a huge role to play. Their (our) natural pessimism can help to reduce the consequences of always listening to the optimists, the people who say “damn the torpedoes”, “failure is not an option”, or “whatever it takes”. Failure is always possible. Before stretching limits it is important to recognize the consequences of the failure to determine if they are acceptable. If the reasonably predictable “worst possible event” results in consequences that cannot be accepted, the prudent course of action is to avoid the action in the first place. I place deepwater drilling for oil and gas into that category. It is pretty obvious that the possible consequences are unacceptable and that technological development has not yet found a way to mitigate those consequences. I am not sure what the limits of “deepwater” should be, but it is apparent that 5,000 feet is beyond the limit. I do not place operating nuclear energy production facilities in that category. However, there are very definitely some kinds of nuclear plants – like very large graphite-moderated, water-cooled reactors operated by people who override safety systems and ignore warning indications – that have proven that they can cause consequences that are not acceptable. The real value comes in determining what the reasonably predictable consequences might be and what failure modes are reasonable to assume. For people who have no firm foundation in real world mechanics, chemistry and physics, it is possible to spin all kinds of scary scenarios that depend on a series of impossible events. (Note: Just because I believe that there is always something that can go wrong, I do not believe that all things are possible.) My prescription for progress is not “faith” in engineers or technologists. It is for people to approach challenges with knowledge, a questioning attitude, humility and a willingness to expend the resources necessary to operate safely. A thirst for maximizing short term profits or an attitude of blind optimism are both incompatible with performing difficult tasks in potentially dangerous environments.

#### Tech optimism based on empirical research is good---prefer specific experts

Krier 1985 (James E. Krier, Professor of Law at the University of Michigan, “The Un-Easy Case for Technological Optimism,” Michigan Law Review, Vol. 84, No. 3; December 1985, pp. 405-429

A technological optimist is not simply a person with unqualified enthusiasm about technological promise. Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was an enthusiast, but he was not a technological optimist as the term is currently used. Saint-Simon, rather, was a utopian who happened to attach his vision to technocratic expertise.4 He was the forefather of Technocracy, an active utopian movement in the 1930s and one not entirely dead even today.5 Technological optimists are not utopians, but something less - let us say quasi-utopians, after a recent usage (applied to himself) of Robert Dahl's.6 Unlike any self-respecting pure utopian, quasi-utopians (and technological optimists) seek not perfection but tolerable imperfection, tolerable because it is better than anything else they consider attainable though not nearly as good as lots of alternatives that can be imagined. But technological optimists are also something more than mere believers, or faddists, or techniks.7 Their views are rigorously formulated, grounded in an apparent reality, based on knowledge and experience, and artfully defended. There are no crazies among the best of the optimists; they are conservative, respected experts who command enormous authority. They have a very specific position namely, "that exponential technological growth will allow us to expand resources ahead of exponentially increasing demands."8 This is the precise meaning of technological optimism as a term of art.

### Transition

#### No transition – its utopian

Barnhizer 2006 David Barnhizer (Professor of Law at Ohio State University, Articles Editor of the Ohio State Law Journal and then served as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow in Colorado Springs Legal Services Office, a Ford Urban Law Fellow, and a Clinical Teaching Fellow at the Harvard Law School, Senior Advisor to the International Program of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Senior Fellow for Earth Summit Watch, and General Counsel for the Shrimp Tribunal. He has served as Executive Director of The Year 2000 Committee) 2006 “waking from sustainability’s “impossible dream”” Georgetown environmental law review

Despite good intentions, empty dreams and platitudes may be counterproductive. This essay argues that the ideal of sustainability as introduced in the 1987 report of the Brundtland Commission and institutionalized in the form of Agenda 21 at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit is false and counterproductive. The ideal of sustainability assumes that we are almost god-like, capable of perceiving, integrating, monitoring, organizing, and controlling our world. These assumptions create an "impossible" character to the "dream" of sustainability in business and governmental decisionmaking. Sustainability of the Agenda 21 kind is a Utopian vision that is the enemy of the possible and the good. The problem is that while on paper we can always sketch elegant solutions that appear to have the ability to achieve a desired Utopia, such solutions work "if only" everyone will come together and behave in the way laid out in the "blueprint."7 Humans should have learned from such grand misperceptions as the French Enlightenment's failure to accurately comprehend the quality and limits of human nature or Marxism's flawed view of altruistic human motivation that the "if only" is an impossibly utopian reordering of human nature we will never achieve.8

#### Transition is impossible – time and human nature

Barnhizer 2006 David Barnhizer (Professor of Law at Ohio State University, Articles Editor of the Ohio State Law Journal and then served as a Reginald Heber Smith Community Lawyer Fellow in Colorado Springs Legal Services Office, a Ford Urban Law Fellow, and a Clinical Teaching Fellow at the Harvard Law School, Senior Advisor to the International Program of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Senior Fellow for Earth Summit Watch, and General Counsel for the Shrimp Tribunal. He has served as Executive Director of The Year 2000 Committee) 2006 “waking from sustainability’s “impossible dream”” Georgetown environmental law review

Medieval alchemists sought unsuccessfully to discover the process that would enable them to turn base metal into gold-assigning the name "Philosopher's Stone" to what they sought. The quest was doomed to failure. Just as a "sow's ear" cannot become a "silk purse," a base metal cannot become gold. Sustainability is impossible for the same reasons. It asks us to be something we are not, both individually and as a political and economic community. It is impossible to convert humans into the wise, selfless, and nearly omniscient creatures required to build and operate a system that incorporates sustainability. Even if it were ultimately possible (and it is not), it would take many generations to achieve and we are running out of time.