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#### A. Definitions

#### Increase means making an already existing thing greater

Buckley et al., 2006 (Jeremiah, attorney, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al., google)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

#### Two types of current viable solar power – Photovoltaic and Solar Thermal anti-freeze

Washington 11 (Nikia, “Solar Technology Shatters the Old Glass City”, http://blogs.bgsu.edu/blackswampjournal/2011/08/02/solar-technology-shatters-the-old-glass-city/) What is Solar Energy Solar power, as defined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is the energy received from the sun to create renewable energy. Two types of solar technologies currently exist in the market: photovoltaic, which collects energy from the sun to provide electricity, and concentrated solar energy (solar thermal), which magnifies the intensity of the sun to create heat. The solar thermal method uses the sun to warm an anti-freeze liquid in tubes called solar thermal collectors. The liquid is then transferred to a heating tank, commonly used for hot water and space heating. The photovoltaic method uses photovoltaic silicon cells, usually linked together to generate maximum power, to collect energy from the sun. A grid gathers the energy from the cells and then converts it to operational electricity.

#### B. Violation – Plan is not one of the resolutionally required energy types. OTEC is not solar energy

#### Even if they argue that they are solar power because they are solar energy - Ocean Thermal is distinct from Solar Thermal Energy

Raju 10 (OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION SEMINAR REPORT Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Master of Technology in Civil Engineering (Environmental Engineering) of the University of Kerala) Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) is a power generation method that utilizes small temperature difference between the warm surface water and cold deep water of the ocean. The present case study at Kumejima Island in southern part of Japan describes the performance simulation results of an OTEC plant that utilizes not only ocean thermal energy but also solar thermal energy as a heat source. This power generation system was termed SOTEC (solar-boosted ocean thermal energy conversion). In SOTEC, the temperature of warm sea water was boosted by using a typical low-cost solar thermal collector. The results show that the proposed SOTEC plant can potentially enhance the annual mean net thermal efficiency up to a value that is approximately 1.5 times higher than that of the conventional OTEC plant if a single-glazed flat-plate solar collector of 5000-m2 effective area is installed to boost the temperature of warm sea water by 20 K. The objective of the study was to estimate the potential thermal efficiency and required effective area of a solar collector for a 100-kWe SOTEC plant, study was carried out under the ambient conditions at Kumejima Island in southern part of Japan.

#### C. Prefer our Interpretation

1 – Limits – they justify every renewable energy being topical, as well as energy types not currently even considered renewable energies. Biofuels, Ocean, Wave energy since the sun influences the tides or even HUMAN PRODUCTION since we need the Sun for Vitamin E – there are also a very large number of ways that solar can be deployed in the future

Scott Sklar , founder and president of The Stella Group, Ltd., in Washington, DC, is the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Sustainable Energy Oct 23 2007 Coalitionhttp://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2007/10/whats-the-difference-between-solar-energy-and-solar-power-50358

Lee, this is a question I get often, and believe it is worth addressing. Solar "power" usually means converting the sun's rays (photons) to electricity. The solar technologies could be photovoltaics, or the various concentrating thermal technologies: solar troughs, solar dish/engines, and solar power towers.¶ Solar "energy" is a more generic term, meaning any technology that converts the sun's energy into a form of energy—so that includes the aforementioned solar power technologies, but also solar thermal for water heating, space heating and cooling, and industrial process heat. Solar energy includes solar daylighting and even passive solar that uses building orientation, design and materials to heat and cool buildings. Now in the early 1980's, I was Political Director of the Solar Lobby, formed by the big nine national environmental groups, that embraced all solar technologies—which we viewed as wind, hydropower, and biomass, along with the long list of traditional solar conversion technologies.

The thesis, which is correct, is that the sun contributes to growing plants, wind regimes, and evaporation and rain (hydropower), so that all the renewables are part of the solar family. Now, of course, most would argue that geothermal, and tidal and wave (effected by the gravitational force of the moon) are not solar, but we included these technologies as well.

2 – Ground – They can have internal links to advantages that we cannot be prepared to debate because they used an unpredictable energy type.

3 – Extra Topicality is an independent voting issue – it proves the resolution alone is insufficient to address the problem.

#### D. Topicality is a Voting Issue
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#### TEXT: The United States Navy should provide a grant for energy production from an Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion plant at Kaneohe Bay.

#### The CP is sufficient – Pearl is not perfect, and Kanehoe is adequate due to cable advantages – the margin of solvency is dwarfed by the link diffential on net benefits

Hawaii Hawaii OTEC OTEC Pilot Pilot Plant Plant Site Site Assessment Assessment and Survey 22 Fred Arnold NAVFAC Engineering Service Center June, 2010 <http://www.crrc.unh.edu/workshops/otec_2/site_assessment_arnold.pdf>

Project Overview • Funded by ONR Alternate Energy Program. • Obbjectives, Goalls, andd Taskking • Conduct  engineering technical assessment of three candidate Navy sites sites. • Collect high‐resolution survey data to support technical assessment. • Provide technical site data to LMCO for preliminary design of Pilot Plant. • Collaborate with NOAA to collect data to help define environmental baseline. • Provide Provide Navy Navy with with technical technical assessment assessment and and supporting supporting information for Hawaiian OTEC way forward discussion. Three Navy sites to be assessed.

• Pacific Pacific Missile Missile Range Range Facility Facility (PMRF) (PMRF), Kaua i Kaua‘i

• Joint Base Pearl Harbor – Hickam, Oahu

• Marine Corps Base Hawai­­i, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu Process

• Compile existing data of areas of interest into a comprehensive Desktop Study (DTS). • Conduct assessment and select the best technical site from DTS data data. • Conduct ocean survey of the identified best site. • Provide Provide data data toto and and assist assist Navy Navy Region Region Hawaii Hawaii inin selecting selecting pilot plant location. • Developed Site Evaluation Matrix to establish criteria Assessment  Process • Developed Site Evaluation Matrix to establish criteria and weights for evaluation • Grouped Grouped factors factors for for evaluation evaluation into into categories categories • Vetted the matrix and criteria with Navy, OTEC‐LM Team • Selected six sites for evaluation – Two each at PMRF, Kaneohe, and Pearl Harbor – Deepwater Site (1100m) and preferred anchoring site at each location – Criteria at all sites was min 20 Deg C Temp Differential)

#### Pearl Harbor coral reef are viable now

JStor Plant Science DECEMBER 5, 2011 Pearl Harbor, Coral Reefs, Reflective Surfaces, and FDR The content and the tools that comprise JSTOR Plant Science are driven by the plant science community, including leading experts around the world such as Sir Peter Crane, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew; Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Brian Huntley, South African National Biodiversity Institute Peter Raven, Missouri Botanical Garden Gideon Smith, South African National Biodiversity Institute Sebsebe Demissew, The National Herbarium, Addis Ababa University <http://jstorplants.org/2011/12/05/pearl-harbor-coral-reefs-reflective-surfaces-and-fdr/>

The coral, by the way, is actually relatively healthy and robust despite the presence of large numbers of non-endemic species that were introduced into the Pearl environment during the buildup of the navy base prior to World War I and the events of World War II. According to Wolanski, there have been several studies to determine the number of species in and around Pearl Harbor (including one study that solely attempted to document the organisms introduced solely by the USS Missouri during her time at Pearl Harbor in World War II-this was the ship on which the official surrender of Japan was signed). Overall, the point being that Pearl Harbor is ecologically strong, but certainly greatly effected by human activity.

#### Kanehoe coral are NOT viable due to dredging

Coral Relocation Project in Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii Report on Phase I Paul L. Jokiel, Ku’ulei S. Rodgers and Fred Farrell Coral Reef Assessment and Monitoring Program (CRAMP) University of Hawaii Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology P.O. Box 1346, Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744 April 22, 2005

Many of the coral reefs in Kaneohe Bay were severely damaged between 1937 and 1944 by a dredge and fill operations undertaken to create ship channe ls and seaplane runways during construction of the Kaneohe Naval Air Station (Devaney et al. 1982). A recent study (Uchino 2004) evaluated coral and fish communities at a dredged patch reef off Coconut Island in comparison to a nearby patch reef that was not dredged (Fig. 1). The study by Uchino demonstrated that the dredged reef has failed to recover substantially over the past 60 years, although environmental conditions for coral growth at that location are highly favorable. The limiting factor is the layer of fine sand on the dredged reef that has blocked new coral recruitment. Coral larvae cannot settle and grow on sand, but transplanted coral colonies will do extremely well under these conditions. This reef is close to the source of the salvaged corals and is an ideal site for restoration efforts

#### OTEC wrecks coral reefs via chlorine – putting it near them is a bad global model

John T. Harrison NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS FEBRUARY 1987 THE 40 MW, OTEC PLANT AT KAHE POINT, OAHU, HAWAII: A CASE STUDY OF POTENTIAL BIOLOGJCAL IMPACTS NO A A-T M - N M FS-S W FC - 6 8 <http://137.110.142.7/publications/TM/SWFSC/NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-68.PDF> ‘

Hazard of 8'11 Ammonia \_a Cblorine &lease--The hazardous nature of ammonia and chlorine makes strict safety precautions mandatory for OTEC. Should an accident occur with e i t h e r system, t h e r i s k s a r e s i m i l a r t o those f o r other i n d u s t r i a l a p p l i c a t i o n s involving these chemicals. Common a p p l i c a t i o n s involving ammonia include r e f r i g e r a t i o n systems f o r i c e skating rinks. Early i n d u s t r i a l r e f r i g e r a t i o n systems and i c e houses also used ammonia as t h e r e f r i g e r a t i o n working f l u i d . Ammonia commonly is used as a f e r t i l i z e r . Chlorination systems similar in s c a l e and function t o t h e OTEC system are used for municipal water treatment systems and f o r biofouling control in steam e l e c t r i c power generation systems (EPA 1974). Large volume s p i l l s of chlorine or ammonia on t h e LBCS of s u f f i c i e n t magnitude t o a f f e c t t h e p u b l i c at large are u n l i k e l y , but could result from severe plant damage due t o sabotage, large s h i p c o l l i s i o n s , or storms or earthquakes exceeding the 100-yr event standard used f o r plant design. A major leak caused by a c a t a s t r o p h i c accident o r n a t u r a l event m i g h t result i n a s p i l l of s u f f i c i e n t magnitude t o k i l l f i s h in the immediate area. A cloud of ammonia or chlorine vapor from such a c a t a s t r o p h i c incident also might spread beyond t h e plant boundaries. . A t t h e average temperature of Hawaiian seawater, about 60% of a major s p i l l of ammonia on t h e s e a s u r f a c e w i l l immediately d i s s o l v e and r e a c t w i t h seawater. The remaining 40% w i l l disperse t o t h e atmosphere. In a i n t o solution (EPA 1977). Due t o t h e d i s s o c i a t i o n r e a c t i o n of ammonia i n water, NH3 + H20 --> NH4+ + OH', seawater pH in the v i c i n i t y of a major s p i l l w i l l be elevated s u f f i c i e n t l y t o cause p r e c i p i t a t i o n of carbonates and m e t a l l i c hydroxides (Walsh 1981). Entrainment and d i l u t i o n of s p i l l e d ammonia and its by-products i n l o c a l current f i e l d s w i l l result i n dispersion of t h e s p i l l plume and gradual r e t u r n t o normal seawater conditions. Impacts to planktonic and benthic communities w i l l vary w i t h t h e extent and p e r s i s t e n c e of toxic concentrat i o n s r e s u l t i n g from t h e s p i l l , a s well as w i t h t h e location of t h e s p i l l . However, inconsistencies in p r i o r assessments of c a t a s t r o p h i c ammonia release (OTC 1984b) make i n t e r p r e t a t i o n of proposed scenarios somewhat d i f f i c u l t . Nearshore current models of t h e problem of ammonia release i n d i c a t e a range of p o t e n t i a l t o x i c plume d i s t r i b u t i o n s of from 7 t o 53 km (encompassing t h e majority of t h e Waianae coast) (Divoky et a l . 19841, and a corresponding p e r s i s t e n c e of from 2-1/4 t o 11 d. confined l i m i t of t h e t o x i c i t y range, t h e t h r e a t t o t h e c o a s t a l benthos appears s u f f i c i e n t t o warrant f u r t h e r study and adoption of s t r i n g e n t mitigation s t r a t e g i e s . Even a t the most A major chlorine leak a t t h e plant would r e l e a s e large volumes of chlorine gas. Because chlorine gas has a density much g r e a t e r than t h a t of a i r , it w i l l d i s s i p a t e more slowly than would a comparable s p i l l of ammonia. The chemistry of chlorine-seawater i n t e r a c t i o n s was discussed previously (Section 5.4). As w i t h ammonia s p i l l s , nearshore c i r c u l a t i o n p a t t e r n s w i l l determine the extent and p e r s i s t e n c e of toxic chlorine concentrations r e s u l t i n g from a c a t a s t r o p h i c s p i l l . Previous assessments (OTC 1984b) have indicated t h a t phytoplankton and zooplankton communities exposed to toxic chlorine l e v e l s (20.02 mg 1-l) (Hall et al. 1981) will be killed . However, no assessment of impacts to affected benthic communities has been made, despite the known sensitivity of coral reef communities to chlorine exposure (Johannes 1975). Although exchange r e a c t i o n s w i t h organic compounds i n t h e water column proceed r e l a t i v e l y slowly i n subtropical regions (Sansone and Kearney 19851, higher concentrations of organic materials on benthic surfaces may r e s u l t i n more rapid formation of p e r s i s t e n t , t o x i c halogenated amines as a consequence of plume i n t e r a c t i o n w i t h t h e benthos. Similar dispersion c a l c u l a t i o n s t o those conducted f o r an ammonia s p i l l place t h e nearshore benthos along t h e Waianae coast a t s u b s t a n t i a l p o t e n t i a l r i s k .

#### Coral reefs are key to human survival.

Philippine Daily Inquirer 02. (“REEFS UNDER STRESS”, 12-10, L/N)

The artificial replacement of corals is a good start. Coral reefs are the marine equivalent of rainforests that are also being destroyed at an alarming rate not only in the Philippines but all over the world. The World Conservation Union says reefs are one of the "essential life support systems" necessary for human survival, homes to huge numbers of animals and plants. Dr. Helen T. Yap of the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines said that the country's coral reefs, together with those of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, contain the biggest number of species of plants and animals. "They lie at the center of biodiversity in our planet," she said.
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#### Race tight but it has tipped to Obama – momentum arguments don’t matter.

Nate Silver, 10-24-2012, is an American statistician, sabermetrician, psephologist, and writer, he correctly predicted the winner of 49 of the 50 states, economic consultant with KPMG in Chicago, FiveThirtyEight, New York Times, “Oct. 24: In Polls, Romney’s Momentum Seems to Have Stopped,” <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/oct-24-in-polls-romneys-momentum-seems-to-have-stopped/#more-36636>

The term “momentum” is used very often in political coverage — but reporters and analysts seldom pause to consider what it means. Let me tell you what I think it ought to mean: that a body in motion tends to stay in motion. That is, it ought to imply that a candidate is gaining ground in the race — and, furthermore, that he is likely to continue to gain ground. As a thesis or prediction about how polls behave, this notion is a bit dubious, especially in general elections. In races for the United States Senate, for instance, my research suggests that a candidate who gains ground in the polls in one month (say, from August to September) is no more likely to do so during the next one (from September to October). If anything, the candidate who gains ground in the polls in one month may be more likely to lose ground the next time around. (Where might there be clearer evidence for momentum, as I’ve defined it? In primaries, especially when there are multiple candidates in the race and voters are behaving tactically in choosing among them. But there is little evidence of it in general elections.) The way the term “momentum” is applied in practice by the news media, however, it usually refers only to the first part of the clause — meaning simply that a candidate has been gaining ground in the polls, whether or not he might continue to do so. (I’ve used this phrasing plenty of times myself, so I have no real basis to complain about it.) But there are other times when the notion of momentum is behind the curve — as it probably now is if applied to Mitt Romney’s polling. Mr. Romney clearly gained ground in the polls in the week or two after the Denver debate, putting himself in a much stronger overall position in the race. However, it seems that he is no longer doing so. Take Wednesday’s national tracking polls, for instance. (There are now eight of them published each day.) Mr. Romney gained ground in just one of the polls, an online poll conducted for Reuters by the polling organization Ipsos. He lost ground in five others, with President Obama improving his standing instead in those surveys. On average, Mr. Obama gained about one point between the eight polls. This is the closest that we’ve come in a week or so to one candidate clearly having “won” the day in the tracking polls — and it was Mr. Obama. The trend could also be spurious. If the race is steady, it’s not that hard for one candidate to gain ground in five of six polls (excluding the two that showed no movement on Wednesday) just based on chance alone. What isn’t very likely, however, is for one candidate to lose ground in five of six polls if the race is still moving toward him. In other words, we can debate whether Mr. Obama has a pinch of momentum or whether the race is instead flat, but it’s improbable that Mr. Romney would have a day like this if he still had momentum. The FiveThirtyEight model looks at a broader array of polls — including state polls — in order to gauge the overall trend in the race. Our “now-cast” also finds a slightly favorable trend for Mr. Obama over the course of the past 10 days or so. Mr. Romney’s position peaked in the “now-cast” on Friday, Oct. 12, at which point it estimated a virtual tie in the popular vote (Mr. Obama was the projected “winner” by 0.3 percentage points).

#### Obama blunting the Republican edge on veterans – they are key in every swing state – Romney convention speech proves symbolic politics matter.

Linda J. Bilmes is a professor at Harvard University 10/23, 2012 Veterans should flex their electoral muscles in November

Read more here: http://www.thenewstribune.com/2012/10/23/2341437/veterans-should-flex-their-electoral.html#storylink=cpy

Veterans could play a key role in deciding whether Mitt Romney or Barack Obama is in the White House next year. The swing states – Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, Nevada, Colorado and Ohio – have high concentrations of vets. And veterans as a group are twice as likely to vote as the rest of the electorate. No surprise, then, that both candidates are heavily courting their votes. Veterans have traditionally favored Republicans. In 2008, Sen. John McCain won the overall veterans vote 55 percent to 45 percent, and George W. Bush had a 16-point margin over John Kerry in 2004. Polling suggests that Romney has an edge this year too, but the race for the veteran vote is not over. The cohort is more youthful – with more than 2 million troops newly returned from Iraq and Afghanistan – and their party loyalty is far from settled. Some 40 percent of new veterans are registered as independents, with the remainder evenly split between the parties. Moreover, for the first time in 80 years, none of the four candidates for president and vice president has served in the military. A few key issues are likely to influence the vote. These include the prevalence of joblessness, homelessness, post-traumatic stress disorder and suicide among veterans, the chronic backlog of benefit claims at the Department of Veterans Affairs, the implementation of the post-9/11 GI Bill for education, the difficulties facing women in the military, and the national security and defense budget. Despite the GOP’s advantage in the polls, President Barack Obama has some strengths that could attract the veterans vote. He is generally acknowledged to have made veterans a top priority of his first term. He appointed retired four-star Army Gen. Eric K. Shinseki to be VA secretary, the highest-ranking military official ever to serve in this position. He increased the VA budget by 25 percent, funding substantial increases in mental health care and expanding VA medical coverage to more National Guard, reservists and other vets who had been pruned from the rolls during the Bush era. The VA implemented the post-9/11 GI bill with relatively few glitches, which has enabled 800,000 new veterans and family members to attend college. Shinseki has set a new tone at the VA, making it easier for veterans to claim benefits for mental health issues and for exposure to chemicals in Vietnam and the Persian Gulf War. Homelessness among veterans has been cut in half. Using his military seniority, Shinseki was able to persuade the Defense Department to begin consolidating medical records with the VA – still a work in progress, but it reversed decades of infighting between the two government bureaucracies. Obama has introduced tax credits for businesses that hire unemployed vets, strengthened hiring preferences for vets in the federal government, and partnered with the private sector to host job fairs around the country. Jill Biden and Michelle Obama have actively pushed the “Joining Forces” initiative, which has increased visibility on the challenges faced by military families. For many veterans, however, those things aren’t enough. They’re skeptical about Obama’s proposed defense cuts, and they are extremely worried about jobs. Unemployment among Iraq and Afghanistan-era veterans is still around 10 percent, after hovering at more than 12 percent throughout 2011. For female veterans the picture is especially bleak, with nearly 20 percent unable to find work. Veterans and employers report difficulty in translating military experience into civilian skills. (As one veteran explained to me: “They say – this guy drove a tank and we don’t have a tank here, so this person is not qualified to work here.”) The administration’s tax credits have not worked as well as hoped because many businesses are too small to use them. And the new GI Bill is under attack in some quarters because of a loophole that has given unfair advantages to for-profit schools. Romney is pinning his hopes on older veterans, for whom the size of the defense budget is a defining issue. The prospect of cuts in the size of the Army or reducing the number of Navy carriers worries this group of veterans. The consensus in Washington today, reflected in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles recommendations, is that the Pentagon will need to become leaner over the next decade. But Romney has pledged to add 100,000 troops, build more military weapons, forgo military cuts and peg defense spending at a minimum of 4 percent of GDP. In doing so, he has staked out a core position on military spending that sets him apart from the president and much of the Washington establishment. Romney does have some negatives, however, that don’t play well with veterans. He was criticized for not mentioning veterans during his acceptance speech at the Republican convention. And he hasn’t been helped by the Republicans in Congress, who in September blocked passage of the Veterans Jobs Corps Act, a bill that would have hired thousands of veterans as police officers, firefighters and first responders. Younger veterans were furious. “The Congress let partisan bickering stand in the way of putting thousands of America’s heroes back to work,” said Paul Rieckhoff, founder of the bipartisan Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. These topics will be at the top of the agenda in coming weeks, and veterans should use their electoral power to demand that the candidates be very specific about how they will use the next four years to benefit those who have served our nation.

#### Building at Pearl Harbor leads to veteran backlash.

<http://kealohaenergy.kealohaestate.com/2012/10/15/navys-plan-for-a-solar-farm-at-pearl-harbor-meets-opposition/> Navy’s Plan for a Solar Farm at Pearl Harbor Meets Opposition Blog, Featured, News & Media By Laura Poirier – Renewable Energy World October 15, 2012

In keeping with the military’s goal of 50% renewable energy for all bases by 2020, the U.S. Navy has been planning to build a Honolulu solar farm at the Pearl Harbor site in Honolulu, Hawaii. The Pearl Harbor Naval Base is on the National Register of Historic Places with many buildings still showing the damage done by the 1941 Japanese attack and it is a major tourist destination in the Hawaiian islands. The plans for the new solar farm have been met with opposition from groups like the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association and other veterans who feel that adding fields of Hawaii solar panels will irreparably mar the historically important site by giving it an industrial feel. Mal Middlesworth, a member of the Survivors Association, told the Los Angeles Times, “Ford Island is one of the most sacred areas of the Pacific Theater. It’s a national shrine. I don’t understand the Navy.” Proponents of the project argue that the site chosen at Pearl Harbor is an old air strip that has been overgrown with weeds and solar panels would actually improve its appearance while also providing clean energy to the base. The panels would help the Navy save some $1.5 million in energy costs in just the first year of operation. “We look at this as an opportunity to preserve what is on Ford Island while taking advantage of new technologies to secure our energy future,” said Capt. Mike Williamson, who is in charge of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command in Hawaii.

Controversial

#### Romney will label china a currency manipulator – not a bluff

Palmer, 12

Doug, Trade Journalist @ Reuters, 3/12, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328

Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation-adviser¶ Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney is looking at ways to increase pressure on China over what he sees as currency manipulation and unfair subsidy practices, a Romney campaign adviser said on Tuesday.¶ "I think he wants to maximize the pressure," Grant Aldonas, a former undersecretary of commerce for international trade, said at a symposium on the future of U.S. manufacturing. Aldonas served at the Commerce Department under Republican President George W. Bush.¶ Romney, the front-runner in the Republican race to challenge President Barack Obama for the White House in November, has promised if elected he would quickly label China a currency manipulator, something the Obama administration has six times declined to do.¶ That would set the stage, under Romney's plan, for the United States to impose countervailing duties on Chinese goods to offset the advantage of what many consider to be China's undervalued currency.¶ Last year, the Democratic-controlled Senate passed legislation to do essentially the same thing.¶ However, the measure has stalled in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where leaders say they fear it could start a trade war, and the Obama administration has not pushed for a House vote on the currency bill.¶ The U.S. Treasury Department on April 15 faces a semi-annual deadline to declare whether any country is manipulating its currency for an unfair trade advantage. The department, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has not cited any country since 1994, when China was last named.¶ Asked if Romney was serious about declaring China a currency manipulator, Aldonas answered: "He is."

#### China bashing causes the mother of all trade wars.

Carmosky 2011 (Janet Carmosky, September 8, 2011, “China Bashing Season Officially Kicks Off,” Forbes, google)

In the past 24 hours both Mitt Romney and House Democrats have unleashed the threat of labeling China as a Currency Manipulator. There is talk of employing sanctions, of taking steps to launch the mother of all trade wars. Let’s be clear: in the event of a “divorce” of the G2, everyone suffers. It’s primary season, though. Republican or Democratic, the rhetoric implies we have a moral imperative to punish China for its economic success. Although we bought the goods that gave China a trade surplus, and sold the T-Bills that allow them to hold 8% of our total deficit, the implication is that Beijing has foisted an agenda hostile to the USA upon us, and must be stopped from continuing, even if stopping them destroys US-China relations. No place in this narrative for the fact that China is by far the USA’s fastest growing export partner; nor that a faster devaluation of the Yuan raises the risks of a financial crash in both nations, hence the world overall. The two nations are in this together. A trade war would be damaging all around. Will the satisfaction of having a clear enemy (that isn’t us) be worth it? Moral indignation may play well on the podium; recognize however, that to the extent we view economics as moral philosophy, we must also allow that it is subject to different interpretation in different cultural contexts.

#### US-China trade conflict guts relations and is the most likely scenario for escalation

**Landy 2007** (Ben Landy, Director of Research and Strategy at the Atlantic Media Company, April 3, 2007, google)

The greatest threat for the 21st century is that these economic flare-ups between the US and China will not be contained, but might spill over into the realm of military aggression between these two world powers. Economic conflict breeds military conflict. The stakes of trade override the ideological power of the Taiwan issue. China’s ability to continue growing at a rapid rate takes precedence, since there can be no sovereignty for China without economic growth. The United States’ role as the world’s superpower is dependent on its ability to lead economically. As many of you will know from reading this blog, I do not believe that war between the US and China is imminent, or a foregone conclusion in the future. I certainly do not hope for war. But I have little doubt that protectionist policies, on both sides, greatly increase the likelihood of conflict – far more than increases in military budgets and anti-satellite tests.

#### Key to solve laundry list.

**Hickey 2011** (Dennis V. Hickey, James F. Morris Endowed Professor of Political Science and Director of the Graduate Program in Global Studies at the distinguished Missouri State University, Harvard of the Midwest, “Sino-US cooperation essential,” China Daily, google)

After all, cooperation between the two governments is essential if the international community hopes to cope with a wide range of pressing global problems, including terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, environmental degradation, health issues, dwindling energy supplies and the continuing global economic crisis, to name just a few. Given the stakes involved, it is likely that President Hu and President Obama will work hard during their meetings to manage disagreements and keep them from escalating. As a first step, however, both leaders could follow the advice of Henry Ford, founder of the Ford Motor Company, who advised that "if there is any one secret of success, it lies in the ability to get the other person's point of view and see things from his angle as well as your own".

## OFF

#### The affirmative takes part in the naturalization of the military as the optimal mode of politics- this creates a Clauswitzian political sphere where war is the only political choice

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

These stratocratic controls of planetary human activity reveal more than the ideology of a single administration; they are an extension of what we can now see as the complete devotion to an apparatus that captures all cultural and political energies in terms of what Clausewitz defined as "policy." The original state of "emergency" as defined by the Bush Administration in the wake of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks has been naturalized and sedimented as to become a fundamental starting point of human existence. Consequently, understanding the full intensity of the age of militariality requires more than the common critical awareness of Clausewitz's central doctrine: "War is merely the continuation of policy by other means" (28). It requires first an understanding that for Clausewitz, war is the very ontological basis of human existence, a basis that transcends culture, history and temporality. War defines the very structure of human subjectivity, a juridico-natural "code of law" that is "deeply rooted" in a people, an army, a government: "war is a paradoxical trinity—composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy" (30). Clausewitz assigns a constituency to each of the registers of this trinity: "The first of these…mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government" [End Page 143] (30). In a totalizing problematic organized according to the idea of war serving as the basis of human existence, the people of a nation are equated with that of a blind primordial force of violence: "the first," which refers to "primordial violence, hatred, and enmity" identifies the people living in the nation. "Government" therefore names that entity constituted for the exclusive purpose of controlling its unstable citizenry by reorienting the energies of the people towards warfare. This reorientation lays the groundwork and delineates the horizon of human creativity, and determines the single legitimized space of freedom: the army, where the "creative spirit is free to roam." The space of instability, of chance, which is the condition for the possibility of creativity, enters into the war-footing picture of reality only on this register of militarized human activity. This connection here is not a matter of association; military activity defines the very essence of freedom and human creativity. The army and its state are not defined in this picture in traditional terms of democracy, protection, and service to a people. Nor are they the a sign of the discourse of biopower, for biopower has its eyes on the productivity of a population and functions according to a general administration of life that, although affecting "distributions around a norm," still invites and produces a certain amount of heterogeneity (Foucault 266). The army and the state are instead named as the necessary foundational machinic force that determines the war footing constitution of humanity, ensuring that all its energies are channeled in a single direction: "The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people" (Clausewitz 31). The government and the army, in fact, only arise and become increasingly indispensable as the movement of humans through history becomes more "civilized" and "intellectually developed": "In any primitive, warlike race, the warrior spirit is far more common than among civilized peoples. It is possessed by almost every warrior: but in civilized societies only necessity will stimulate it in the people as a whole, since they lack the natural disposition for it" (45). This explains the constant disdain for "intellectuals," for they are understood to be part of the general problem of the so-called civilizing process, the "general intellectual development of a given society" (45, italics in original). This intellectual development is a double-edged sword for Clausewitz and the war-footing polity. On the one hand Clausewitz must have access to at least a modicum of classificatory procedures, otherwise he would not be able to establish the lesser other whose constitution makes possible the essential act of war. On the other hand the non-primitive human consciousness must acquire "appropriate gifts of intellect and temperament" and not be distinguished by "great power(s) of meditation" (44, 48). Instead what is needed is "mental force," a "firmness" of opinion that does not waver: "We say a man has strength of character, or simply has character, if he sticks to his convictions….Such firmness cannot show itself, of course, if a man keeps changing his mind" (54, [End Page 144] emphasis in original).11 This affects the realm of knowledge production as well, for "Knowledge in war is very simple"; and a "high degree of education" simply leads to "ridiculous pedantry" (96, 95, emphasis in original). It is not that life and the political have collapsed in the total politicization of life, as Agamben argues, or not solely. This collapse is only one of the outcomes of the total militarization of the biopolitical settlement, of the bios. The civil bios has no role in this problematic; it does not even exist. In this characterization war, and not biopower, becomes the very basis of the political: "war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse"; "The political object is the goal, war is the means of reaching it" (28, 29). We can see the full manifestation of Clausewitz's polity as war in the truth-statements of militariality advocates. "Step 8" of War Footing, is clear: "Wage Political Warfare" (136). A month after 9/11 Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld launched the Office of Strategic Influence (OSI). The OSI is "a component of a broader, government-wide strategic communications campaign, specifically [designed] to assist government agencies in crafting policy regarding the military aspects of information operations" (139). The program was shut down, but its advocates make it clear that it should be revived as soon as possible, on the grounds that its tight connection between information and militarization can bring about the planned unidirectional metaphysical orientation of warfare with greater speed than any other approach. Militariality sets up a program for direct political warfare and stands that against the "far more limited effort known as 'public diplomacy'": "even when they are well conceived and well executed...public diplomacy strategies will be a long-term effort. This is in their nature, given the reliance they place on such instruments as international media programming, exchange visits of political and cultural figures, humanitarian and development assistance, training future leaders, and so forth. Such efforts take years....And we do not have the luxury of time" (141). The suggestions for a plan of action include the immediate execution of a political warfare strategy, the drafting of legislative vehicles for political warfare, the strengthening of CIA clandestine services, the housing of the primary responsibility for political warfare in the Department of Defense, and the direct use of the Internet as a tool of political warfare (143–145). The consequences to be drawn from all of this are severe. Information in the post-9/11 state of constant "emergency" generated by the government of the Bush administration and its war footing organizations must now be identified as organizing not only the general political arrangement of life but the greater and more amorphous register of civil existence as well. It is in this sense that we are witnessing the creation of a new World Stratocratic Picture, a new totality, one that has its telos in the total control of the totality (the subtext of the above passage concerning diplomacy is its dependency on an actual engagement with an international community, a dependency that violates the [End Page 145] unilateral orientation adhering to the decision-making process of the military polity). In the creation of a totality capable of being totally controlled the indissoluble connection between the political and the civil changes dramatically. It can no longer be said that the civil is indirectly tied to the political. The line between the two may never have been solid, but in the "state of exception," which installs a justification for acting "outside the normal order" of a democratic polity, sites of human production, knowledge, information, media reports, entertainment, the Internet, defense, militarization, representation, and human consciousness itself, all flow in and out of one another so as to confuse any possibility of making clear distinctions between them. The political regime, progressively acting directly on the civil register, diminishes the civil register to the point of its eventual erasure. With the erosion of the civil register it becomes clearer that metamilitarization appears increasingly as an essential technique of the polity rather than an exceptional measure. A war footing philosophy thus becomes the very constitutive paradigm of remaining popular civil institutions such as the media and film production. Sound bite culture is only one sign of this.

#### This creates the psychological priming for conflict- most probable explanation for why we go to war

Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois ‘4 (Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn) (Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34). Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite. As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematic- ally and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families. Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative. This rejection opens up spaces to create discourses alternative to the American exceptional military project

Robert P. Marzec, rmarzec@purdue.edu, is Associate Professor of English literature and postcolonial studies at Purdue University, and associate editor of Modern Fiction Studies The Global South Volume 3, Number 1, Spring 2009 “Militariality” Project Muse

All of these transformations owe their existence, of course, to a long and complex history that cannot be articulated in the space available here. The cords of militariality extend back to a number of historical developments in ontological thought, judiciary systems, agricultural reorganizations, sovereign displacements, national reterritorializations, economic restructurings, and the colonial expansions that have generated today's international community. These cords are more difficult to see than those present in the stratocracy itself—one fact of militariality's character that opens a pathway for a real awareness of its increasing excessiveness and thus the potential for resistances to develop across ethnic, religious, and national lines. The paradox of militariality's strength and simultaneous fragility is precisely this visible excessiveness, which is part of its self-destructive essence. The greater problem is in some sense the development of a general awareness of those previously-existing discourses of modern liberal humanism that so easily establish, time and again, the stratocratic polities of the modern era. Even so, the visible nature of these cords of militariality—its direct daylight attacks on and incarcerations of foreign and domestic constituencies, its fully mediatized legal signings, its denouncements of the educational system and the international community—should not be understood as lacking in power. Any criticism of militariality will need to take into consideration the heavy economic, material, and faith-based investments in its project and continual existence. These investments hide the stratocracy's hysterization of the [End Page 147] polity with the general concept of necessity: it is necessary to take this action because we are under attack.12 But, if it still can be said that democracy owes its existence to the kind of interrogative thinking that challenges the unrelenting necessities forced on human existence, then it may come to be known that necessity will be the end of democracy, and the constabularies of militariality the architects of this end.

## COLONIES

#### Overpopulation not a problem – aging populations and low birthrate

Ertelt 2011 (Steven, “New Video: 7 Billion People on Earth is Not Overpopulation,” October 10, http://www.lifenews.com/2011/10/04/new-video-7-billion-people-on-earth-is-not-overpopulation/)

The Population Research Institute (PRI) just released the fifth episode of their highly popular YouTube cartoon video series just in time for the world’s population to reach 7 billion people. The series notes how the Earth is not overpopulated — since many countries are seeing aging populations and worker shortages. The latest video, available at [www.overpopulationisamyth.com](http://www.overpopulationisamyth.com), is about two minutes long, and it deals with the issues surrounding the latest milestone of 7 billion people on the planet. The video aims to show that, according to the UN’s latest data, the world’s population is not skyrocketing out of control, but rather slowing to a standstill before plummeting downward again. “We set out to be entertaining first,” says Colin Mason, PRI’s Director of Media Production and the video’s editor. “We figure if we can be funny and interesting visually, people will absorb the concepts.” “Essentially,” Mason continues, “when people see the rate at which we’re adding a billion people, they automatically assume that our population is ballooning at an unsustainable rate. But that’s not the case at all . . . and most of the time, all it takes is a simple explanation of the math and people get it. The hard part is getting them interested enough to do that. That’s what we hope to accomplish with these videos.” Steven Mosher, PRI’s president, adds: “The fight against the myth of overpopulation does not have to be a bare-knuckled brawl. These videos are funny and easy to digest, the very opposite of Al Gore’s boring pronouncements on the ‘dangers’ of too many people. Our viewers end up considering the science that supports our pro-people position, often for the very first time. We say to our skeptics: watch, laugh, and learn.” In May, the Population Division of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs released a projection that the world population will reach 7 billion on October 31. The UNFPA used this as an opportunity to call for more family planning services in order to decrease fertility rates worldwide. This is a not so subtle call for more population control. “The call for population control is a false alarm. Birthrates are already dropping worldwide. Many countries have fertility rates that are well below replacement rate,” [notes Bill Saunders](http://www.lifenews.com/2011/05/11/un-calls-for-population-control-as-global-birthrates-decline/), an attorney with Americans United for Life. “In order to maintain a steady population that does not increase and does not decrease, a country must have a fertility rate of 2.1. This is the replacement rate. If each woman has an average of 2.1 children, she will replace herself and a man, and allow for the occasion in which some children will not make it to maturity in order to replace themselves. A fertility rate below 2.1 children per woman means that a country will not replace itself.” “Russia is a perfect example of this. Today Russia’s population is disappearing. From 1985 to 1990, Russia had a fertility rate that just met replacement, 2.12 children per woman. Russia’s fertility rate dropped drastically from 2005 to 2010, to 1.44 children per woman.[2] Similarly, Russia’s total population has decreased from 148,244,000 people in 1990, to 142,958,000 in 2010.[3] That is a decrease of 5,268,000 people in 20 years. A significant factor is Russia’s declining birthrate is abortion. An unofficial estimate signifies that there are 4 million abortions a year in Russia as compared to only 1.7 million live births,” he explained. “Russia is not the only country with a fertility rate that is below replacement. Most of Europe is suffering from this demographic crisis. Italy, Spain, Germany, and Portugal and others had fertility rates close to 1.4 children per woman from 2005 to 2010.[6] Furthermore, worldwide fertility rates have dropped by nearly 50% since 1950,” Saunders continued. “Countries with birthrates that are significantly below replacement rate face the challenge of decreased workforce, decreased consumption, and decreased ability to defend their borders. The impact of years of “population control” propaganda and abortion, on the world’s fertility has been devastating. Instead of continuing down that path, the United Nations should take a leaf out of Russia’s book and try to think of ways to strengthen the family and increase fertility worldwide.”

#### Space colonization is impossible—other planets are uninhabitable.

Jeffrey Bell, 11/25/2005. Former space scientist and Adjunct Professor for Planetary Science at the Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics & Planetologyat the University of Hawaii. “The Dream Palace of the Space Cadets,” http://www.spacedaily.com/news/oped-05zzb.html.

Unfortunately, the new generation of organizations like the Space Frontier Foundation and the Mars Society and even¶ the staid National Space Society mostly lack something that the old L-5 Society and Space Studies Institute had: technical¶ sophistication. Just look at Bob Zubrin's vision of Mars colonization. Nowhere in Zubrin's books is there the¶ kind of detailed engineering design for Mars colonies that the O'Neillians produced for their L-5 colonies. The¶ problems of sustaining human life on Mars are dismissed after superficial discussions devoid of any hard¶ numbers. And there are obvious problems with colonizing Mars. The first one is that it gets incredibly cold¶ there - probably down to -130C on winter nights. Every robot Mars probe has used small slugs of Pu-238 to keep its batteries from¶ freezing at night. And there is air on Mars - not enough to breathe, but enough to conduct heat. The Martian¶ regolith will not be the perfect insulator that the Moon's is. Thermal control on Mars will not be simply a matter of¶ adding layers of aluminum foil to reflect the sun. Bases and rovers will need to be insulated and heated. And¶ how do you keep a human in a spacesuit warm in this climate? And Mars has permafrost - at least in some¶ places and those places are the ones to colonize. How do we keep the heat leaking out from our habitat or¶ farm greenhouse into the ground from heating up the ice and melting or subliming it away? This is a severe¶ problem in permafrost areas of the Earth - how bad will it be on Mars? Zubrin even proposes underground habitats. These¶ will be in direct contact with the cold subsoil or bedrock which will suck heat out at a rapid rate. If Gerard O'Neill was still alive and advocating Mars¶ colonies, he would be doing some basic thermal transfer calculations to see how bad the Martian cold problem really is. He would be figuring out how¶ big a fission reactor to send along to keep the colony warm and how often its core will need to be replenished by fresh U-235 from Earth. He would¶ even have a rough number for the amount of Pu-238 everyone will have to carry in their spacesuit backpacks. Bob Zubrin is perfectly¶ competent to do these calculations since he has a Ph.D. in nuclear engineering. But you never see this kind of¶ hard engineering analysis from the Mars Society. Instead, we get propaganda stunts like the Devon Island "Mars Base"¶ which is only manned during the peak of the Arctic summer when the climate is tropical compared with that of Mars. Another thing you¶ never see from the Mars Society is a realistic discussion of what would happen to the human body in the low¶ Martian gravity. Zubrin has discussed at length the need for artificial spin gravity on the 6 month trip to Mars. But he assumes that the problem¶ ends once the astronauts land on Mars. The problem of bone loss in a 0.38g field on Mars for ~18 months is completely ignored. When I read¶ Zubrin's book The Case For Mars, I was so intrigued by this surprising omission that I consulted a friend who is a space medic at¶ JSC. He tells me that this issue was once discussed at a conference of medical doctors who had actually worked¶ with the long-term residents of Mir and ISS. NONE of these experts thought that humans could adapt¶ permanently to Mars gravity!

#### OTEC construction increases the costs of electricity

Ocean Energy Council, “What is the cost of OTEC energy?,” February 15, 2008, <http://www.oceanenergycouncil.com/index.php/Ocean-Thermal-OTEC/What-is-the-cost-of-OTEC-energy.html>, accessed 10-27-2012.

At the present time, despite the fact that OTEC systems have no fuel costs and can produce useful by-products, the high initial cost of building such power plants makes OTEC generated electricity more expensive than conventional alternatives.¶ As such, OTEC systems at the present time are restricted to experimental and demonstration units. Island nations which currently rely on expensive, imported fossil fuels for electrical generation are the most promising market for OTEC.

#### High energy prices jack up food prices – means drastic cuts in food aid

Tom Capehart, Specialist in Agricultural Policy¶ Resources, Science and Industry Division, and ¶ Joe Richardson¶ Specialist in Domestic Social Policy¶ Domestic Social Policy Division, “Food Price Inflation: Causes and Impacts,” Congressional Research Service, April 10, 2008, <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RS22859_20080410.pdf>, accessed 10-25-2012.

Higher commodity and food prices reduce our ability to provide food aid to other¶ countries without additional appropriations. Food aid usually takes the form of basic food¶ grains such as wheat, sorghum, and corn, and vegetable oil — commodities critical to¶ developing-country diets. Since there is very little value added for these commodities,¶ shifts in prices translate directly into higher prices for food-insecure countries or reduced¶ food aid contributions per dollar spent. Also, higher energy costs have increased shipping¶ costs for both food purchases and food aid. Unlike some domestic nutrition programs,¶ foreign food aid is not adjusted to account for changing costs. After a long period of¶ declining food costs, developing countries are facing increased food import bills — for¶ some countries as high as 25% in 2007.¶ 13¶ The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has indicated that rising¶ food and fuel prices would result in a significant reduction in emergency food aid.¶ According to press reports in March 2008, USAID expects a $200 million shortfall in¶ funding to meet emergency food aid needs. For FY2008, Congress appropriated $1.2¶ billion for P.L. 480 food aid, the same as FY2007. For FY2009, the President’s budget¶ again requested $1.2 billion. In six out of ten years since 1999, supplemental funding for¶ P.L. 480 Title II food aid has been appropriated.¶ Last year, the U.N. World Food Program (WFP) estimated it would need $2.9 billion¶ to cover 2008 food aid needs. Recent commodity, energy, and food cost increases have¶ boosted this estimate to $3.4 billion. According to the WFP, the current price increases¶ force the world’s poorest people to spend a larger proportion of their income on food.

#### No resource wars

Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3 http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs. But popular accounts typically do not look at the dogs that do not bark. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, food scarcity and hunger are problems endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, food shortages and malnutrition affect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and state failure. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). In short, resource scarcity, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare; therefore, environmental conditions, by themselves, cannot predict violent outbreaks. Second, even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare and state collapse. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions – not just the response of central governments – in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so. Third, states often bear responsibility for environmental degradation and resource shortfalls, either through their own projects and initiatives or through neglect of the environment. Clearly, climate change itself is an exogenous stressor beyond the control of individual governments. However, government policies and neglect can compound the effects of climate change. Nobel Prizewinning economist Amartya Sen finds that, even in the face of acute environmental scarcities, countries with democratic institutions and press freedoms work to prevent famine because such states are accountable to their citizens (Sen, 1999). Others have similarly shown a strong relationship between democracy and protection of the environment (Li & Reuveny, 2006). Faced with global warming, some states will take the necessary steps to conserve water and land, redistribute resources to those who need them most, and develop disaster-warning and -response systems. Others will do little to respond to this threat. While a state’s level of income and technological capacity are certainly important, democracy – or, more precisely, the accountability of political leaders to their publics – is likely to be a critical determinant of how states respond to the challenge. Fourth, violent conflict is an inefficient and sub-optimal reaction to changes in the environment and resource scarcities. As environmental conditions change, several possible responses are available, although many journalists and policymakers have focused on the potential for warfare. Individuals can migrate internally or across borders, or they can invest in technological improvements, develop conservation strategies, and shift to less climate-sensitive livelihoods, among other adaptation mechanisms. Engaging in armed rebellion is quite costly and risky and requires large-scale collective action. Individuals and households are more likely to engage in simpler, personal, or smallscale coping strategies. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the individual level. But, more importantly, armed violence against the state is used as a means to gain leverage over governments so as to gain some form of accommodation, namely, the redistribution of economic resources and political power. Organized armed violence rarely (if ever) arises spontaneously but is usually pursued when people perceive their government to be unwilling to listen to peaceful petitions. As mentioned above, rebellion does not distribute resources by itself, and protracted civil wars can have devastating effects on the economy and the natural environment, leaving fewer resources to bargain over. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the collective level. Responsive, accountable political leaders – at all levels of government – are more likely to listen to citizen demands for greater access to resources and the means to secure their livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

#### No conflict over resources – your literature base overfocuses on instances of conflict – for every example to prove resource wars exist there are several examples that disprove it. Their research is based on dated data – cooperation is more likely

Simon Dalby (Dept. Of Geography, Carleton University) 2006 "Security and environment linkages revisited" in Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21st Century, www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/publications/SSIS/SSIS001.pdf)

In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

## NAVY

#### Grid resilient- Even worst case scenario it doesn’t hurt the military

Lewis 2010 (James Andrew Lewis, senior fellow and director of the Technology and Public Policy Program CSIS, March 2010, “The Electrical Grid as a Target for Cyber Attack,” http://csis.org/files/publication/100322\_ElectricalGridAsATargetforCyberAttack.pdf)

This conclusion is different from the strategic consequences on a cyber attack on the power grid. The United States routinely suffers blackouts. The nation does not collapse. In the short term, military power and economic strength are not noticeably affected - a good example for opponents to consider is Hurricane Katrina, which caused massive damage but did not degrade U.S. military power in or even long-term economic performance. Is there any cyber attack that could match the hurricane?¶ The United States is a very large collection of targets with many different pieces making up its electrical infrastructure. While a single attack could interrupt service, the large size and complexity of the American economy make it more resilient. Even without a Federal response plan, the ability of electrical companies to work quickly together to restore service is impressive and we should not underestimate the ingenuity of targets to recover much more rapidly than expected. This is a routine occurrence in aerial bombing: impressive damage is quickly rectified by a determined opponent.

#### Grid resilient

Clark 2012 (Paul Clark, MA candidate in Intelligence Studies at American Military University, April 28, 2012, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” American Military University, online)

In 2003, a simple physical breakdown occurred – trees shorted a power line and caused a¶ fault – that had a cascading effect and caused a power blackout across the Northeast (Lewis¶ 2010). This singular occurrence has been used as evidence that the electrical grid is fragile and¶ subject to severe disruption through cyber-attack, a disruption that could cost billions of dollars,¶ brings business to a halt, and could even endanger lives – if compounded by other catastrophic¶ events (Brennan 2012). A power disruption the size of the 2003 blackout, the worst in American¶ history at that time (Minkel 2008), is a worst case scenario and used as an example of the¶ fragility of the U.S. energy grid. This perceived fragility is not real when viewed in the context¶ of the robustness of the electrical grid.¶ When asked about cyber-attacks against the electrical grid in April of 2012, the¶ intelligence chief of U.S. Cyber Command Rear Admiral Samuel Cox stated that an attack was¶ unlikely to succeed because of the “huge amounts of resiliency built into the [electrical] system¶ that makes that kind of catastrophic thing very difficult” (Capaccio 2012). This optimistic view¶ is supported by an electrical grid that has proven to be robust in the face of large natural¶ catastrophes. Complex systems like the electrical grid in the U.S. are prone to failures and the¶ U.S. grid fails frequently. Despite efforts to reduce the risk out power outages, the risk is always¶ present. Power outages that affect more than 50,000 people have occurred steadily over the last¶ 20 years at a rate of 12% annually and the frequency of large catastrophes remains relatively¶ high and outages the size of the 2003 blackout are predicted to occur every 25 years (Minkel¶ 2008). In a complex system that is always at risk of disruption, the effect is mitigated by policies¶ and procedures that are meant to restore services as quickly as possible. The most visible of these policies is the interstate Emergency Management Assistance Compact, a legally binding¶ agreement allowing combined resources to be quickly deployed in response to a catastrophic¶ disaster such as power outages following a severe hurricane (Kapucu, Augustin and Garayev¶ 2009).¶ The electrical grid suffers service interruptions regularly, it is a large and complex system¶ supporting the largest economy in the world, and yet commerce does not collapse (Lewis 2010).¶ Despite blizzards, earthquakes, fires, and hurricanes that cause blackouts, the economy is¶ affected but does not collapse and even after massive damage like that caused by Hurricane¶ Katrina, national security is not affected because U.S. military capability is not degraded (Lewis¶ 2010).¶ Cyber-security is an ever-increasing concern in an increasingly electronic and¶ interconnected world. Cyber-security is a high priority “economic and national security¶ challenge” (National Security Council n.d.) because cyber-attacks are expected to become the¶ top national security threat (Robert S. Mueller 2012). In response to the threat Congress is¶ crafting legislation to enhance cyber-security (Brito and Watkins 2012) and the Department of¶ Homeland Security budget for cyber-security has been significantly increased (U.S. Senate¶ Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs 2012).

#### Turn- Status quo readiness is on the brink- funding for alternative energy trades-off with key missions- kills readiness

Dickenson ’12 (Bill Dickenson, Professor emeritus of geoscience at the University of Arizona and a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, “The Car a 500-Pound Gorilla Drives”, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php>, May 22, 2012, LEQ)

The U.S. military uses almost every form of energy in a number of different ways in order to carry out its mission. Some applications are comparable to those in normal civilian life – such as heating or air conditioning for office buildings in downtown Washington, D.C., gasoline for on-base cars and trucks in Japan, or lighting for warehouses in Germany. Other applications are incredibly unique and certainly much less pedestrian – like fuel for high performance jets or tactical vehicles (we might call them tanks) in remote locations, electric power for communications equipment in mountain outposts, diesel fuel for Naval vessels on the Indian Ocean and uranium for vessels under it. The military applications that are more or less analogous to everyday civilian applications have similar constraints to those of their civilian counterparts. That is, what will be the cost of the renewable energy supply and how does it compare with the alternative – be it electric power from the grid or fuel oil from a regional refinery? In these situations, decisions become a balancing act between budgetary considerations (will the renewable alternative cost more than conventional sources and blow the budget? And, if so, where will the incremental funding come from?) and policy considerations (do renewables help or hinder the military’s mission? And, are there broader national policy objectives mandating renewables that need to be considered?). At a time when all military budgets are tight, and many military facility maintenance budgets are under-funded (never, however, in a way that affects mission readiness), it becomes difficult for the military to materially support renewables when the cost of renewable energy is substantially higher than the alternatives. Given the geographic variation in the availability of renewable resources, renewables are cost effective in some locations, but not in others. Where renewables are cost-effective, the military can (and does) use renewables as part of their regular course of doing business. In situations where renewable sources of energy are more expensive than conventional alternatives, it seems unfair to ask the military to shoulder extra costs at the expense of much needed maintenance or other activities, unless incremental funding is provided to support the extra costs associated with the renewable implementation decision. Beyond this, the military does have a couple potentially interesting roles to play in accelerating the commercialization of renewable technologies: Some applications unique to the military have significantly different economics than civilian applications. Getting fuel oil for generators to a forward operations base in Afghanistan is a long, involved, risky, and expensive supply chain process. When flexible, portable photovoltaic panels can recharge batteries at these far-flung bases, they are much more cost-effective than the conventional alternative (recall the news report about $600/gallon price for fuel oil delivered to a forward operations base). For such applications, the mission requirements make renewables cost-effective and it makes sense for the military to move forward on its own, without additional external policy mandates. The scale of military energy purchases can provide sizable early market purchases offering stability to new market entrants. Naturally, this can only occur where the technical risk of the renewable alternative is known or is manageable. Examples of such sizable renewable purchases include the U.S.Navy’s bulk purchase of biofuels and the U.S. Army’s large-scale push into renewables for domestic on-base electric power supply. As there are few other consumers that could have comparable scale of purchases, this is a distinctive role of the military. It is here that the gorilla comes out to play as there are no easy answers: Can clean energy fit into the military’s mission? Yes. Should the military fund clean energy when mission needs and cost effectiveness dictate it? Yes, and it already is doing this. Can the military serve as a catalyst for the country to shift to cleaner energy sources? Yes, but… Should the military shift resources to renewables that are not cost-effective in order to support broader national energy policy goals when mission needs do not dictate it? No, unless incremental funding is made available. While the military can play a role, it should not be required to shift needed resources away from its core mission for national energy policy goals. Incremental resources to support these broader energy policy goals should come from alternate sources and flow to the military consistent with the role it is being asked to play. So, what kind of car does a 500-pound gorilla drive? Anything he wants. You can be the one to tell him, “no”.

#### High energy costs hurts the Navy – wouldn’t be able to afford AFF tech, can’t train sailors, can’t complete missions

U.S. Navy, “Task Force Energy,” June 21, 2010, <http://greenfleet.dodlive.mil/energy/task-force-energy/>, accessed 10-27-2012.

Energy availability costs and security are at the forefront of the challenges faced by our Nation, Department of Defense, and Navy. Energy is essential for developing and employing our combat capability in support of National Defense. The cost of energy needed to complete Navy missions is becoming more volatile and less secure. Both price volatility and supply predictability are strategic concerns since Navy operational flexibility and sustainability are linked directly to our access to energy. High energy costs siphon away resources that can be used to procure Force Structure and to train and equip our Sailors. The potential for disruption of fuel supplies threatens our ability to perform in the battle space and the vulnerability of energy supplies to our facilities puts our ability to support our deployed forces at risk. Additionally, there are numerous current and prospective regulatory and legislative mandates related to energy and climate change.

#### This causes a hollow military force and jacks hegemony- massive perception link- externally causes wars to breakout

Carafano et al 7 – Deputy Director @ The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Director of the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies (Heritage) (James, and Baker Spring, F.M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy @ Heritage, and Mackenzie Eaglen, Research Fellow for National Security Studies @ Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, “Four Percent for Freedom: Maintaining Robust National Security Spending,” Heritage Foundation, 4-10, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/em1023.cfm>)

Avoiding a "Hollow Force." The term "hollow force" was coined in the post–Vietnam War era to describe a military force that lacks the resources to field trained and ready forces, to support ongoing operations, and to modernize. In the past, when America's military has begun to become hollow, the strain has showed first in the National Guard. The same warning signs are evident today, including an austere lack of equipment, heavy reliance on cross-leveling to fill out units preparing to deploy, and a reduction in the levels of unit readiness. However, this problem is not exclusive to the National Guard. The Army and Air Force are already showing signs of funding shortfalls for equipment modern­ization. Although today's military is not yet hollow, it could become [hollow] so in less than a decade if funding for military modernization is not adequate over a sustained period of time.  Moreover, underfunding defense will actually cost the U.S. more in the long run, including reduc­ing [reduce] the defense industrial base to a dangerously low level. This leads to an undercapitalized base that is not competitive, driving up costs for the U.S. gov­ernment and taxpayer. Not spending enough on defense also creates the reality and perception of American weakness, which will increase risk, hinder economic growth, and lower stability in the world. Indeed, robust defense spending saves money. President Ronald Reagan's defense buildup and steady defense funding throughout the 1980s helped to win the Cold War and enabled the U.S. to quickly defeat Saddam Hussein in the Gulf War.  Regrettably, the Administration's defense budget request and emergency supplemental spending bill come at a time when political pressure to reduce defense expenditures is growing. The perception is that the battle in Iraq constitutes the entirety of the war effort and that as this operation winds down, the American people are entitled to a new peace div­idend. This notion, coupled with the imminent retirement of 78 million baby boomers, means that the danger of a hollow force is very real. Mandatory spending in the U.S. budget is projected to increase significantly in the coming years. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the share of the U.S. economy devoted to defense spending will actually decrease as a result.  Entitlement Reform as National Security Issue. The U.S. government is running a large budget deficit, and the principal reason is the growth in entitlement costs, not increased defense funding since 9/11. Since 1970, the historical ratio between defense spending and entitlement spending on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security has flipped. In 1970, military spending totaled 7.8 percent of GDP—almost twice the 4.1 percent of GDP spent on the big three entitlement programs. Today, defense spending has fallen to 3.9 percent of GDP while enti­tlement spending has more than doubled to 8.8 per­cent of GDP. By 2030, the big three entitlements will absorb roughly 84 percent of all federal revenues, crowding out defense and homeland security and threatening the historically low-tax, high-growth U.S. economy. Congress needs to find a solution to the entitlement spending problem quickly.  Consequently, defense is not the problem with the budget, and cutting defense is not the solution. As a nation at war, the U.S. is spending remarkably little on defense. Devoting 4 percent of GDP to defense imposes a reasonable burden on the U.S. economy and is significantly below the mean of roughly 7.5 percent of GDP that the U.S. spent on defense during the Cold War.  Spending 4 percent of GDP will not risk losing the war because of economic collapse brought on by excessive defense spending. Further, Congress needs to keep in mind the economic costs of military failure. Military power trumps economic power in the short term. Even a single successful attack on U.S. territory using an electromagnetic pulse generated by a nuclear weapon would have devastating economic consequences.  What the U.S. Should Do. Over the long term, federal spending should be reformed to provide ade­quate funds for current defense needs, and the shape of the U.S. military should continue to transform to reflect future threats. Rather than decrease defense spending, Congress needs to make a strong commit­ment to fund the nation's war requirements well into the future; indeed, the next President and future Congresses must also commit to providing for the nation's defense through increased defense budgets. Both Congress and the President should also begin the difficult task of changing public opinion, not fol­lowing it, by reminding the American people that the ongoing war is not over, regardless of what hap­pens in Iraq, and that the stakes in this war extend to their lives, liberty, and future prosperity.

#### Heg doesn’t solve war

Barbara Conry (former associate policy analyst, was a public relations consultant at Hensley Segal Rentschler and an expert on security issues in the Middle East, Western Europe, and Central Asia at the CATO Institute) and Charles V. Pena (Senior Fellow at the Independent Institute as well as a senior fellow with the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, and an adviser on the Straus Military Reform Project at the CATO Institute) 2003 “47. US Security Strategy” CATO Handbook for Congress, http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb108/hb108-47.pdf

Another rationale for attempting to manage global security is that a world without U.S. hegemony would soon degenerate into a tangle of chaos and instability, in which weapons proliferation, genocide, terrorism, and other offensive activities would be rampant. Prophets of such a development hint that if the United States fails to exercise robust political and military leadership today, the world is condemned to repeat the biggest mistakes of the 20th century—or perhaps do something even worse. Such thinking is seriously flawed. First, instability in the international system is nothing new, and most episodes do not affect U.S. vital interests. Furthermore, to assert that U.S. global leadership can stave off otherwise inevitable global chaos vastly overstates the power of any single country to influence world events. Indeed, many of the problems that plague the world today, such as civil wars and ethnic strife, are largely impervious to external solutions. There is little to back up an assertion that only Washington’s management of international security can save the world from political, economic, or military conflagration.

#### Deterrence fails – non-falsifiable, no verification, requires unknowable information

Marullo 85 (Sam, Professor of Sociology at Cleveland State University, “The Ideological Nature of Deterrence: Some Causes and Consequences” pg. 316-319 JSTOR)

An understanding of this paradox is obtained by analyzing the interests being served by this obfuscation, in conjunction with the structural correlates and technological imperatives of deterrence ideology. More specifically, we should examine officials' hesitance to speak directly and openly to the public about the possibilities of nuclear war and our own nuclear strategies because of the anticipated negative political consequences; the lack of public participation in discussion and debate over nuclear weapons policies largely due to a lack of knowledge; the realities imposed by the weapons mere existence; the military-industrial governmental bureaucratic elites' (the "iron triangle" as Adams [1981] calls it) beliefs or consciousness based on the existence of nuclear weapons technology and a world order dependent on deterrence; and the internal political functions played by deterrence. By examining these disjunctions, several cognitive beliefs of deterrence are demonstrated to lack empirical verification and are shown to be non-verifiable, demonstrating the ideological nature of deterrence. Government and military officials are reluctant to talk about nuclear exchanges because of the potential effect of "upsetting" the public. This reflects a conscious decision to withhold information from the public in an effort to avoid the negative political repercussions they have seen occur in the past (e.g., the uproars following McNamara's "No Cities" speech and Carter's PD 59). As Morton Halperin, a former Assistant Deputy Secretary of Defense, has more candidly stated, All public officials have l earned to talk in public only about deterrence and city attacks. No war-fighting, no city sparing. Too many critics can make too much trouble, so public officials have run for cover. That included me when I was one of them. (Quotes in Lifton and Falk, 1982:178-179) Before 1979 there had been only sporadic and fairly restricted public discussions of nuclear weapons policy. The technical knowledge required to understand nuclear arsenal capabilities is vast and not widely circulated. Furthermore, the legal, moral, and logistical complexities surrounding the use of force in the international realm can be overwhelming. These together have enabled a virtual monopoly of knowledge and decision-making ability to be concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of defense contractors, administration security officials, defense department and military leaders, and select congressmen (Tobias, 1983). In fact, Adams sees the lack of participation in the formulation of defense policy as an intended consequence of the iron triangle's operations. He claims they feel that their internal views on national security are both received wisdom and in tune with the world around it. Government and industrial officials became adept at protecting and expanding their turf in the defense arena, creating one of the most powerful policy machines in Washington (.A dams,1 982:8) It is thus no surprise that much of the public is not very well informed regarding nuclear weapons policy, that logical inconsistencies in deterrence ideology have gone virtually unnoticed, and the mismatch between declaratory policy and actual employment policy has remained largely undetected. In addition, much of the public does not particularly want to hear or talk about the use of nuclear weapons; a "psychic numbing," as Lifton (Lifton and Falk, 1982) describes it, has occurred. Nuclear weapons are seen as deterrents and a necessary evil with which we have to live, but we prefer not to spend time agonizing over them. The horrible destructiveness of the weapons and the withholding of information on the part of military and governmental officials has precluded much informed discussion of nuclear weapons policy alternatives, thereby contributing to the rhetoric-policy disjuncture. Limited survey results attest to the general ignorance of the public on nuclear weapons capabilities, arsenals composition, and declaratory policy regarding the use of nuclear weapons. Ironically, the overwhelming majority of the public feels it is the government's responsibility to make more information available to the public (Zweigenhaft, 1984). The political economies of the United States and the Soviet Union are distinct enough and contain expansionary forces such that conflict over resources and interests will continue to emerge for some time. These cautiously expansionary tendencies and the concomitant efforts toward containing the other power's expansion have led to the deployment of large armed forces that serve more than to merely protect territorial boundaries, but also function to project forces around the globe for either containment or expansionist purposes.14S Since nuclear weapons have become part of the superpower's arsenals--indeed, a new stage in our technocratic consciousness--plans for their use and the prevention of the opponent's use of them have become an integral part of these policies. In sum, nuclear weapons are, by most peoples thinking, a firmly entrenched component of the global order. As a consequence, mutual assured destruction has become an accurate description of weapons technology and one facet of superpower relations. However, its transformation into a policy of deterrence requires the incorporation of the psychological component that each superpower has to convince the other of its capability and determination to carry out the threat of mutual destruction. The critical issue is that national determination, and to a lesser extent capability, cannot be measured directly, and we rely on statements of intended use (less reliable) and arsenal configuration (more reliable) as proxies. Since deterrence rests on projecting to the other side one's own determination-and knowing that it can be measured only imperfectly-each side sends messages by making declarations of intended use and configuring its arsenal in such a way that it perceives the other side will receive the intended message. Under this scheme there can be no external validation of one's assessment of the enemy's (or even one's own) determination. As a result, one can never be sure that the enemy is convinced of one's determination to carry out the threatened retaliation. This has the unfortunate consequence that there is a tendency to err on the side of making sure the appropriate message indicating determination is being conveyed. It is unfortunate in that the clearest message is usually presumed to be a highly threatening arsenal configuration. The very nature of deterrence is such that it cannot be demonstrated to work. We cannot verify that it is deterrence rather than other factors that is working, or has worked over the past 30 years to prevent nuclear war between the superpowers. In a scientific logic sense, we can only observe the failure of deterrence through the eruption of an all-out nuclear war,15 but its failure to occur may or may not reflect the effectiveness of deterrence. Furthermore, the logic of deterrence dictates that elected officials and military leaders never question the logic of deterrence, lest the Soviet Union question our resolve to carry out threatened retaliation. These two characteristics, the incorporation as a cognitive belief of a non-verifiable assertion and the self-reinforcing logic of these beliefs, demonstrate the ideological nature of deterrence in an epistemic sense (Geuss, 1981). The calls for military expansion or modernization exhibit two levels of reliance on deterrence: one for use vis-a-vis the public, and a second for use within the inner circle of nuclear weapons policymakers and strategists. The former case takes the form of officials claiming that particular military threats or Soviet superiority in specific weapons categories threatens our national security.16 New weapons are thus rationalized before the public as necessary counter-threats to the Soviets, needed to maintain deterrence. This deliberately vague use of the notion of deterrence performs an important political role in justifying increased military spending. The second, deeper level of reliance on deterrence ideology is demonstrated by administration and military officials statements within the iron triangle. There, officials freely admit that there are no foreseeable Soviet military threats to U.S. national security, but they express concern over the potential political threats which may result from sending a signal of weakness. It is feared that any defense cutbacks may lead to the Soviets' inference of a lack of U.S. resolve, which may lead them to think they could extract political or economic concessions from us.17 Thus, the need for the appearance of a united base of support for a component of our deterrent force becomes the rationale for muting public debate over particular weapons. The debate over the MX missile (rekindled in 1981) demonstrates the two levels of dependence on deterrence ideology. The "window of vulnerability" argument presented to the public focused on whether the Soviets could in fact initiate a successful first strike on our land based missiles, leaving the President in a situation where he might find it more rational to refrain from retaliating then to retaliate and prompt a second Soviet strike aimed at U.S. cities. Among military circles, this scenario is dismissed as highly unlikely (U.S. Senate, 1983b). Yet the Scowcroft Commission nevertheless strongly endorsed the deployment of the MX for "symbolic" reasons -to threaten the Soviet land based missiles and to demonstrate America's resolve. As the Commission chair Brent Scowcroft stated at a Congressional hearing to explain the report's conclusion, the MX is needed to demonstrate national will and cohesion. Four Presidents have now stated that the MX is important...To now back away from that. .. would reflect an absence of that critical element of deterrence, and that is national will and determination. (U.S. Senate, 1983b) Thus, vague deterrence language is more commonly used vis-a-vis the public, in an effort not to stir up too much controversy, while statements more truly reflective of nuclear weapons employment policy are shared within the iron triangle and infrequently transmitted to the Soviet Union. Both, however, indicate a reliance on deterrence ideology.
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#### Our disadvantage time frame is faster than your turns

PAUL Krugman 2005 (Economist) “The Chinese Connection”, The New York Times, May 20

Here's what I think will happen if and when China changes its currency policy, and those cheap loans are no longer available. U.S. interest rates will rise; the housing bubble will probably burst; construction employment and consumer spending will both fall; falling home prices may lead to a wave of bankruptcies. And we'll suddenly wonder why anyone thought financing the budget deficit was easy. In other words, we've developed an addiction to Chinese dollar purchases, and will suffer painful withdrawal symptoms when they come to an end. I'm not saying we should try to maintain the status quo. Addictions must be broken, and the sooner the better. After all, one of these days China will stop buying dollars of its own accord. And the housing bubble will eventually burst whatever we do. Besides, in the long run, ending our dependence on foreign dollar purchases will give us a healthier economy. In particular, a rise in the yuan and other Asian currencies will eventually make U.S. manufacturing, which has lost three million jobs since 2000, more competitive. But the negative effects of a change in Chinese currency policy will probably be immediate, while the positive effects may take years to materialize. And as far as I can tell, nobody in a position of power is thinking about how we'll deal with the consequences if China actually gives in to U.S. demands, and lets the yuan rise.

#### The impact is the most probable scenario for global nuclear war

Dibb 1. (Paul, Prof – Australian National University, Strategic Trends: Asia at a Crossroads, Naval War College Review, Winter, http://www.nwc.navy.mil/press/Review/2001/Winter/art2-w01.htm)

The areas of maximum danger and instability in the world today are in Asia, followed by the Middle East and parts of the former Soviet Union. The strategic situation in Asia is more uncertain and potentially threatening than anywhere in Europe. Unlike in Europe, it is possible to envisage war in Asia involving the major powers: remnants of Cold War ideological confrontation still exist across the Taiwan Straits and on the Korean Peninsula; India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, and these two countries are more confrontational than at any time since the early 1970s; in Southeast Asia, Indonesia—which is the world’s fourth-largest country—faces a highly uncertain future that could lead to its breakup. The Asia-Pacific region spends more on defense (about $150 billion a year) than any other part of the world except the United States and Nato Europe. China and Japan are amongst the top four or five global military spenders. Asia also has more nuclear powers than any other region of the world. Asia’s security is at a crossroads: the region could go in the direction of peace and cooperation, or it could slide into confrontation and military conflict. There are positive tendencies, including the resurgence of economic growth and the spread of democracy, which would encourage an optimistic view. But there are a number of negative tendencies that must be of serious concern. There are deep-seated historical, territorial, ideological, and religious differences in Asia. Also, the region has no history of successful multilateral security cooperation or arms control. Such multilateral institutions as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the ASEAN Regional Forum have shown themselves to be ineffective when confronted with major crises.

#### China bashing guts relations that prevent inevitable armed conflict.

Hugh De Santis, 10-7-2011, strategic analyst and consultant, former career officer in the Department of State and senior official at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the RAND Corporation, “China Currency Manipulation: Protectionism Not The Answer,” Atlantic Council, google)

Election-year politics aside, imposing tariffs to pressure China into revaluing its currency is not likely to lead to a resurgence of manufacturing jobs in the US. American corporations that have set up shop in China will simply move their factories to other low-wage countries. Even if the RMB rapidly accelerated, factor costs in China will still be lower than those in the US. A strengthened RMB that becomes an international currency is also likely to displace the dominance of the dollar in Asian regional economies and thus make it more difficult to fund US government deficits. In the end, this ill-advised legislation is hardly likely to prod China into revaluing its currency, even though it is China’s interest to do so to contain inflation and reduce the bubble in real estate prices. The imposition of duties on Chinese goods is more far more likely to trigger an international trade war and the beggar-thy-neighbor policies of the 1930s. Worse still, it will put China and the US on a confrontational path that could lead to a renewed cold war.

#### Their impact defense doesn’t apply - currency legislation would be unprecedented and destroy stable relations their evidence assumes.

Wu Jiao & Cui Haipei, 10-11-2011, “Warning: Yuan bill to spark trade war,” China Daily, Google

The US imposing sanctions on China would violate international trade rules, said Cao Fengqi, director of the Finance and Securities Research Center at Peking University. "The US should not blame China for its trade deficit and high unemployment," he said. "The bill will be unfavorable for Chinese exports. China may also take retaliatory measures, including raising tariffs on imports from the US," Cao said. However, he believed the bill has little chance of passing in the House. Economist Robert Mundell, winner of the Nobel Prize, said that US legislation to press China to raise the value of the yuan would be a "disaster". "This is not going to help Americans," Mundell said on Sept 27 in a Bloomberg Television interview. "This is not going to create jobs for Americans. It's just going to create a disaster. "This would have a wounding effect on the stability of international relations. There's never been any precedent in economic history where a country, through any legal system, was forced to appreciate its currency relative to another country."

#### Overwhelms interdependence - Chinese threats prove.

Erika Johnsen, 10-12-2011, “Bad Move: The Senate Votes to Slap Sanctions on Chinese Trade,” Town Hall, Google

While it would be nice if the CPC would stop trying to pull the run-around on the rest of the world by manipulating their currency, toying with the yuan to keep Chinese exports to the U.S. cheap and making American exports more expensive, let’s step back and recognize that the United States is far from innocent of similar shenanigans. The free market should determine the values of freely competing currencies, but government intervention is practically inevitable. So, though I’m generally not in favor of allowing the CPC to strong-arm us in any shape, manner, or form, I have to agree with Speaker Boehner when he said that imposing sanctions on China would be “pretty dangerous.” Nothing deters war and aggression like economic interdependence, and the Chinese have threatened a trade war if the U.S. moves to impose sanctions on China. I did, however, appreciate the dissenting voice of the usually robust free marketeer Senator Jeff Sessions, which Tina Korbe pointed out on HotAir. Senator Sessions recognized that one of the necessary preconditions of free enterprise is a stable and reliable currency, and that its difficult to have faith in your transactions with a party that openly games the trading system. In this case, though, we stand to lose a lot more than we stand to gain by punishing China.

#### Bad U.S. economy and election overwhelm normal safeguards.

Justin Calderon, 10-4-2011, “How to read both sides of the looming US-China trade war,” Transcending Culture Shock, Google

Beijing and Washington, ever the odd couple, just can’t seem to bring their mismatched, yet inextricably linked, relationship to a calm accord. Without proper mediation, the story of this duo could get kooky real soon. — The US has long debated that China’s currency, the Renminbi, is being artificially undervalued to aid Chinese exports. And up until recently, I had believed that a bunch of podium-positioned finger pointing and top-heavy throat clearing could be the only weapons the US would use against a country which holds vast sums of US debt. But times are tough. Unemployment (not counting those who are unemployed but still looking) is cruising below 10 percent, and with an election not far in the distance, politicians may heed the temptation to stog the fire of demagoguery. Yesterday, as if speaking directly to China’s Politboro, US Senator Charles Schumer defiantly announced, “The gig is up.” If congress follows this impassioned rhetoric, sanctions and tariffs will follow possibly begetting a trade war by the world’s two largest economies. This should be avoided.

#### Turns Navy and all hege impacts

MEAD 2004 [Walter Russell- Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow in U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Policy, “America’s STICKY Power”, March/April] lp

Similarly, in the last 60 years, as foreigners have acquired a greater value in the United States-government and private bonds, direct and portfolio private investments-more and more of them have acquired an interest in maintaining the strength of the U.S.-led system. A collapse of the U.S. economy and the ruin of the dollar would do more than dent the prosperity of the United States. Without their best customer, countries including China and Japan would fall into depressions. The financial strength of every country would be severely shaken should the United States collapse. Under those circumstances, debt becomes a strength, not a weakness, and other countries fear to break with the United States because they need its market and own its securities. Of course, pressed too far, a large national debt can turn from a source of strength to a crippling liability, and the United States must continue to justify other countries' faith by maintaining its long-term record of meeting its financial obligations. But, like Samson in the temple of the Philistines, a collapsing U.S. economy would inflict enormous, unacceptable damage on the rest of the world. That is sticky power with a vengeance. THE SUM OF all POWERS? The United States' global economic might is therefore not simply, to use Nye's formulations, hard power that compels others or soft power that attracts the rest of the world. Certainly, the U.S. economic system provides the United States with the prosperity needed to underwrite its security strategy, but it also encourages other countries to accept U.S. leadership. U.S. economic might is sticky power.

### 1NR uniqueness

#### Obama will win -

#### Histogram tabulations, collapse in momentum, undecideds break even.

Sam Wang, 10-25-2012, is an American professor, neuroscientist and author, Princeton Election Consortium, “David Brooks – now with Ro-mentum!,” <http://election.princeton.edu/2012/10/25/do-you-understand-polls-as-well-as-david-brooks/>

All of that effort, and his two conclusions still have two major errors. Evidently he does not read the Princeton Election Consortium. Let us dissect this. 1. President Obama would be a bit more likely to win. This is false – he’s a lot more likely to win. Look at the Princeton Election Consortium’s EV histogram, which tabulates all 2.3 quadrillion possible combinations of states to give a clear snapshot of the race: Today's electoral vote histogram In a race today, President Obama would win with about 90% probability. The true probability is even higher, since the Meta-Analysis does not correct for individual pollster errors. We could – but the political blowback from unskewing polls is too large. 2. There seems to be a whiff of momentum toward Mitt Romney. Ah, yes…Ro-mentum! Bobo has taken the bait. He is probably looking at other aggregators, where for various reasons (q: do you want me to write about that sometime?) the real trends are harder to see. Let’s roll the instant replay. As you can see, Ro-mentum ended around October 11th, the date of the VP Biden-Ryan debate and reversed around October 16th, Debate #2. Now the median EV expectation is at a plateau around Obama 293 EV, Romney 245 EV. Viewed through the all-important Electoral College, Obama has a Popular Vote Meta-Margin lead of 1.5%. This measure is precise to within <0.5%, far better than any single poll. If anything, the race is starting to look a bit static. Of course, some change may well happen over the coming 12 days. Based on past races (see “The Presidential Predictor sharpens,” Sept. 29), here is how much movement we can expect. The “1 SD band” indicates the 1-sigma range for future Meta-Margin change. The election is 12 days away, over which we could expect movement of up to 1.4% in either direction – about equal to the current Meta-Margin. If drift were random, Romney’s chances of catching up would be 1 in 6 – the roll of a die. But which way will things actually go? The largest unknown factor that might help Romney is undecided voters. In national surveys ending on Oct. 23 or after, there are still 4.0 +/- 0.7 % undecideds (n=7). Based on past elections (“How will the last holdouts break?” 11/3/2008), undecideds break about equally, with a tiny advantage for the challenger. Romney can expect a net benefit of +0.3 +/- 0.8%. That benefit is a main contributor to the 1 in 6 chance I give him above. However, the uncertainty (0.8%) is larger than the average benefit (0.3%), so it could also hurt him. In President Obama’s favor, he (a) won debate #3, and (b) has had a Meta-Margin lead of +3.3+/- 1.3% this year. Movement is more likely toward this mean than away from it. The red strike zone in our history graph reflects this, and gives a re-elect probability of 89%.

#### Key swing states.

Daily Kos, 10-24-2012, “why we all should chill, courtesy of Politico,” <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/10/24/1149301/-why-we-all-should-chill-courtesy-of-Politico>

As an antidote to the (perhaps) irrational Republican exuberance that seems to have seized D.C., we pause for the following public-service announcement. To be President, you have to win states, not debates. And Mitt Romney has a problem. Despite a great debate and what The Wall Street Journal's Neil King Jr. on Sunday called a polling "surge," Romney has not put away a single one of the must-have states. President Obama remains the favorite because he only needs to win a couple of the toss-ups. Mitt needs to win most of them. A cold shower for the GOP: Most polling shows Romney trailing in Ohio, Wisconsin, Nevada, New Hampshire and Iowa - by MORE than Obama trails in North Carolina. Glenn Thrush and Jonathan Martin reminded of us of the 2008 primary analogy: Whatever else Hillary Clinton had, Barack Obama had the math. And math, not momentum, gets you the big house, the bulletproof car, the cool plane. We now resume our regularly scheduled Playbook.

#### Their evidence is just conservative spin.

The Week, 10-24-2012, “Mitt Romney's momentum: An illusion conjured by his campaign?,” <http://theweek.com/article/index/235270/mitt-romneys-momentum-an-illusion-conjured-by-his-campaign>

President Obama is winning, Mitt Romney's rise in the polls stopped two weeks ago, and Team Romney's "downright giddy" claim of election-winning momentum "is a bluff." Of course, conservatives don't agree. But according to Chait and fellow liberals, Team Romney has cleverly employed a few head-fakes about leaving battleground states supposedly in the bag, vague talk of expanding the map, and lots of bluster about inevitable victory. Indeed, "Romney is carefully attempting to project an atmosphere of momentum, in hopes of winning positive media coverage and, thus, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy." And it might be working. With the national polls tied and Obama enjoying a clear advantage in the Electoral College math, Romney and his allies seem to be successfully "suckering the press corps with a confidence game." Is Romney's momentum a clever ruse? The shameless spinning is tricking the media: Even after Obama's wins in the final two debates, the highly crafted tale "is congealing... that Romney is going to win the election," says Michael Tomasky at The Daily Beast. Of course, "in reality, Obama is the favorite." But give credit to conservatives: "They are creating a reality," and have been since the first debate. Feed reporters "a few poll results, a few morsels from the trail," and many will parrot your line. The real goal is to "make Democrats fearful and jittery and reactive," so Dems should calm down and reassert reality.

### Veterans Key

#### Consistent veteran friendly policies key to Obama

Larry Pressler Former Republican Senator from South Dakota 10/08/2012 Republican Senator, Vietnam Veteran Endorses President Obama <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/larry-pressler/larry-pressler-obama_b_1948415.html>

As a combat veteran of two tours in Vietnam with twenty-two years of service as a Republican member of the U.S. House and Senate, I endorse President Barack Obama for a second term as our Commander-in-Chief. Candidates publicly praise our service members, veterans and their families, but President Obama supports them in word and deed, anywhere and every time. As a Vietnam vet, one of the reasons I support President Obama is because he has consistently shown he understands that our commitment to our servicemen and women may begin when they put on their uniform, but that it must never end. This decision is not easy for any lifelong Republican. In 2008 I voted for Barack Obama, the first time I ever voted for a Democrat, because the Republican Party was drifting toward a dangerous path that put extreme party ideology above national interest. Mitt Romney heads a party remaining on that dangerous path, proving the emptiness of their praise as they abandon our service members, veterans and military families along the way. What really set me off was Romney's reference to 47% of Americans to be written off -- including any veteran collecting disability like myself, as a post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) veteran. Behind closed doors with his donors, Romney made clear he'd write off half of America -- including service members and veterans -- because, as he said "I'll never convince them they should take personal responsibility for their lives." But there's no greater personal responsibility than to wear your country's uniform and defend the rights we all enjoy as Americans. We don't sow division between "us" versus "them." The Commander-in-Chief sets the bar for all to follow and fight for the entire country. Mitt Romney fails that test. As a veteran I feel written off. Just as revealing is what Romney actually says publicly. As a former Foreign Service Officer, I find it offensive that Romney, Congressman Paul Ryan and their Republican Party are politicizing the death of Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other brave Americans who lost their lives in Libya. Being Commander-in-Chief requires a resolve and steadiness that's immune to politics and fear mongering. Mitt Romney fails that test. And along with high-profile Republican surrogates, Romney and Ryan are pandering to election-year politics rather than focusing on pending cuts to military spending. Strategy should drive our military priorities, not party purity. We are a nation at war -- the longest war in our nation's history -- and we must remember the sacrifice that so many have given for the protection of our country and our values. That's why it's so surprising that Republican nominee Mitt Romney has given five speeches on foreign policy -- and will be giving another one today -- and has yet to outline any plan to end the war in Afghanistan or bring our troops home. That's unacceptable for anyone running to be Commander-in-Chief. President Obama ended one war, is ending another and meeting our national security needs with support of our military leaders. He's laid out a clear plan that would reduce the deficit and prevent the mandatory military spending cuts that no one wants. But today's Republican Party, including Ryan who voted for the deal that would trigger the cuts, is willing to bring our country's defenses to the fiscal cliff -- just so a multimillionaire doesn't have to pay a single extra penny in taxes. And the real lack of leadership? Failing to own up to your role in racking up a record debt from two unpaid wars and two massive unpaid for tax cuts. Mitt Romney leads the party that fails this leadership test. And as former member of the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, the Senate Finance Committee and Chairman of the then Commerce Committee, I came to know the federal budget in detail. I'm disappointed that just as our troops are returning home after a decade of war, Romney and Ryan might gut by up to 20 percent investments in the Department of Veterans Affairs -- and even suggest privatizing the veterans' health care. Again, they would short change our national security and the education, health care and employment benefits our veterans have earned and deserve just to cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans. Let's be clear, Romney and Ryan would be disastrous for America's service members, veterans and military families. Public praise rings hollow when you fail to mention an ongoing war in accepting your party's nomination to be president, or veterans in a speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a so-called jobs plan or in a budget that should be a blue print of our nation's values. Meanwhile President Obama recognizes our sacred trust with those who serve starts when they take their oath and never ends. He's enacted tax credits to spur businesses to hire unemployed veterans and wounded warriors. He implemented and improved the post-9/11 GI Bill, the largest investment in veterans education since the original GI Bill over sixty years ago. He's proposing a Veterans Jobs Corps that would put returning service members to work as police officers, firefighters and first responders. As part of his achievable plan to keep moving our country forward, the President would use half the savings from ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to help pay down our debt and invest in nation building here at home, putting Americans back to work -- including our veterans -- fixing our roadways and runways, bridges and schools. And something that hits close to home, President Obama also secured the largest increase in VA investments in decades so our veterans get the care and benefits they earned, like treatment for PTSD and traumatic brain injury. As someone with service-related PTSD, I meet with younger veterans weekly to help them through the treatment and transition to a productive civilian life. It makes a difference for them knowing their President has their back. That's the difference in this election. In word and deed anywhere and every time, President Obama never forgets that standing by those who serve is the heart, soul and core value of this country. As a life-long Republican, I stand by him as he stands by all of us, putting national allegiance ahead of party affiliation. I endorse President Obama for reelection in 2012.

## CP



## Colonies

#### Energy prices are low now –

#### Electricity prices are still decreasing in relation to the market – price shifts are stable and only due to weather

EIA, “SHORT-TERM ENERGY AND WINTER FUELS OUTLOOK,” U.S. Energy Information Administration, October 10, 2012, <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/steo/report/electricity.cfm>, accessed 10-25-2012.

During this past winter, U.S. heating degree days during the fourth quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012 totaled 18 percent below the 30-year normal. Temperatures this winter are expected to be colder than last winter. In particular, projected heating degree days in the southern states, where a majority of homes heat with electricity, are 27 percent higher than last winter. As a result of the colder weather, EIA projects retail sales of electricity to the residential sector this winter will average 6.2 percent more than retail sales last winter. U.S. Electricity Generation¶ Natural gas prices have risen steadily since this past spring. In September, the Henry Hub price averaged $2.85 per million Btu, which was 46 percent higher than the average in April. With higher natural gas prices EIA expects natural gas to lose some of its recent gains in electricity generation market share. The share of total generation fueled by natural gas in the fourth quarter of 2012 is projected to average 27.8 percent compared with 25.4 percent during the same period last year. By the beginning of 2013, higher natural gas prices should contribute to year-over-year declines in natural gas's share of total generation. EIA expects natural gas to fuel 25.8 percent of generation during the first quarter of 2013, which is 2.8 percentage points lower than during the first quarter of 2012. U.S. Electricity Retail Prices¶ EIA expects the nominal U.S. residential electricity price will rise by 0.4 percent during 2012 to an average of 11.84 cents per kilowatthour. During 2013, U.S. residential retail electricity prices increase 1.3 percent over the average 2012 price. When measured in real terms, the U.S. residential electricity price declines by 1.7 percent in 2012 and by 0.3 percent in 2013.

#### OTEC pricey

Terri Harber, “OTEC rate hike: 7.1 percent,” Baker City Herald, September 23, 2011, <http://www.bakercityherald.com/Local-News/OTEC-rate-hike-71-percent>, accessed 10-27-2012.

The average residential electric bill will rise by about $7.13 per month, OTEC estimates.¶ That estimate factors in both the rate increase and a boost in the monthly delivery charge, which will rise for all residential customers, regardless of the amount of power they use, from $15 to $18 starting Oct. 1.¶ “This is to make sure the increase is spread out more equitably” among customers, said Angela Perez, an OTEC spokesperson.¶ The delivery charge helps to cover OTEC’s costs for operating and maintaining thousands of power poles, hundreds of miles of line, as well as substations and other equipment.¶ OTEC last raised the delivery charged on Oct. 1, 2009, when it rose from $10 per month to $15 as a result of BPA’s 7.6 percent wholesale rate hike.¶ The power bill from BPA makes up about half of OTEC’s operating costs. OTEC says the overall increase also includes a rate rise of roughly one percent for delivery system upgrades described as “long overdue,” however.¶ Eastern Oregon is an area where demand from power users is strong year-round because of its cold winters and warm summers, which makes it a customer base with a “high load” of demand, Perez said.¶ This is why customers “need to have more power delivered” than in areas with gentler weather conditions during at least part of the year, Perez said.¶ A well-working delivery system also is important so the power transfers can reach users, she said.

#### No conflict over resources – your literature base overfocuses on instances of conflict – for every example to prove resource wars exist there are several examples that disprove it. Their research is based on dated data – cooperation is more likely

Simon Dalby (Dept. Of Geography, Carleton University) 2006 "Security and environment linkages revisited" in Globalisation and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualising Security in the 21st Century, www.ntu.edu.sg/idss/publications/SSIS/SSIS001.pdf)

In parallel with the focus on human security as a necessity in the face of both natural and artificial forms of vulnerability, recent literature has emphasised the opportunities that environmental management presents for political cooperation between states and other political actors, on both largescale infrastructure projects as well as more traditional matters of wildlife and new concerns with biodiversity preservation (Matthew/Halle/Switzer 2002). Simultaneously, the discussion on water wars, and in particular the key finding the shared resources frequently stimulate cooperation rather than conflict, shifted focus from conflict to the possibilities of environmental action as a mode of peacemaking. Both at the international level in terms of environmental diplomacy and institution building, there is considerable evidence of cooperative action on the part of many states (Conca/Dabelko 2002). Case studies from many parts of the world suggest that cooperation and diplomatic arrangements can facilitate peaceful responses to the environmental difficulties in contrast to the pessimism of the 1990’s where the focus was on the potential for conflicts. One recent example of the attempts to resolve difficulties in the case of Lake Victoria suggests a dramatic alternative to the resource war scenarios. The need to curtail over-fishing in the lake and the importance of remediation has encouraged cooperation; scarcities leading to conflict arguments have not been common in the region, and they have not influenced policy prescriptions (Canter/Ndegwa 2002). Many conflicts over the allocations of water use rights continue around the world but most of them are within states and international disputes simply do not have a history of leading to wars.

## Navy

#### Funding trades-off with actual hard power capabilities- quicker link

Hodge ’12 (Hope Hodge, Hope Hodge reports on national security and defense issues for Human Events. “The Green Monster”, <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=51594>, May 19, 2012, LEQ)

Their agenda: spend millions on expensive alternative biofuels. Invest even more in undeveloped “green” technology. Prepare for the melting of the polar ice caps brought on by climate change. Some aggressive and well-funded environmentalist group? Nope. It’s the U.S. military. A few days ago, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta added fuel to the fire of an emerging controversy—just now capturing the attention of some members of Congress—by sharing his plans for the future of the military with a group of rapt environmentalists at an Environmental Defense Fund gala in his honor in Washington, D.C. “Our mission at the Department is to secure this nation against threats to our homeland and to our people,” he said. “In the 21st century, the reality is that there are environmental threats which constitute threats to our national security. For example, the area of climate change has a dramatic impact on national security: rising sea levels, to severe droughts, to the melting of the polar caps, to more frequent and devastating natural disasters all raise demand for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.” Despite pending defense cuts that have had a dismayed Panetta pounding lecterns across the country, the Defense Secretary said DoD would be committing $2 billion in the next fiscal year alone to energy-efficient equipment and efficiency programs, and research and development for green technology. Not so fast, Secretary Panetta. Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), a staunchly pro-military member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, takes the opposite view. He argues that’s money that could be used to manufacture or update a new fleet of aircraft. He now has defense leaders squarely in his crosshairs, determined to hold them to account for espousing debunked philosophies on climate change and promoting costly green initiatives while procurement needs go unmet. Following Panetta’s speech, Inhofe fired out a statement promising to provide congressional oversight and build awareness about the Defense Department’s “radical agenda.” Inhofe deconstructs Panetta Inhofe sat down with Human Events in his office last week and countered one by one each of Panetta’s climate change claims, reading from a ring-bound folder of research drawn from academic journals: there has been no statistically significant acceleration in sea level rise over the past century. The oft-cited severity of the 2011 drought, which covered 25 percent of the country, was nothing compared to one in 1984, which affected 80 percent of the land mass. Hurricanes, a common natural disaster, have been on the decline since the U.S. started keeping records of them in the 19th century. Everything Panetta said, Inhofe concluded, was a talking point cribbed from Al Gore’s 2006 global warming opus “An Inconvenient Truth,” and each, he said, has been refuted. Inhofe had a head start on the research. The minority leader of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, he is also the author of The Greatest Hoax, a refutation of climate change theory published earlier this year. The senator doesn’t expect Panetta to be as well-versed on climate change as he is, saying Panetta’s role is to lead the troops, not create environmental policy. Nor does Inhofe attribute all the far-left language and green initiatives to the defense secretary, who Inhofe said knows better than to spearhead such programs. “I’ve always liked Panetta; I served with him in the House and he’s always been one who has been very straightforward, very honest,” Inhofe said. “However, he has a commander in chief named Obama, so he has to say what Obama tells him to say.” Panetta has publicly and strongly defended the climate change and green energy talking points to critics, however, such as when he responded in March to criticism from Rep. Mike Conaway (R-Texas) at a House Armed Services Committee that Conaway’s premise for disagreement was “absolutely wrong” and that embracing the green agenda would make for a better military. The “Green Fleet” ready to launch While having America’s fighting forces plan for hypothetical climate change might be regarded as silly, DoD’s aggressive pursuit of biofuels as an alternative to traditional fossil fuels is a more immediate and potentially more damaging proposition. At the same gala featuring Panetta, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus told guests about plans to launch “Great Green Fleet” featuring ships and aircraft operating on a blend of traditional and biofuels. At up to $26 per gallon, biofuels can cost more than six times as much as traditional fuel sources at $3 or $4 per gallon, putting them out of the price range of many private industry maritime consumers with similar needs. Last December, in what was the largest government biofuel purchase in history, the Defense Logistics Agency procured 450,000 gallons of an advanced variety of the alternative fuel, made from both non-food waste and algae, for the relative bargain price of $12 million. Other test fuels have used the oil of the camelina mustard seed. According to a plan first made public by Mabus in 2009, the Navy expects to launch the fleet this summer for its exercises on the Pacific Rim—powered by the $12 million biofuels purchase—and to deploy it by 2016. Mabus listed his reasons for promoting the infant biofuel technology for his audience: the U.S. was too dependent on volatile areas of the world for fossil fuels, and unexpected fuel price fluctuation, as during the Libya conflict, could and did cost the DoD billions of dollars. Troops were endangered transporting traditional fuel to the battlefield. And like American steel in the 1880s, biofuel was a new technology waiting for an investor to come and purchase it at above-market prices, so eventually it could reduce its costs and become competitive. “That’s what we can do with energy,” Mabus said. “We can break the market.” The environmentalists applauded. Military inappropriate for green testing While keeping troops safe and lowering long-run costs are valuable goals for the Defense Department, biofuels won’t accomplish either, said Dr. David Kreutzer, a Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change for the Heritage Foundation. In the first case, he said, convoys would still have to transport fuel, whether “green” or petroleum, over ground to reach deployed forward operating bases. And since biofuels have a lower energy density, transport convoys would actually have to be larger to carry the supply, creating a broader target for the enemy. Second, Kreutzer said, if the technology behind alternative fuel sources was truly propitious, endorsement by the military should not be necessary to ensure its survival. “The fact that you have to get the Department of Defense to fund this to me is a sign that (biofuels are) not all that promising,” he said. Moreover, Kreutzer said, there were plenty of cheaper alternatives closer at hand. “We could drill a couple of wells in the Gulf of Mexico and get way more than we could for their biofuel initiatives,” he said. Kenneth P. Green, an energy and environment expert with the American Enterprise Institute, said the idea of energy security and independence was equally suspect. “The price shock issue is real,” he said. “But trying to decouple from the world energy economy isn’t going to fix that.” Biofuels, subject to the laws of supply and demand, would increase in cost during a fuel price spike—and if kept off the world market, the cost of keeping them off would be high. “It’s more a matter of energies-phobia,” Green said. “The idea of survival as sort of independence in everything is the sort of reflexive mindset. We don’t think about this with regard to smartphones, knapsacks... with almost everything, we understand that it’s better with world trade.” And, Green said, the military had no business choosing the winners in fuel technology, especially with untapped options such as shale gas close at hand. “You don’t economize on keeping your soldiers alive, but where possible, don’t they have an obligation to conserve costs with the public’s dollar?” Green said. “Find the cheapest fuel, not the most politically correct fuel.” Biofuels could hurt combat readiness A study released in late March by the Bipartisan Policy Center on energy innovation within the Department of Defense found that while the military had some success in piloting new efficient technologies that would keep troops safer, its size and capacity meant it was ill-equipped to become a pioneer for green energy. “DoD’s ability to house supply and demand under one roof, and to produce lasting improvements in complex systems over time, driven in part by large, sustained procurement programs, is nearly unique—and unlikely to be widely reproduced in the energy and climate context,” a summary read. “There are significant constraints upon what DoD is likely to do directly in this area; the department is unlikely to become an all-purpose engine of energy innovation.” The study concluded the military would do best if pragmatism, not politics, drives energy and environmental decisions. “We believe that DoD’s scope in this area will be significantly constrained to issues and opportunities... that will also reliably assist DoD’s ability to fulfill its core mission,” one of the study’s authors, Samuel Thernstrom of the Clean Air Task Force, told Human Events. “Where those activities do not fall squarely within DoD’s core mission, it seems less likely that those efforts will be successful.” Sen. Inhofe’s game plan On Capitol Hill, Inhofe said he was the loudest voice protesting wasteful defense energy policies, but he said there were others who agreed, including Democrats who worried that the issue would affect their re-election races. While Inhofe’s options in terms of direct political action are limited, he said, because the Republicans lack a majority in the Senate, he plans to maintain a watchdog role to keep public attention on the issue. Later this month, he will deliver an extended address on the Senate floor denouncing the military’s far-left energy policies. And Inhofe looks forward to seeing how this year’s presidential election may provide a way to walk back the liberal Defense energy policies of the last term. Panetta is a great Secretary of Defense, Inhofe said; he would just be a better one serving under someone else.

#### Empirically proven

Christopher J. Fettweis (Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College) 2010 “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,” Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much. The limited evidence suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, 'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'.30 And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilis-ing presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.

#### International system resilient – no conflict

Christopher Preble (director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute) August 2010 “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?” http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.
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#### Here’s an energy list

Charles Q. Choi Date: 12 December 2008 The Energy Debates: Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion http://www.livescience.com/3155-energy-debates-ocean-thermal-energy-conversion.html

Ocean thermal energy conversion relies on the fact that water near the surface is heated by sunlight while seawater deep in the dark is much colder. OTEC plants use warm surface water to heat ammonia or some other fluid that boils at a low temperature. The resulting gas is used to drive turbines that produce electricity. The gas is then cooled by cold water pumped up from the ocean depths and the resulting fluid is recycled to help generate power.¶ As OTEC relies on temperature differences, it works best in the tropics, where the surface water is hottest. As long as the temperature of surface water and the deep water differs by roughly 36 degrees Fahrenheit (20 degrees Celsius), an OTEC system can generate significant amounts of power.¶ The idea for ocean thermal energy conversion was originally proposed in 1881 by French physicist Jacques-Arsene d'Arsonval. The first OTEC plant was later built in Cuba in 1930 and produced 22 kilowatts of power, enough to supply roughly two typical modern households. Although a handful of OTEC plants were created following the oil crisis of the 1970s, funding for them dwindled after the price of oil dropped, and none are now operating.¶ Still, rising fuel costs have revived interest in these devices. In September the U.S. Department of Energy awarded its first grant for OTEC in years.¶ Pros¶ If less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all the solar energy trapped in the oceans could be converted into electric power , it would supply more than 20 times the total electricity the United States consumes everyday, according to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. "It could easily supply all the energy we wanted," said Terry Penney, a lab program manager at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colo. "The process is very low efficiency, just 2 or 3 or 4 percent, but all that energy's free."¶ Unlike wind and solar power, OTEC can provide constant power that utilities can depend on any time of day. The electricity it produces could also be used to drive chemical reactions that generate fuel such as hydrogen, ammonia or methanol, Penney added. It might especially benefit island communities or military outposts that rely heavily on imported fuel.

#### OTEC is ocean energy – distinct from solar energy in the literature.

Kobayashi ‘1 (The Present Status and Features of OTEC and Recent Aspects of Thermal Energy Conversion Technologies, Hiroki KOBAYASHI Hitachi Zosen Corporation Sadayuki JITSUHARA, Dr. Xenesys Inc. Haruo UEHARA, Dr. Saga University, 2001 http://www.nmri.go.jp/main/cooperation/ujnr/24ujnr\_paper\_jpn/Kobayashi.pdf) The world population is 6.1 billion in 2000, and it is still growing explosively. At the same time, energy consumed by human is also increasing explosively, as shown in Fig.1. By considering future economic growth and environmental problems it is obvious that in the 21st century we cannot rely on the current mainstream resources, i.e. oil, coal, and uranium for the world energy supply. Thus, we must face the urgent and important problem of developing an alternative energy source to fossil and nuclear fuel. For the alternative energy sources we can easily consider, for example, such as wind, solar and geothermal power. However, ocean energy should become also an important potential energy source which must be obtained. Among the various forms of ocean energy, the ocean thermal energy is plentiful and very stable. During the last decade, the technology of OTEC has been made great strides. It is worthy of special mention that OTEC technology is easily applicable in many industrial fields for recovery and saving of energy in lower temperature range and small thermal head.

#### Any aff would include both Oceanic and Solar energy – at best they are extra topical – this is a voting issue because it proves the resolution alone is insufficient to address the problem AND Solar thermal is a SECONDARY source for OTEC – they at least include oceanic.

Raju 10 (OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION SEMINAR REPORT Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Master of Technology in Civil Engineering (Environmental Engineering) of the University of Kerala). The results of these studies revealed that due to a small temperature difference (approximately 15–25 K) between the surface water and deep water of the ocean, the Rankine-cycle efficiency is limited to be only 3–5%. This results in a high cost of the electricity generated by an OTEC plant. In order to improve the cycle efficiency, an ammonia–water mixture as the working fluid have been developed and reported to have better thermal efficiency than the Rankine cycle at the same temperature difference. However, it is evident that increasing the temperature difference between the hot and cold heat sources is the most effective solution to improve the thermal efficiency of a thermodynamic power generation cycle. In this study, an OTEC system was described that utilizes not only ocean thermal energy but also solar-thermal energy; the latter is used as a secondary heat source. A solar collector used in a residential application is

#### Contextually different in the media.

Merrick 11 (Calvin, “OTEC – Alternative Energy from the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion, <http://voices.yahoo.com/otec-alternative-energy-ocean-thermal-energy-9826177.html>) You don't hear much about ocean thermal energy conversion in the media. One reason for this is that solar energy and bio-fuels currently hold the spotlight. Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) is an alternative energy technology that uses ocean water temperature differences to produce electricity. It's a clean energy solution with excellent potential for the future. More specifically, OTEC systems use the temperature difference between warm shallow ocean waters and cooler deep running ocean waters. The heat energy from the [water](http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/8237633/water_conservation_save_water_save.html) is then converted into electric power.

#### They are even discussed at different types of energy conferences

Carlson 11 (Doug, <http://hawaiienergyoptions.blogspot.com/>, [Asia Pacific Energy Summit Convenes This Week as Resistance To Big Wind Builds Steam on Molokai](http://hawaiienergyoptions.blogspot.com/2011/09/asia-pacific-energy-summit-convenes.html))The third annual [Asia Pacific Clean Energy Summit and Expo](http://www.ct-si.org/events/APCE2011/) kicks off tomorrow, and it takes a couple minutes for the website to cycle through the photographs of more than 200 speakers. They include a governor and ex-governor, utility representatives, legislators, military officials, advocates for solar, wind, geothermal and ocean thermal energy conversion technology, landfill experts, private equity investors, lawyers and many others. There’s at least one misidentification – the current chair of the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission is still listed as a state representative – but getting everything right would be a stretch. Word comes from Molokai as the Summit gets underway that opposition to the Big Wind energy project is growing, and one wonders whether that community-based effort will be noticed by the guests.

#### C. Studies prove – depth is better than breadth.

**Arrington 09** (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic.