# 2AC

## \*Warming

#### 1AC

- Prothero---real and anthro---long term trend---99% agree

- Nuccitelli---reducing emissions key, action now---4 degrees catastrophic

- Flournoy---extinction---SPS key

- Sify---oceans acidification causes extinction

- Ginsborg---magnifies all impacts---land, water, food

- Fuerth/Glick---Africa nuclear war---failed states, global draw-in

- Flournoy---SPS transitions away---existing power plants

- Dvorsky---FF unsustainable---SPS solves, exports

- Flournoy---alts fail---SPS k2 global demand

- Ritter---US key to international signal

- Kammen---global emissions

### AT: Backstopping

#### No backstopping---no capacity

Forbes 11(Forbes magazine, “Spare Capacity Dwindles, Alaska Looks Better,” http://blogs.forbes.com/greatspeculations/2011/07/15/spare-capacity-dwindles-alaska-looks-better/)

Heck, Barron’s had a cover story a few days ago about oil reaching $150 by next spring. It cited some of the same data we cited four months ago, about “spare capacity” — or lack thereof. “Spare capacity,” we pause to remind you, is the ability of oil producers to jump-start new oil production within 30 days and keep it up for at least 90 days. According to Morgan Stanley, “spare capacity” will be tapped out in two years… and that’s based on figures before the war in Libya took that nation’s 1.5 million barrels per day offline. With existing fields declining, and Washington keeping new fields off-limits, Big Oil is bailing on Alaska — or at least some of its historically prolific regions. Chevron, for instance, decided recently to dump its holdings in the Cook Inlet area. “The decision comes as production from Cook Inlet oil and gas fields is declining,” reports the Anchorage Daily News, “typically, a period when big energy companies lose interest in their investments and smaller operators jump in.” For those smaller operators, there’s a surprising amount of oil yet to be tapped. “Nearly all of the operating oil and gas fields in Cook Inlet derive from exploration done in the 1950s and 1960s,” explains *Petroleum News*. Then the giant Prudhoe Bay field was discovered and everyone ran off to work there instead. “As a consequence,” the trade publication goes on to say, “only limited exploration of Cook Inlet has taken place in more recent decades.” That’s not the only incentive for a small operator to work over a place like Cook Inlet. “Some 80% of state revenues depend on oil and gas extraction,” says Chris. “It employs thousands of people. Those people in turn support shops, restaurants, and the whole wheel that is a community. “So the state government created some sweetheart deals for oil and gas companies to spend money here. Among these goodies is a 40% state refund on money spent for drilling and exploration costs — paid in cash to the operator. There are other laws in place that could refund as much as 20% of other costs and 25% of net losses incurred.” “For a small operator looking to get a sweet return on a moderate-sized pot of money, Alaska is like the El Dorado of oil and gas.” The realities of shrinking spare capacity are becoming more evident by the day. The International Energy Agency warns that unless OPEC can raise production by 1.5 million barrels a day — about the same as that lost Libyan production — global demand oil demand will start to outrun available supply between now and year-end. Thus, “If there is not enough supply to match the 89 million barrels of oil the global economy is expected to burn every day,” says former CIBC World Markets chief economist Jeff Rubin, “world oil prices have only one direction to go.” “With no obvious end in sight to the Libyan conflict**,”** Mr. Rubin continues, “and sectarian violence against oil fields and refineries suddenly on the rise in Iraq ahead of the scheduled U.S. troop withdrawal, the prospects are not promising for OPEC to increase supplies. “This is even more evident given the region’s largest producer, Saudi Arabia, has little more to offer other than unwanted sour, heavy oil to add to the global supply mix.” It’s not that the Saudi sheiks aren’t trying. Production in the kingdom rose nearly 4% last month, to 9.7 million barrels per day. Thing is, only half of that increase hit the international market. The rest went to Saudi Arabia’s own refineries for “power generation and water desalination plants during the peak summer season,” according to an IEA report out yesterday. Two more factors spurring oil demand: power shortages in China and Japan. Because of drought in China, hydropower plants can’t generate as much electricity. Diesel generators are making up the difference. Diesel is also making up the difference in Japan after the Fukushima disaster. Two-thirds of the country’s nuclear capacity is offline and won’t be coming back online anytime soon. Thus, oil stands to be a profitable play for some time to come even if what passes for a “recovery” in the United States ends up stalling out. How to play it? “About one-fifth of the domestically produced oil in the U.S. comes from Alaska,” observes Chris Mayer, who’s been examining the investing possibilities. “But these assets have been in long decline. Production of crude oil is down more 70% from its high in the 1980s.”

#### Does NOT turn the case

Sadorsky 8 (Irene, and Peter, Schulich School of Business in Canada, “Oil prices and the stock prices of

alternative energy companies,” http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic741392.files/EnergyStockPrices.pdf, Energy Economics 30 (2008) 998–1010)

Simulation results show the stock prices of alternative energy companies to be impacted by shocks to technology stock prices but shocks to oil prices have little significant impact on the stock prices of alternative energy companies. These results add to a small but growing literature showing that oil price movements are not as important as once thought because investors may view alternative energy companies as similar to other high technology companies. These results should be of use to investors, managers and policy makers.

### Flow

#### Extinction from warming---real and anthro---Prothero

#### AT: honeybees

Wind pollination solves

Dailey 8 (Kate, “Why Are Bees Dying?”, Newsweek, 6-14, http://www.newsweek.com/id/141488/output/print)

Are we doomed? The short answer is no. Human beings don't need honeybee pollination. Most of the plants that provide calories for the human population tend to be wind pollinated cereals, like wheat and corn and rice. But once you have an economy improving and the standard of living improving and the diet improving, you start seeing the introduction of meat and dairy products, and both of those require forage crops that are honeybee pollinated. When an economy starts improving, you start seeing melons, fruits, berries--all of these are bee pollinated. The point is, human survival does not depend upon honeybee pollination, but quality of life in a developed economy does. So you can live without honeybee pollination, you just don't want to. Compare the diets in a country like Canada, the United States, and Great Britain with diets in a country like Nigeria, Sudan, or Malaysia. You don't have the preponderance of meat and dairy and fruit and vegetables in developing countries like you do here. That difference is defined by bee pollination.

Status quo solves

RHS 10 (Royal Horticultural Society, “Bee populations recover,” June 11th, <http://www.rhs.org.uk/News/Bee-populations-recover>, EMM)

Honeybees have emerged from the harshest winter in 30 years apparently none the worse for wear, according to the latest survey of colonies by the British Beekeepers' Association (BBKA). Overall about 80% of colonies have survived this year, in sharp contrast to previous years when up to 30% of honeybees died out, leading to serious concerns for their welfare. There are, however, substantial regional variations - the highest losses were recorded in the north of England, where beekeepers lost about a quarter of their honeybees, while in the south-west losses were less than half as bad at 12.8%. Though the figures are a marked improvement, BBKA president Martin Smith says they're still too high for beekeepers to relax. 'It shows that our honey bees are slowly moving out of intensive care but they are still not healthy enough,' he said. 'Winter losses of between 7-10% are acceptable: the current rate is not.' The UK's honeybee population has more than doubled, largely due to a steady rise in the number of people taking up beekeeping following the widespread publicity over the plight of the honeybee. There are now more than 80,000 beehives in the country, twice as many as in 2007 when concerns were first raised, and the BBKA reports its membership has risen by more than a third in the last year alone.

#### Safe---Dvorsky

#### AT: helps marine ecosystems

#### Yes CO2 acidification impact

#### AT: geoengineering

## \*Bistatic Radar

#### 1AC

- Johnson---key to bistatic radar and stealth

- Baker---monostatic fails

- Garretson---perception key to airforce---tech dominance

- Tanks/Telegraph---cruise missiles

- Axe---counter stealth radar key to AP---China/Russia

- Eaglen---perception of AP key to global commons, miscalculation

- Schanz/Wallace---Arctic nuclear war

- Khalilzad/Matheny---Asia nuclear war, bioweapons

- Dunlap/Strait Times---key to heg, US-China war

- Barnett/Goldstein

#### Bioterrorism high risk---Matheny

#### Top gov officials card is about Arctic

#### High risk to airpower credibility---too outdated---stealth coming in the status quo---GUTS new technology and gains---that’s Axe

#### Will NOT overtake challenges---perception

### AT: Weaponization

#### Weaponization inevitable globally

Bridge 12-10 – Robert Bridge, writer for RT, December 10th, 2012, "Space militarization: Coming to a galaxy near you" rt.com/politics/space-militarization-us-russia-699/print/

The United States is moving toward the militarization of space and this will change the face of war in the near future, an academician with the Russian Academy of Engineering Sciences has warned.¶ Judging by recent developments, **the idea of** formidable space weapons **prowling the last frontier is no longer limited to the realm of science fiction**.¶ The US has published tactical guidelines over the past three years on the use of force in outer space, while systems that may be used as orbiting weapons are undergoing rigorous test flights, said Yuri Zaitsev, Academic Advisor with the Russian Academy of Engineering Sciences.¶ In a security document released in October, the US Department of Defense (DoD) said that its space-related activities are designed to “maintain and enhance the national security advantages afforded by the use of outer space.”¶ Among its numerous stated objectives, the DoD report said it is US policy to “proactively seek opportunities to cooperate with allies and selected international partners in developing space architectures and in **designing, acquiring, and** operat**ing military space systems**.”¶ Zaitsev said that America’s push to militarize space may include the use of both nuclear and conventional weapons, which could have dangerous and dramatic implications for future warfare.¶ "**The** U**nited** S**tates, as well as some other leading powers, is attempting to gain supremacy** in [space],” Zaitsev explained. “This will enable their aerospace operations at the very beginning of a war to initiate strikes on strategic facilities throughout the [targeted] country.”¶ **During this year’s UN General Assembly, the US conspicuously refused to support a resolution to halt the militarization of space.**¶ In a vote on a resolution titled ‘Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space,’ 169 member-states, including the Russian Federation, voted in favor of the draft resolution stating, “[The] exploration and use of space…shall be for peaceful purposes…carried out for the benefit and in the interest of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development.”¶ Only **the United States and Israel abstained from voting on the document**, rendering it effectively toothless.¶ Washington’s refusal to cede control of space likely stems from its increasing reliance on space-based systems: An estimated 90 percent of the US Military reportedly uses or depends on space-based systems.¶ The Russian academic referred the shock over China’s successful targeted destruction of an old orbiting weather satellite in 2007.¶ "The Americans were frightened by the Chinese tests of anti-satellite weapons,” Zaitsev said. “It is quite possible that the US may soon initiate negotiations on anti-satellite systems."¶ Zaitsev also said that the United States and its allies may attempt to regulate space activity to its advantage.¶ "The United States and the European Union are working out a draft code of conduct in outer space," he said. "This document may regulate space activity in the interests of the United States and its allies and may discriminate [against] other states, including Russia.”¶ “**Russia and China are unlikely to sign this document, which means** military confrontation in outer space will intensify**,”** Zaitsev warned.

#### No arms race

Lopez 12 – Laura Delgado Lopez, expert at the Institute for Global Environmental Studies, Arlington, Virginia, master's degree in international science and technology from George Washington University, 2009 Truman Scholar and a Northrop Grumman Fellow at GWU's Space Policy Institute, bachelor's in political science, March 6th, 2012, "Predicting an Arms Race in Space: Problematic Assumptions for Space Arms Control" [www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14777622.2012.647391](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14777622.2012.647391)

**Referring to the history of the nuclear arms race, as space doves often do, is misleading**. The Soviet Union and the United States did race to build up their nuclear arsenals, but that was because they could, both technologically and economically. Interestingly, while both lawful 43 and potentially illegal transfers of nuclear technology have taken place, the list of countries with known or suspected nuclear technology is still relatively small. 44 Moreover, it would be open to debate whether those countries that possess the knowledge of how to build nuclear weapons are currently immersed in a race to build up their arsenals in response to that of other countries. It is probable that limited proliferation may be a sign of the success of an efficient arms control regime, but it is nevertheless evident that adequate resources are a necessary prerequisite for an arms race**.**¶ **In the case of** space weapons**, the** conditions are even harsher**.** The incredible cost not only to develop and launch these systems, but to maintain them has been a major impediment to their development. Brilliant Pebbles, arguably the most cost-effective U.S. space-based missile defense program, which would also amount to an ASAT weapon, still amounted to a price tag of between $11 and $16 billion, expended over a 20-year period. 45 Would a country such as Pakistan, which ranks twenty-eighth in the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency’s World Factbook Gross Domestic Product comparison, be able to raise the kind of resources necessary for racing other countries in space? It is more probable that countries such as China and Russia would be able to compete if they so chose, 46 but **the idea of a worldwide space arms race can still not be sustained**. And therein lies the biggest issue that space doves fail to address in their arguments about an inevitable space race: resources. The perception of a threat and the political will to meet it are not enough to warrant the kind of worldwide conditions they are so quick to describe.¶ When space doves bring up the question of resources, they point to ‘‘asymmetric challenges from those who could not afford to be participants in the race itself.’’ 47 This situation might encourage, for instance, nuclear proliferation or the build-up of chemical or biological weapons. In fact, Nancy Gallagher argues that the United States rightly denies the existence of an arms race in space ‘‘only in the narrow sense that there is not, and probably will not be, a Cold War style ‘space arms race,’ i.e., an action-reaction dynamic between peer competitors,’’ but that doing so ignores the danger of ‘‘asymmetric reactions.’’ 48¶ Space doves thus seem to acknowledge that measures to regain or sustain stability in the international system do not always manifest themselves in the same way because power can take many forms. In proposing his concept of ‘‘soft power’’ as a legitimate tool for the United States to exert international influence, Joseph Nye explained that in a world of increased political complexity, the traditional ways to employ force are too costly, and thus ‘‘other instruments such as communications. . . and manipulation of interdependence have become more important.’’ 49¶ But this contention clearly **invalidates the inevitability of an arms race in space**. If countries do not respond in kind, then there is no race to speak of, and the inevitability argument breaks down. Gallagher’s statement thus seems contradictory: if a space race is not an ‘‘action-reaction dynamic between peer-competitors,’’ then what do space doves mean with an arms race? Why must it be avoided?¶ **This issue also raises a more** important problem: causality. **Unless other countries explicitly state that their asymmetric build-up is a direct response to U.S. deployment of space weapons, then** this link cannot be established**.** Even considering the timing sequence of deployment and the projected build-up—which would be difficult considering it takes years to develop, launch, and deploy space systems—**it would be simplistic to assume that other motivators for international behavior are not at work.**

#### No space war – deterrence checks

Klein 12 – CDR John J. Klein, USN (BS, Georgia Institute of Technology; MS, Naval Postgraduate School; MA, Naval War College), is assistant air officer (“miniboss”) aboard the USS John C. Stennis (CVN 74). He has served as maintenance officer, Sea Control Squadron 24 (VS‑24); test and evaluation project officer, Naval Force Aircraft Test Squadron (VX-20); naval flight officer under instruction, US Naval Test Pilot School; tactical development and evaluation officer (VS-24); and maintenance branch officer, Sea Control Squadron 28 (VS‑28). Commander Klein is the author of several journal articles and the book Space Warfare: Strategy, Principles and Policy (London: Routledge, 2006). March 6th, 2012, Astropolitics: The International Journal of Space Politics & Policy, "The Influence of Technology on Space Strategy," [www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14777622.2012.651700](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14777622.2012.651700)

Fourth, advanced space-based technology and weapons systems can have a stabilizing effect on the international community. As was the case with nuclear weapons during the Cold War, if a weapons system poses a large enough threat to two or more adversaries, its potential use can cause state leaders to avoid direct confrontation. This is not to suggest that future space-based weapons will eliminate tensions among competing states, nations, or groups, but **weapons can provide a stabilizing influence at times.**

#### SPS is not a weapon and will not be attacked

Smith 8 – PhD Student @ University of Reading M.V., Lt. Col, PhD student in the strategic studies program under Professor Colin Gray at the University of Reading in the UK, winner of the National Space Society’s 2008 Space Pioneer Award, Chief of Future Concepts (Dream Works) the Pentagon “Weaponization, Environmental Risk, and Multinational Approaches”

 “Your concern about weaponization of the system and environmental risks are proper and deserve solid answers. For the answers (and a whole bunch of other great information) let me point you to a special edition of Ad Astra magazine produced by the National Space Society. If you look on page 29 you’ll see the answers as to why space-based [SPS] solar power satellites cannot be weaponized. Let me add to that list the following items: **The DoD will not own or operate SBSP satellites**. Energy production and distribution is outside of its Title X authority. In my opinion the DoD merely wants to be a customer of safe, clean energy and is most comfortable purchasing its energy from commercial vendors, just as it does today. The interest shown by the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in hosting the work done by the Space-Based Solar Power Study Group was largely because NASA does not do energy and the DoE does not do space. In other words, it was a ball being dropped along organizational lines. The security-related interest of the NSSO as it stepped in to host the study was three fold: Provide more energy sources to hopefully alleviate energy competition as a trigger for war between the major powers in the 21st Century Achieve American energy independence from foreign oil suppliers who attract US vital interests in areas and with peoples with whom we really would prefer to interact with in ways other than a dependent customer-supplier relationship. Provide a source of clean energy that provides America with broader options regarding carbon contamination and clean-up, as well as improved ability to make progress on treaties such as Kyoto. **Simple inspections of the waveguides for either laser or microwave transmitters on the satellites can easily verify that the beam cannot be focused narrowly to create a weapons effect**. Such inspections can and likely will be conducted at time of insurance inspection, licensing, and registration before launch. **International inspectors would be welcome and encouraged**. The goal is to have international corporations own and operate these satellites and provide power to international customers–that’s the key to defense of these huge birds–deterrence by mutual defense through broad international ownership and international customership–an attack on a satellite is an attack against all.

#### China already perceives weaponization

Waugh 12-12 – Rob Waugh, December 12th, 2012, "US launches mysterious 'space weapon' which can orbit for a year" uk.news.yahoo.com/us-launches-mysterious--space-weapon--which-can-orbit-for-a-year-140313369.html

An Atlas V rocket blasted off from Cape Canaveral yesterday carrying a mysterious and controversial military 'space plane'. ¶ Boeing's X37-B is 196 feet long, robotic, and designed for long stays in space - it orbited for 469 days on its last mission, more than a year. ¶ What is unclear is what is aboard the unmanned craft - or what it does in orbit.¶ News outlets and analysts speculated that the craft could have been built to spy on Chinese satellites. ¶ Brian Weeden of the Secure World Foundation says that **the vehicle is highly controversial in** China**, where the government** views it as a 'space weapon'. ¶ Reports from Chinese news agencies suggested that the Chinese were developing their own rocket-powered space plane. In 2007, the Chinese tested an anti-satellite missile against one of its own weather satellites, destroying it in orbit.

### AO---SPS---Disease

#### SPS is key to disaster response and soft power

Wood 12 – Leet W.Wood is a PhD student in political science at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, February 15th, 2012, ““Projecting power: The security implications of space-based solar power,” Ebscohost

The ability of the system to direct power on short notice to most points on the globe also has significance for international aid and disaster relief. In the wake of a **natural or humanitarian disaster**, power from space could be used to **keep hospitals and refugee camps operational, as well as providing electricity for water desalination** and other critical but energy-intensive processes. Operating in this mode, spacebased solar power could become a powerful tool of diplomacy rather than one of force projection in the traditional sense.

#### Disaster response prevents disease outbreaks

Aljunid et al 12 Syed, Professor of Health Economics and Senior Research Fellow at UNU International Institute for Global Health, Kouadio Koffi Isidore, Postdoctoral Fellow at United Nations University International Institute for Global Health, Taro Kamigaki, Assistant Professor, at the Department of Virology of Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Karen Hammad, Australian emergency nurse and Lecturer at the School of Nursing and Midwifery, Flinders University and Hitoshi Oshitani, Professor of Virology at Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, "Preventing and controlling infectious diseases after natural disasters", March 13, United Nations University, unu.edu/publications/articles/preventing-and-controlling-infectious-diseases-after-natural-disasters.html#info

Beyond damaging and destroying physical infrastructure, natural disasters can lead to outbreaks of infectious disease. In this article, two UNU-IIGH researchers and colleagues review risk factors and potential infectious diseases resulting from the secondary effects of major natural disasters that occurred from 2000 to 2011, classify possible diseases, and give recommendations on prevention, control measures and primary healthcare delivery improvements.¶ Over the past few decades, the incidence and magnitude of natural disasters has grown, resulting in substantial economic damages and affecting or killing millions of people. Recent disasters have shown that even the most developed countries are vulnerable to natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina in the United States in 2005 and the Great Eastern Japan Earthquake and tsunami in 2011. Global population growth, poverty, land shortages and urbanization in many countries have increased the number of people living in areas prone to natural disasters and multiplied the public health impacts.¶ Natural disasters can be split in three categories: hydro-meteorological disasters, geophysical disasters and geomorphologic disasters.¶ Hydro-meteorological disasters, like floods, are the most common (40 percent) natural disasters worldwide and are widely documented. The public health consequences of flooding are disease outbreaks mostly resulting from the displacement of people into overcrowded camps and cross-contamination of water sources with faecal material and toxic chemicals. Flooding also is usually followed by the proliferation of mosquitoes, resulting in an upsurgence of mosquito-borne diseases such as malaria. Documentation of disease outbreaks and the public health after-effects of tropical cyclones (hurricanes and typhoons) and tornadoes, however, is lacking.¶ Geophysical disasters are the second-most reported type of natural disaster, and earthquakes are the majority of disasters in this category. Outbreaks of infectious diseases may be reported when earthquake disasters result in substantial population displacement into unplanned and overcrowded shelters, with limited access to food and safe water. Disease outbreaks may also result from the destruction of water/sanitation systems and the degradation of sanitary conditions directly caused by the earthquake. Tsunamis are commonly associated with earthquakes, but can also be caused by powerful volcanic eruptions or underwater landslides. Although classified as geophysical disasters, they have a similar clinical and threat profile (water-related consequences) to that of tropical cyclones (e.g., typhoon or hurricane).¶ Geomorphologic disasters, such as avalanches and landslides, also are associated with infectious disease transmissions and outbreaks, but documentation is generally lacking.¶ After a natural disaster¶ The overwhelming majority of deaths immediately after a natural disaster are directly associated with blunt trauma, crush-related injuries and burn injuries. The risk of infectious disease outbreaks in the aftermath of natural disasters has usually been overemphasized by health officials and the media, leading to panic, confusion and sometimes to unnecessary public health activities.¶ The prolonged health impact of natural disasters on a community may be the consequence of the collapse of health facilities and healthcare systems, the disruption of surveillance and health programmes (immunization and vector control programmes), the limitation or destruction of farming activities (scarcity of food/food insecurity), or the interruption of ongoing treatments and use of unprescribed medications.¶ The risk factors for increased infectious diseases transmission and outbreaks are mainly associated with the after-effects of the disasters rather than to the primary disaster itself or to the corpses of those killed. These after-effects include displacement of populations (internally displaced persons and refugees), environmental changes and increased vector breeding sites. Unplanned and overcrowded shelters, poor water and sanitation conditions, poor nutritional status or insufficient personal hygiene are often the case. Consequently, there are low levels of immunity to vaccine-preventable diseases, or insufficient vaccination coverage and limited access to health care services.¶ Phases of outbreak and classification of infectious disease¶ Infectious disease transmission or outbreaks may be seen days, weeks or even months after the onset of the disaster. Three clinical phases of natural disasters summarize the chronological public health effects on injured people and survivors:¶ Phase (1), the impact phase (lasting up to to 4 days), is usually the period when victims are extricated and initial treatment of disaster-related injuries is provided.¶ Phase (2), the post-impact phase (4 days to 4 weeks), is the period when the first waves of infectious diseases (air-borne, food-borne, and/or water-borne infections) might emerge.¶ Phase (3), the recovery phase (after 4 weeks), is the period when symptoms of victims who have contracted infections with long incubation periods or those with latent-type infections may become clinically apparent. During this period, infectious diseases that are already endemic in the area, as well as newly imported ones among the affected community, may grow into an epidemic.¶ It is common to see the international community, NGOs, volunteers, experts and the media leaving a disaster-affected zone usually within three months, when in reality basic sanitation facilities and access to basic hygiene may still be unavailable or worsen due to the economic burden of the disasters.¶ Although it is not possible to predict with accuracy which diseases will occur following certain types of disasters, diseases can be distinguished as either water-borne, air-borne/droplet or vector-borne diseases, and contamination from wounded injuries.¶ Diarrhoeal diseases¶ The most documented and commonly occurring diseases are water-borne diseases (diarrhoeal diseases and Leptospirosis). Diarrhoeal diseases cause over 40 percent of the deaths in disaster and refugee camp settings. Epidemics among victims are commonly related to polluted water sources (faecal contamination), or contamination of water during transportation and storage. Outbreaks have also been related to shared water containers and cooking pots, scarcity of soap and contaminated food, as well as pre-existing poor sanitary infrastructures, water supply and sewerage systems.

#### Extinction

**Torrey and Yolken 5** E. Fuller and Robert H, Directors Stanley Medical Research Institute, 2005, Beasts of the Earth: Animals, Humans and Disease, pp. 5-6

The outcome of this marriage, however, is not as clearly defined as it was once thought to be. For many years, it was believed that microbes and human slowly learn to live with each other as microbes evolve toward a benign coexistence wit their hosts. Thus, the bacterium that causes syphilis was thought to be extremely virulent when it initially spread among humans in the sixteenth century, then to have slowly become less virulent over the following three centuries. This reassuring view of microbial history has recently been challenged by Paul Ewald and others, who have questioned whether microbes do necessarily evolve toward long-term accommodation with their hosts. Under certain circumstances, Ewald argues, “Natural selection may…favor the evolution of extreme harmfulness if the exploitation that damages the host [i.e. disease] enhances the ability of the harmful variant to compete with a more benign pathogen.” The outcome of such a “marriage” may thus be the murder of one spouse by the other. In eschatological terms, this view argues that a microbe such as HIV or SARS virus may be truly capable of **eradicating the human race**.

## \*Solvency

#### 1AC

- Lemonick/NSSO---DOD catalyzes

- Mankins---3 years, low cost, efficiencies

- Garretson---studies prove

- Reed---resilient

#### Framing issue---their arguments ONLY assume the status quo, not DOD catalyzing investment

#### Yes solvency---launch costs being reduced now---private launch vehicles and efficiency upgrades---DOD procurement makes it feasible too---that’s Dvorsky and Lemonick

#### Power can be transmitted

#### Not a demo

#### Satellites solve warming

#### It’s competitive and solves---already competitive with ground based solar---NSSO

#### Launch costs answered above

#### Technology solves---Mankins---3 years---SPS-ALPHA---new model---studies prove from the Air Force—that’s Reed---most qualified expert

### Aerospace AO

#### Federal support for SPS is key to revitalize the aerospace sector

Mankins, President of SPA and Former NASA Scientist, 9 (John, Preeminent Global Expert on SSP, SPA = Space Power Association, President of ARTEMIS Innovation Management Solutions, Worked @ NASA for 25 Years, “To boldly go: the urgent need for a revitalized investment in space technology,” 5-18, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1377/1>)

Unfortunately, the US investment in advanced research and technology for space exploration and development has been reduced to historically low levels, and concurrently has been focused more narrowly than ever before on immediate system designs and development projects. In many respects, the current budget is little more than an “advanced development” program with minimal opportunity for innovation and essentially no possibility that an invention arising from civil space research and technology programs could influence system design decisions, inform budget estimates or inspire new, more ambitious space program goals. The challenge today Space has never been more important to our national security than it is today. The opportunities for truly profound scientific discoveries through space exploration have never been greater. And the pace of international development of new capabilities for space operations has never been faster. Federal budgets for advanced research and technology to enable future space exploration and development have been reduced in scope and focused on near-term system developments to the point that US preeminence in space activities is in question. NASA’s advanced space research and technology budget was over $2 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2005, with a focus on objectives five to ten years in the future and with the purpose of informing program and design decisions, while retiring both technical and budget risks of those future programs. The President’s FY 2007 budget for NASA exploration technology declined to less than $700 million, and of that only a small fraction (perhaps less than $200 million) still addressed longer-term objectives. The corresponding budgets in 2008 and 2009 were further reduced. Little to none of the remaining investment deals with enabling fundamentally new goals or objectives, or dramatically reducing expected costs. With these funding levels and program goals, it is unlikely that the US will maintain leadership in space exploration beyond the current generation of projects—all of which are founded on the “seed corn” harvested from past investments in innovative new space capabilities. Further, declining support for space research and technology is creating an innovation vacuum in the US as small business opportunities evaporate, and funding for universities and students vanishes. This trend jeopardizes America’s long-term leadership in space exploration and development, and damages our ability to achieve important national security goals. History Since the conclusion of the Apollo program in the early 1970s, the US space program has experienced varying levels of support from national leaders in the White House and the US Congress. Moreover, during most of that time human exploration beyond low Earth orbit has been “off the agenda”, with the exception of the short-lived Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) of 1989–1993. During the same period, US robotic exploration has had a number of tremendous successes, primarily involving the outer planets (e.g., Voyager spacecraft, Galileo, and more recently, Cassini), but also the inner solar system (e.g., Viking on Mars, Magellan at Venus), and the recent series of Mars missions (e.g., Pathfinder/Sojourner, Mars Observer, Spirit and Opportunity). However, these programs have tended to reflect one-of-a-kind successes with a minimal number of spacecraft and missions using common systems or technologies, resulting in continuing very high costs. Various attempts to create a foundation of common technologies and modular spacecraft have failed. Similarly, attempts to bridge the gap between robotic mission systems technologies and human space flight technologies (e.g., “Platform Z” from the early Space Station Freedom program) have failed. The most notable successes in this vein arose from the in-space assembly and spacecraft servicing capabilities of the Space Shuttle, first in the early 1980s with the Solar Max servicing mission, then with the series of hugely successful Hubble Space Telescope servicing missions, and finally with the assembly of the International Space Station. However, these achievements were far more the exception than the rule. For the most part human and robotic exploration systems and technologies became increasingly isolated beginning in the 1970s. More recently Following the Columbia tragedy in 2003, the direction of the US space program was again the subject of intense discussion (led by the White House) and including various agencies and organizations. The result, announced in January 2004, was the “Vision for Space Exploration” (VSE). The VSE as formulated originally was much more than a new justification for human space flight. Rather, the Vision addressed the full range of human and robotic exploration, as well as a revitalization of advanced space research and technology with far-reaching implications. The original VSE strategy placed strong emphasis on studies, research, and technology developments that would in time inform decisions regarding architectures and systems for (1) a Space Shuttle replacement; (2) annual robotic technology missions to the Moon; (3) a human return to the Moon to establish a permanent presence; (4) new space observatories to explore the universe beyond our solar system; (5) a campaign of robotic missions to Mars and beyond; and more. With current funding levels and program goals, it is unlikely that the US will maintain leadership in space exploration beyond the current generation of projects—all of which are founded on the “seed corn” harvested from past investments in innovative new space capabilities. However, in 2005 NASA shifted to a dramatically different approach to exploration and related technology developments with the results of the Exploration Systems Architecture Study. ESAS results placed exclusive emphasis on a US human lunar return and in an attempt to accelerate the first operational capability for the “crew exploration vehicle”—a capsule-based Space Shuttle replacement. To achieve this focus, numerous strategic changes were necessary. References to other aspects of space science and exploration were dropped, as was integrated planning of human and robotic exploration missions. For example, the initially planned annual campaign of robotic technology missions to the Moon was reduced to a single orbiter and one lunar lander mission, and these retained little or no role in guiding design decisions for human lunar systems. Also, to avoid technology-related risks, a range of lifecycle cost-related architectural options were eliminated from consideration, including in-space assembly of lunar transportation systems, in-space fueling and servicing, reusable lunar transportation systems, and others. The result was a family of systems for low Earth orbit access and a return to the Moon that involved a re-sized, Apollo-like architectural approach, with a heavy-lift launch vehicle and expendable transportation system elements. Significant shifts in agency budgets followed these new strategic directions, including drastic reductions in advanced space research and technology development, and a redefinition of remaining investments as “technology development”, focused on already-made design decisions. This shift in strategy was epitomized by NASA’s elimination of the NASA Institute of Advanced Concepts (NIAC) on the grounds of budget constraints, despite that fact that NIAC represented less than one third of one percent of the agency’s annual budget. The real point was that NIAC no longer had a legitimate role given NASA’s new approach to innovation: low engineering risk designs, and modest technology developments focused on those designs. Unfortunately, the elimination of design-to-cost and investments in longer-term innovation have come with a price. By recent estimates, the transportation-related cost of a single human mission to the Moon using the present, low-technology design solution will exceed $5 billion; transportation for two crewed lunar missions per year would require approximately 60% of NASA’s annual budget. Moreover, in-house agency subject matter expertise has been severely affected, as has the Agency’s contribution to US space technology leadership. Overall, the ambitious goals that were articulated by the White House in 2004 have been pushed into the indefinite future. A permanent human outpost of the Moon, development of lunar resources, deployment of large space observatories, and ambitious missions to the outer planets: all of these have been pushed out into the future by 20 years or more. Moreover, it is difficult to envision how such goals could ever be achieved using current systems concepts and concomitant prohibitively high costs. Only new systems concepts, enabled by focused space research and technology developments, can change this assessment. At the same time, real progress continues to be made by the international space community, grounded in steady investments in new technologies and systems—and resulting in regular accomplishments in space systems. The international flotilla of robotic space missions to the Moon illustrates this point: the US contribution of a single orbiter and a future lander are largely indistinguishable from the missions of other countries. Without an adequate strategy for, and more robust investment in, advanced space research and technology, long-term US preeminence in space exploration and development is doubtful. The Office of Naval Research (ONR) of the US Department of Defense (DOD) provides a useful example for how long-term but focused government research and technology advancement may be pursued. In particular, the ONR uses four complementary program strategies: a foundation of in-house subject matter expertise, sustained basic research and technology investments, development and demonstration of prototypes, and a focus on future capabilities. The concept of “Future Naval Capabilities” (FNCs) is used by the ONR to focus advanced research and technology (R&T) efforts around novel systems and concepts of operations. FNCs allow a range of R&T investments to be coordinated around specific new capabilities—even though the details of those systems designs have not yet been finalized, nor development programs approved. Also, the ONR uses the concept of “Innovative Naval Prototypes” (INPs) to orchestrate a range of ongoing R&T and draw the results of those efforts into nearer-term demonstrations of working prototypes and test-beds. INPs are characterized by ambitious technical objectives, and their potential to truly transform future naval operations. In addition, the ONR has preserved for over 60 years a commitment to long lead, discipline-oriented research and technology development. These investments have been responsible for advances in areas as diverse as materials, electronics, communications, power, and others—but all leading toward naval preeminence. And finally, DOD investments have maintained a foundation of in-house subject matter expertise at the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) and other installations. Over the years, these in-house experts have enabled more effective technology investment decisions and, working with civilian and uniformed leaders better system acquisition decisions. Novel technologies and systems concepts must be matured and validated before decisions are made regarding the detailed designs of future space systems. There are a variety of business models that might be considered for space research and technology development. However, the strategies used by the ONR for its investments seem especially appropriate to the long-term character of the challenge of space exploration and development. For civil space exploration and development, these would be: (1) maintenance of in-house NASA subject matter expertise in relevant technologies; (2) sustained, discipline-oriented investment in basic research and technology at NASA centers, universities, and small businesses; (3) development and demonstration of transformational systems prototypes in partnerships involving NASA, major industry and others; and (4) a sustained focus on future space capabilities. And the results of these investments must be harvested before designs are finalized and system acquisition programs started. Assessment It is hardly consistent with the aspirations of Americans to “go where everyone has been before…” However, it is fantasy to suppose that the civil space program can affordably accomplish ambitious goals and objectives in space using systems concepts and technologies of the last century. Novel technologies and systems concepts must be matured and validated before decisions are made regarding the detailed designs of future space systems. In fact, numerous reports over a period of decades have established the criticality of a robust and focused investment in advanced research and technology, including the findings of several National Commissions, committees of the National Academy of Sciences, and others. Stable, robust, long-term federal investments in advanced research and technology for future civil space capabilities—funded at a level sufficient to assure US preeminence in space science, exploration, and utilization—are critical if we are to meet the challenges of this century: achieving ambitious goals in science and exploration, delivering on the promise of space to contribute to a strong national economy, maintaining a skilled aerospace workforce, and providing the foundations for future national security. It is time for the Congress and the White House—recognizing the challenges facing this nation’s space sector—to articulate and implement a strategy to revitalize advanced space research and technology and to make a sustained commitment to the implementation of that strategy. The recently chartered national study on the future of human space exploration, chaired by Norm Augustine, should take up this task. What should be done? The following actions are needed now: The federal government should revitalize its investment to invent and develop innovative new technologies for space science, exploration, and development, consistent with assuring US preeminence in space activities and industry’s ability to adopt these innovations for application in future space missions and markets. A balanced distribution should be created in the allocation of revitalized advanced space research and technology funding among more basic research efforts, technology maturation, and demonstrations of new technologies. These investments should be guided by the goal of creating ambitious new “future space capabilities”—well-enough defined to inform technology investments, but flexible enough to allow the results of those investments to influence designs, reduce costs, and enable new and more ambitious science goals. In establishing these investments, NASA must seek and embrace inputs from outside the agency (including other agencies, industry, academia) to develop, review, and recommend NASA advanced space research and technology plans, programs, and strategies. NASA in-house space research and technology (performed by engineers and technical specialists) should be restored, in balance with increased external research (by industry and academia). Funding for university research should also be targeted toward producing graduates with advanced degrees to support the follow-on work that will be undertaken by industry. We need to reconsider what makes an ambitious space program worth a substantial investment of public dollars—and consider again the historical and future importance of advancing space technology and developing truly new and valuable space capabilities for the public, the nation, and the world. To achieve the purposes for which it was created, NASA must maintain the excellence of its workforce and their expertise in a wide array of cutting-edge new technologies. As they enter the workforce, it will be impossible to attract the “best and the brightest” to federal service without a foundation of cutting-edge research and technology program opportunities. Moreover, a healthy NASA workforce, armed with appropriate skills and secure in its future, will provide better oversight for technical system procurement and program management. This competence will result in better performing systems, better ability to meet schedule, more productive interactions with other stakeholders in the aerospace enterprise, and more efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Although NASA must accommodate changing priorities and budgets, it must also ensure that it does not lose the important skills and knowledge currently possessed by its workers. NASA also must continue to ensure that the NASA workforce gains the new competencies needed in the aerospace industry of the future. In order accelerate the transition of novel technologies into transformational future space capabilities NASA must invest in demonstrations of innovative space prototypes on the ground and in space. Innovative space prototypes should be implemented in coordination with the DoD, academia, and industry; and wherever possible with co-funding with the private sector in order to speed the application of these new capabilities in creating new space industries. To implement these recommendations effectively, focused and timely near term action is essential: The National Academy of Sciences (National Research Council) should be chartered to conduct an independent, visionary study to identify 6–12 transformational “future space capabilities” that would—if developed—enable a wide range of new, ambitious, and affordable space exploration and development. These future space capabilities would in turn drive planning for government and industry research and technology investments. The Administration should develop—in consultation with the US Congress, and using NASA as its executive agent—a strategic research and technology development roadmap that establishes a baseline for achieving these goals, including objectives, schedules, milestones and budgets. This roadmap should be used to provide the basis for future US investments in advanced space research and technology development and demonstrations. The US space program needs more than a national discussion of what human exploration should do next: International Space Station research versus lunar outposts versus asteroid sorties versus human Mars missions, and so on. These are important questions. Even more, however, weneed to set in place basic policies that can endure from one administration to the next. We need to reconsider what makes an ambitious space program worth a substantial investment of public dollars—and consider again the historical and future importance of advancing space technology and developing truly new and valuable space capabilities for the public, the nation, and the world.

#### Aerospace solves cyberterrorism

Deloitte 12 | (Deloitte is a consulting and financial advisory service, Report Commissioned by the Aerospace Industries Association, " The Aerospace and Defense Industry in the U.S. A financial and economic impact study," March, http://www.aia-aerospace.org/assets/deloitte\_study\_2012.pdf)

The world continues to demonstrate how dangerous it is and how our civilization and way of life can be put in jeopardy quickly. The surprise attacks on Pearl Harbor and the tragic events surrounding the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have shown our nation how vulnerable it can be. Technology innovations and products developed in the aerospace and defense industry have made our nation safer, from sophisticated sensors that can “see” nefarious activities of our adversaries, to the bomb and metal detectors that have become ubiquitous at airports around the world, the industry continues to innovate to produce the necessary defenses used to increase our national security. Recent advances to counter the next generation national security threats include for example, sophisticated software to trace bank transactions of terrorists, advanced listening sensors to eavesdrop on communications of known terrorists, and sophisticated sensors to help discover threats at our airports, borders, and seaports. Of course, the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) has been extraordinarily successful in helping to see, then attack if necessary, our adversaries. Lastly, the specter of a potential cyber-attack on our nation’s water, power, transportation or communications infrastructure is cause for alarm, and the industry continues to develop the next generation technologies to address these and future threats.

#### Great power nuclear war

Fritz 9 | Researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament [Jason, researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, former Army officer and consultant, and has a master of international relations at Bond University, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control,” July, <http://www.icnnd.org/latest/research/Jason_Fritz_Hacking_NC2.pdf>]

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established cyber terrorists’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists could fake or actually cause one nuclear-armed state to attack another, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. This would also act as a force equaliser, and provide terrorists with the asymmetric benefits of high speed, removal of geographical distance, and a relatively low cost. Continuing difficulties in developing computer tracking technologies which could trace the identity of intruders, and difficulties in establishing an internationally agreed upon legal framework to guide responses to computer network operations, point towards an inherent weakness in using computer networks to manage nuclear weaponry. This is particularly relevant to reducing the hair trigger posture of existing nuclear arsenals. All computers which are connected to the internet are susceptible to infiltration and remote control. Computers which operate on a closed network may also be compromised by various hacker methods, such as privilege escalation, roaming notebooks, wireless access points, embedded exploits in software and hardware, and maintenance entry points. For example, e-mail spoofing targeted at individuals who have access to a closed network, could lead to the installation of a virus on an open network. This virus could then be carelessly transported on removable data storage between the open and closed network. Information found on the internet may also reveal how to access these closed networks directly. Efforts by militaries to place increasing reliance on computer networks, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, and their desire to have multiple launch options, such as nuclear triad capability, enables multiple entry points for terrorists. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, the alleged Soviet system known as Perimetr was designed to automatically launch nuclear weapons if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia. Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. Disruptions in communication and the use of disinformation could also be used to provoke uninformed responses. For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, claims of responsibility and declarations of war could be falsified in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.

### AO---SPS---Water Wars

#### SPS solves water wars – the impact is extinction

**Schwab 5 –** director of the Homeplanet Defense Institute (Martin, Homeplanet Defense: Strategic Thought for a World in Crisis, chapter 5)

The protracted crisis in Israel/Palestine continues to fuel much of the fire in the hearts of the Islamic world against the U.S. Even Europe, in general, perceives the U.S. as an impartial broker. This dynamic is destructive to the world system because it divides the transatlantic alliance, perhaps more than most analysts are willing to admit. As the gulf between Europe and the U.S. widens, hardliners and even reformers in China have less of an incentive to take the risks necessary for renewing their great civilization. I believe the sickness in Israel/Palestine radiates outward to the rest of humankind, leading us toward auto-nuclear annihilation on our planet. By implication, I believe the situation in Israel/Palestine is the most immediate and pivotal threat to humankind's continued expansion throughout the cosmos. The stakes have never been higher, more urgent and more opportune on this question than at the present. This is why an entire chapter is devoted to examining this infuriating conflict. Rabbi Michael Lerner, a citizen of San Francisco whose father was national vice president of the Zionist Organization of America, offers a reflective and courageous voice on what is needed to heal Israel/Palestine. "Healing Israel/Palestine" is Rabbi Lerner's framework for how to resolve once and for all this burning and vital question before the world community. To quote Rabbi Lerner: Jews did not return to their ancient homeland to oppress the Palestinian people, and Palestinians did not resist the creation of a Jewish state out of hatred of the Jews ... In fact, both sides have made and continue to make terrible mistakes ... As long as each side clings to its own story, and is unable to acknowledge what is plausible in the story of the other side, peace will remain a distant hope... We need to learn how two groups of human beings, each containing the usual range of people –from loving to hateful, rational to demented, idealistic to self-centered – could end up feeling so angry at each other. 180 Rabbi Lerner has founded a group called Tikkun, which in Hebrew means healing or transformation. This dedicated group has an agenda of global peace that starts- with healing Israel/Palestine. See also www.tikkun.org. Another useful framework for cooling the cauldron of our world's sickness has been offered by diplomatic historians Dr. Laura Zittrain Eisenberg and Dr. Neil Caplan. Like Lerner, they contend that the "unfinished business" of the Arab-Israeli peace process is solvable but only if the parties themselves break the historic patterns of failed negotiations. 181 Eisenberg and Caplan outline the period from 1918-1977 as being characterized by "persistence of passionately held but genuinely irreconcilable national goals [italics are mine]" primarily over territory. The nation-states in the region conducted negotiations for appearances, "trying to impress upon their constituents or upon a powerful third party the justness of their cause, the righteousness of their interpretation of events and their flexibility and willingness to resolve matters, as opposed to the extremist, uncompromising posture of the other side."' 82 Today, this description still applies to Israel and the Palestinians. Eisenberg and Caplan conclude that what is needed, is for the leaders in the region to somehow think about the conflict in a different way that does not inevitably lead to deadlock. 181 The rest of this chapter offers a few specific prescriptive measures by which Israel/Palestine can heal their sickness, with the aid of the rest of the world. As the world moves forward on the Israel/Palestine question, it will be important for the U.S., EU, Russia and the UN, known as the "Quartet" of third-party negotiators to keep in mind a potential inhibitor to peace in the region: The leaders of Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iran will be vying amongst one other to be the most influential leader of all Islamic people. Middle East water as a global strategic issue Given the intertwining issues of Israeli settlements and Palestinian and Arab states' demographic projections, this section will address the issue of water in the Middle East in terms of scarcity rather than distribution. During the latter half of 2002, water scarcity became a quiet driver of conflict in the Middle East. This driver, which has long been considered a topic of "low diplomacy," has the potential to inflame already negative attitudes against the U.S. presence in the region. It has been argued that water resource initiatives over the years have not been as successful as they could have been because they were handled separately from political discussions. Some believe that this separation of "high" diplomacy from "low" diplomacy dooms each process to failure. Progress that had been made by water experts in the Madrid multilateral talks ceased in 1996 only because the bilateral talks on final status between the Palestinians and Israel broke down during Benjamin Netanyahu's tenure as Prime Minister of Israel.' 84 Restarting the multilateral discussions known as the "multilaterals" became a high diplomacy issue of public contention between Israel and Egypt. Egypt contended that resumption of the multilaterals was contingent on the revival of the bilateral talks between Israel and Syria. Addressing mutual problems (namely water scarcity) in what has become the "post peace process era" in the Middle East is an alternative diplomatic framework in which to shape a common vision for future general relations.' 85 In October 2002, the Sharon government of Israel, despite U.S. pressure on it to compromise on the water issue, threatened to go to war with Lebanon over water resources. Sharon, a long time champion for Israeli settlements, stated: "We are deploying maximum efforts to keep our water resources, and Israel always has and always will do whatever it takes to protect its vital resources." This statement, made on public radio, was in reaction to Lebanon's plan to pump water from the Wazzani River. This river indirectly feeds the Sea of Galilee, Israel's main source of fresh water. Lebanon's position is that the water transfer would provide needed drinking water to some 40 villages in the border area. This area had been under Israeli occupation for 22 years, until May 2000. 186 In response, Hezbollah chief, Seyyed Hassan Nasrallah, warned Israel that if it attacks the new Lebanese pumping station on the Wazzani, his guerrillas would retaliate "within minutes" at already selected targets in Israel.' 8' These diplomatic exchanges, through the intermediary of the international press, are indicative of a type of cold war framework that has emerged over the lifeblood of the region, water. Given the seriousness of the situation, the U.S. Department of State sent to the region Chuck Lawson, a U.S. water expert. In late 2002, Lawson conducted quiet talks with officials on both sides of the border. In addition, the EU and the UN sent their own delegates to mediate. 188 It is absolutely critical that the U.S. preempt the possibility of nation-state on nation-state conflict between Israel and her neighbors by placing desalination powered by space solar power on the agenda for peace in a manner that is noticeable to the world community. This is not the first time that the U.S. has acted as a critical third party in the Middle East over the issue of water scarcity. In July 1953, just a few years after its founding, Israel began construction on the intake of its National Water Carrier, on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee. The problem was that their construction began in the demilitarized zone between Israel and Syria. Syria deployed its armed forces along the border and artillery units opened fire on the construction and engineering sites. Syria then protested Israel's action to the UN. 189 In 1954, the UN issued a resolution that allowed Israel to resume work on the water carrier and the U.S.S.R. vetoed the resolution. Israel then moved its intake out of the demilitarized zone and to the northwest shore of the Sea of Galilee. It was during this tense situation, with Cold War implications, that President Eisenhower sent his special envoy, Eric Johnston, to the Middle East in October 1953. His mission was to mediate a comprehensive settlement of the Jordan River system and design a plan for its regional development.'" Johnston engaged in shuttle diplomacy until the end of 1955 to reconcile and unify the separate plans that had been presented by the U.S., Arab states and Israel. His position in the negotiations was bolstered by the fact that the U.S. was offering to fund two-thirds of the development costs. Johnston was also able to work with the common belief by both sides that a regional approach was needed.' 9' Johnston addressed the objections of both Israelis and Arabs and therefore achieved a great deal of compromise in what has become known as the "Johnston Plan." The structure of the Johnston Plan was around distribution of existing water in the Jordan Basin. Four hundred million cubic meters (MCM) per year would go to Israel, 720 MCM/year to Jordan, 35 MCM/year to Lebanon and 132 MCM/year to Syria. Israel had given up on appropriating the Litani River for its sole use and was accepting international supervision of its water projects. Arab states agreed to Israeli storage of water in the Sea of Galilee and the construction of the Magarin Dam as long as neither side would have physical control over the share available to the other.' 192 Johnston's neglect, perhaps purposeful, of groundwater issues later proved to be a significant oversight. The Johnston Plan was never ratified. However, since that time to the present, Israeli and Jordanian (not Syrian) water officials have met several times a year at the confluence of the Jordan and Yarmuk rivers at "Picnic Table Talks" to discuss flow rates and allocations. The water officials even meet as often as every two weeks during the critical summer months. It should be noted that the impetus for this cooperation has been funding for future water development projects, promised by the U.S. only as long as the principles behind the Johnston Plan are adhered to.' 9' Sometimes, what a critical third party cannot achieve through the rule of law, due to the need of parties to save face, can be achieved through hard cash, in combination with innovative ideas. It is important to understand that the Middle East is a transition zone between Mediterranean subtropical and and climates. The Middle East has three main watersheds: the Nile Basin, the Jordan Basin (or "Jordan Valley") and the Tigris-Euphrates Basin. The politics of the Middle East have always been in part "hydro-politics" that occur when a population's demand for water approaches or exceeds water supply. It is little wonder that former Secretary General of the UN, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, said in 1991 that a future war in the Middle East may be fought over water. 194 This chapter focuses on the Jordan Basin or watershed. The conflict in this area, albeit for many reasons beyond water, has infected the entire globe with fervor for human self-destruction. Understanding this crucial strand of this conflict is key to untangling this web that has been woven by Israel and her neighbors in the years since 1948. Seawater desalination powered by space solar power The proximity of the Mediterranean and Red seas serves as an attractive potential to create water abundance through desalination powered by SSP. This potential could help bring the general conflict in this region of our interconnected world to an end. The factor of expense that is associated with water desalination will not be used in the typical manner to disregard the option of desalination but rather as a framework around which all sides involved in the present conflict may be able to contribute. It is the oceans that hold 97 percent of the water on our homeplanet. Desalination is technically feasible, and the use of the process has grown enormously over the last 40 years. In 1992, more than 7,500 desalination plants of various kinds and sizes existed worldwide. Together, they convert 4.8 billion cubic meters of salt water into fresh water each year. However, desalination still produces just one tenth of 1 percent of the world's potable water. Desalination, either by heating water and condensing the steam (distillation) or by filtering water through a membrane using pressure (reverse osmosis), is energy intensive. SSP can ease this problem in Israel/Palestine.

## CP

### Competition

#### Perm do the counterplan as the mechanism of the USFG doing the plan---competition is based on mandates NOT likely outcomes---they just change normal means

#### Does NOT disprove the plan is a good idea---vote aff

#### **Should is not mandatory**

Atlas Collaboration 99

Use of shall, should, may can,” <http://rd13doc.cern.ch/Atlas/DaqSoft/sde/inspect/shall.html> ¶ In the expression of the requirements, shall describes something that is mandatory ; should is weaker. It describes something that might not be satisfied in the final product, but that is desirable enough that any non−compliance shall be explicitly justified ; may grants permission to do something, and makes only a weak statement.

#### Resolved is not part of the resolution

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing 2k [http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm]

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### Resolved can be an opinion not necessarily a determination

Webster’s 98 – Webster’s Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998 [dictionary.com]

**Resolved:**¶5. To express, as an opinion or determination, by resolution and vote; to declare or decide by a formal vote; -- followed by a clause; as, the house resolved (or, it was resolved by the house) that no money should be apropriated (or, to appropriate no money).

#### Process counterplans are a voting issue---these make aff offense impossible, kill topic focus

### 2AC Conditionality

#### Conditionality---reject the team---destroys stable advocacy---key to defending real world proposals---kills 2AC strategic flex---[magnified by multiple worlds]---1 conditional world and pre-round conditionality solves their offense

#### Perm do both---solves the net-benefit---the plan doesn’t mandate how the DOD uses energy---perm means they would use it best.

#### Perm do the counterplan

**Doesn’t solve the case---they wrote the text wrong---nothing about the CP has the DOD agree to buy the energy, it just has them to an assessment study about hypothetically buying it---means the entire case is a DA**

**Their net-benefit evidence non-uniques the DA---it’s about Obama’s current green energy transition for the NAVY.**

**There’s no link to the plan:**

1. **because we allow the military to use SPS energy how it wants---the Bistatic radar advantage proves**

**b) The NSSO evidence concludes it costs less than energy the military is using now**

## 2AC Coal Exports DA

#### Record high exports to China already

Reuters 12 – Reuters, April 19, 2012, "U.S. coal exports to China may double in 2012: Xcoal," www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/19/us-coal-idUSBRE83I0AK20120419

BEIJING (Reuters) - U.S. coal exports to China could **more than double to over 12 million tonnes** in 2012 thanks to depressed freight rates and a fall in domestic demand in the United States, the chief of top U.S. coal exporter Xcoal Energy & Resources said.¶ The expected increase in coal shipments could **further push down coal prices in Asia** where a supply glut following a deluge from the United States and Colombia has **forced prices to slump recently.**¶ **Australian Newcastle-grade coal has dropped** $10 a tonne since end-February, **the Indonesian coal reference price is down** to its lowest in 16 months **and South African coal has shed** $5.¶ "Exports to China could reach over 12 million tonnes this year based on the annualized numbers," Chief Executive Ernie Thrasher told Reuters in an interview on Wednesday.¶ "We only have data for January and February now, but all anecdotal evidence so far suggests that **there are no signs of that diminishing as the year goes on**," he said.¶ "I think there is enough demand in Asia to absorb enough U.S. cargoes to stem a decline in prices."¶ Many U.S. coal sellers have set their eyes on Asia as a shrinking domestic market and tepid demand in Europe have pushed them to look for new customers outside of their traditional markets.¶

#### Exports trade off with China’s domestic coal production – solves the impact

Tu & Johnson-Reiser 12 – Kevin Jianjun Tu is a senior associate in the Carnegie Energy and Climate Program, where he leads Carnegie's work on China's energy and climate policies. He is also a nonresident research fellow at the Canadian Industrial Energy End-Use Data and Analysis Centre. AND\*\*\* Sabine Johnson-Reiser is a junior fellow in the Carnegie Energy and Climate Program. February 16, 2012, "Understanding China's Rising Coal Imprts,"www.carnegieendowment.org/files/china\_coal.pdf

Coal mining can be an unhealthy and dangerous profession if it is not regulated appropriately, and the unprecedented exploitation and utilization of coal in China has created enormous challenges to miners’ safety. Since the creation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, official statistics put the number of Chinese coal miners killed by mining accidents at more than 250,000, and unofficial numbers are likely to be much higher.11¶ Mine safety depends on many factors, including the enforcement of safety measures, quality of mining equipment, and mine type (surface or underground mines). Most of China’s key state-owned enterprises, including the Shenhua Group and the China Coal Energy Company, run state-of-the-art mining operations and have very low fatality rates. For instance, Shenhua’s fatality rate of 0.025 deaths/Mt of coal in 2010 was not only significantly lower than China’s national average at 0.749 deaths/Mt of coal but also lower than the U.S. level at 0.049 deaths/Mt of coal in the same year.12¶ By contrast, many smaller mines, run by township and village enterprises, regularly ignore safety regulations and do not provide miners with modern equipment.13 In the past decade, these mines accounted for about one-third of national coal production but often nearly three-quarters of the annual fatalities. The fatality rate of township and village mines peaked at an astonishing 14.81 deaths/Mt of coal in 2001.14¶ **While the central government has repeatedly tried to shut down many of these mines, its efforts have been only partially successful. The government has faced a tight coal supply and demand balance**—with China using so much coal, **it would be difficult to lose the output provided by these mines**—and vested interests in local governments try to keep the mines operating for the purposes of local revenue and personal gain.¶ Insofar as they help ease supply and demand constraints, **rising coal imports** should make it easier for China to **continuously** close or consolidate small and unsafe mines. Thus the central government may view **overseas coal imports as an alternative strategy to address the coal mine safety challenge in China.**

#### We solve impact---Dvorsky

#### Major barriers prevent new US export growth to Asia

Place and Kriese 12 Eric de, senior researcher at Sightline Institute where he leads work on energy and climate policy and John, Seattle-based consultant specializing in IT, "US Coal Exports and Uncertainty in Asian Markets", October, www.sightline.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/10/marketanalysis\_2012.pdf

To be sure, the two leading Asian prospects for US thermal coal exports, India and China, do show some indications of providing a growing market. But both countries have ample domestic supplies of coal and murky policies governing their coal industries. Moreover, the United States is poorly positioned in geographic terms to supply a commodity like coal where the price is determined largely by the costs of transportation. Major coal-exporting nations like Australia, Indonesia, and Russia enjoy much greater proximity to key markets, and are therefore likely to enjoy lower costs.¶ At least one news account suggests that China is uninterested in large-scale coal imports from the United States with experts citing “high transportation costs, political red tape and environmental regulations” as major barriers. 60 Even relatively small players in the global coal trade, such as Mongolia and Vietnam, already supply far more coal to China than the United States, largely owing to their advantageous geographic proximity to Chinese coal ports. 61 In fact, one Japanese coal-mining company aims to triple exports to China from Mongolia. 62¶ Overall, we find that there is no clear trend governing the future of the Pacific Rim coal trade, but rather an array of countervailing and sometimes contradictory forces that defy accurate predictions. These major uncertainties in Asian global markets make investments in Northwest coal export terminals a gamble with precarious and unforeseeable outcomes.

## \*Immigration DA

### No Economy Impact

#### No economic benefit to legalization

Hill et al. 10 – Laura E. Hill is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. She has been a research associate at The SPHERE Institute and a National Institute of Aging postdoctoral fellow. She holds a Ph.D. in demography from the University of California, Berkeley AND\*\*\* Magnus Lofstrom is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California. He also holds appointments as a research fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) at the University of Bonn and as a research associate at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies at the University of California, San Diego. He has also served as a researcher and has taught at IZA and at the University of California, Irvine. He received his Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, San Diego. AND\*\*\* Joseph M. Hayes is a research associate at the Public Policy Institute of California, where he studies migration and population change throughout the state. He has studied migration in the Central Valley, the families of newly arrived immigrants to California, and the state’s prison population. He holds an M.S. in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. 2010, “Immigrant Legalization Assessing the Labor Market Effects,” Public Policy Institute of California, [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\_410LHR.pdf#ppic](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_410LHR.pdf#ppic)

Legalization of the estimated 12 million unauthorized immigrants residing in the United States would lead to both **economic benefits and costs for the nation.** **Some arguments for comprehensive immigration reform suggest that legalizing immigrants will help end the current recession.** This seems unlikely. Our research suggests that earlier findings from the IRCA era may overstate anticipated earnings from a new reform, at least in the short run. ¶ We do expect occupational mobility to improve for formerly unauthorized immigrants with higher skill levels. When compared to the continuously legal, their occupational earnings growth was about 9 to 10 percent. These higher-skill unauthorized immigrants are more likely to be overstayers than crossers, but unauthorized immigrants with college degrees are found in both groups. **Lower-skill unauthorized immigrants are not likely to experience strong occupational mobility as a result of a legalization program** (although their occupational earnings grow over time in the United States). It will be important that any new legislation give legalized immigrants incentives to improve their skills, especially in English. ¶ The majority of studies investigating the effect of legalizing immigrants on natives’ earnings suggest that the effects are slightly negative for workers with low skill levels. Since we find no improvements in occupational mobility or wages for the lowest skill levels in the short run, we do not expect that legalizing immigrants would place any increased pressure on the wages of low-skill natives or low-skill legal immigrants. Tax revenues may increase, although **many unauthorized immigrants already file federal and state tax returns and pay sales and payroll taxes.** We found that about 90 percent of unauthorized immigrants filed federal tax returns in the year before gaining LPR status. We expect that increases in **tax revenues** resulting from increased earnings among the formerly unauthorized would be modest.

#### No impact

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Economic power not key to hegemony

Kapila 10 [Dr. Subhash Kapila is an International Relations and Strategic Affairs analyst and the Consultant for Strategic Affairs with South Asia Analysis Group and a graduate of the Royal British Army Staff College with a Masters in Defence Science and a PhD in Strategic Studies., “21st Century: Strategically A Second American Century With Caveats,” June 26, http://www.eurasiareview.com/201006263919/21st-century-strategically-a-second-american-century-with-caveats.html]

Strategically, the 20th Century was decidedly an American Century. United States strategic, military, political and economic predominance was global and undisputed. In the bi-polar global power structure comprising the United States and the Former Soviet Union it was the United States which globally prevailed. The 20th Century's dawn was marked by the First World War which marked the decline of the old European colonial powers, noticeably Great Britain. The Second World War marked the total eclipse of Great Britain and other colonial powers. The United States replaced Great Britain as the new global superpower. The 20th Century's end witnessed the end of the Cold War, with the disintegration of the Former Soviet Union as the United States strategic challenger and counter-vailing power. On the verge of the new millennium the United States strode the globe like a colossus as the sole global super power. With a decade of the 21st Century having gone past, many strategic and political analysts the world over have toyed with projections that United States global predominance is on the decline, and that the 21st Century will not be a second American Century. Having toyed, with such projections, these analysts however shy away from predicting whose century the 21st Century will strategically be? The trouble with such projections is that they are based predominantly on analyses of economic trends and financial strengths and less on detailed analyses of strategic and military strengths, and more significantly strategic cultures. Presumably, it is easier for such analysts to base trends on much quoted statistical data. Strategic analysis of global predominance trends is a more complex task in the opinion of the Author, as it cannot be based on statistical data analysis. Global predominance trends need unravelling of strategic cultures of contending powers, the reading of national intentions and resolve and the inherent national strengths and willpower demonstrated over a considerable time span of half-centuries and centuries. Crisply put, one needs to remember that in the 1980's, Japan and Germany as "economic superpowers" could not emerge as global superpowers. Hence global predominance calls for more than economic strengths. The United States getting strategically bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan in the first decade of the 21st Century has not led to any noticeable decline in American global predominance. Despite Iraq and Afghanistan, the United States reigns supreme globally even in East Asia where China could have logically challenged it. More significantly, and normally forgotten, is the fact that the off-quoted shift of global and economic power from the West to East was facilitated by United States massive financial direct investments in China, Japan, South Korea and India. China quoted as the next superpower to rival the United States would be economically prostate, should the United States surgically disconnect China's economic and financial linkages to the United States. More significantly, while examining the prospects of the 21st Century as a "Second American Century" it must be remembered that besides other factors, that out of the six multipolar contenders for global power, none except China have shown any indications to whittle down US global predominance. Even China seems to be comfortable with US power as long as it keeps Japan in check. This Paper makes bold to assert that the 21st Century would be a Second American Century despite China's challenge and the strategic distractions arising from the global Islamic flash-points.

### Pounders

#### Multiple fights pound the agenda---Hagel, guns, budget, Brennan

Zengerle 2-14 Patricia, Reuters, "Republicans block vote on Obama's defense nominee, Hagel", 2013, www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/15/us-obama-nominations-hagel-idUSBRE91C1K320130215

The struggle over Hagel's nomination is one of many battles raging between Obama's Democrats and Republicans in Congress, including disputes over gun control, immigration rules and dealing with huge budget deficits.¶ Hagel broke from his party as a senator by opposing former President George W. Bush's handling of the Iraq War, angering many Republicans. Some Republicans have also raised questions about whether Hagel is sufficiently supportive of Israel, tough enough on Iran or capable of leading the Pentagon.¶ His performance at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee also drew harsh criticism. Even some Democrats have said he appeared unprepared and at times hesitant in the face of aggressive questioning.¶ The panel voted 14-11 along party lines on Tuesday to advance Hagel's nomination to the full Senate.¶ Republican Senator John McCain, for example, had said he opposed procedural tactics to block the vote on Hagel, but changed his mind in order to press the White House to release more information on Benghazi.¶ "As far as we are concerned on this issue, there are other questions. We feel the intervening week and a half is sufficient time to get those questions answered," McCain told a news conference with fellow Republican Senators Lindsey Graham and Kelly Ayotte, who have been among the most vocal Hagel critics.¶ Republicans said that Reid brought the uncertainty on himself by trying to rush Hagel's confirmation. Obama nominated Hagel on January 7 and his hearing before the Armed Services panel took place on January 31.¶ Democrats said the time frame was not unusually short. They also noted that many of Hagel's most vocal opponents served with him during his two terms as senator from Nebraska from 1997 to 2009 and knew him well.¶ The confirmation of another of Obama's national security nominees, John Brennan for CIA director, also faces a delay as the White House and lawmakers joust over the release of sensitive documents, including some related to Benghazi.

### Won’t Pass

#### Immigration is dead on arrival---won’t pass and won’t solve

Epstein 2-16 – Jennifer Epstein, February 16th, 2013, "Rubio: Reported Obama immigration plan 'dead on arrival'" www.politico.com/politico44/2013/02/rubio-reported-obama-immigration-plan-dead-on-arrival-157209.html

Sen. Marco Rubio said Saturday that President Barack Obama's immigration plan will be "dead on arrival" on Capitol Hill if it looks like the proposal reported by USA Today.¶ “If actually proposed, the president’s bill would be dead on arrival in Congress, leaving us with unsecured borders and a broken legal immigration system for years to come," said **Rubio, who's seen as a key figure in pushing a bipartisan immigration** bill through the Senate.¶ A White House spokesman told POLITICO earlier Saturday that the administration continues to support a bipartisan plan from the Hill and has not produced a final bill to send to Congress.¶ Rubio's statement is combative, faulting the administration for releasing a proposal without getting Republican input. “**It’s a mistake for the White House to draft immigration legislation without seeking input from Republican members of Congress,"** Rubio said. "President Obama’s leaked immigration proposal is disappointing to those of us working on a serious solution."¶ "The president’s bill repeats the failures of past legislation," he continued. "It **fails to follow through on previously broken promises to secure our borders, creates a special pathway that puts those who broke our immigration laws at an advantage over those who chose to do things the right way and come here legally and does nothing to address guest workers or future flow, which serious immigration experts agree is critical to preventing future influxes of illegal immigrants."**¶ “Much like the president’s self-described stopgap deferred action measure last year, this legislation is half-baked and seriously flawed," Rubio added. "**It would actually make our immigration problems worse and would further undermine the American people’s confidence in Washington’s ability to enforce our immigration laws and reform our broken immigration system.**

#### Obama’s strategy is to make sure immigration does NOT pass

Nazworth 2-18 – Napp Nazworth, February 18th, 2013, "Does Obama Really Want Immigration Reform?" www.christianpost.com/news/does-obama-really-want-immigration-reform-90270/

Republicans are asking whether President Barack Obama really wants immigration reform to pass in the narrow window that experts say now exists in the Congress, pointing to a leak late last week and statements by officials over the weekend.¶ Some congressional Republicans are concerned that the White House immigration proposal leaked to USA Today over the weekend signaled that Obama is more interested in using the issue to divide the Republican Party ahead of the 2014 elections than actually getting an immigration reform bill signed into law, according to some political insiders.¶ The leak "does feed a fear" that Obama "will pull the rug out from under us," said Michael Gerson, a Washington Post columnist and former speechwriter for President George W. Bush, on CBS' "Face the Nation."¶ Stuart Stevens, a top strategist for Mitt Romney's 2012 presidential election campaign, reflected that fear in a panel discussion on ABC's "This Week." Stevens could not understand why **the White House is leaking proposals that have no chance of getting passed in the House, rather than working with Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.), a leading Republican on the immigration reform issue**.¶ "Is this about politics or is this about passing a bill?" Stevens asked rhetorically. "You have in Senator Rubio someone who really is doing something extraordinary, trying to, and could be a partner in this process to help get it through."¶ Rubio could help the White House "lower the temperature in all this" and "try to get something done," Stevens added.¶ Jonathan Karl, ABC's chief White House correspondent, interviewed Obama's new chief of staff, Denis McDonough, on "This Week." Karl asked him repeatedly why the White House would leak the proposal and why they have not even met with Rubio.¶ "Let's be honest. There is no passing an immigration bill without Marco Rubio. How could the White House be working on a draft without Republican input?" Karl asked.¶ "We've got a bill, we're doing exactly what the president said we would do last month in Las Vegas, which is we're preparing. We're going to be ready," McDonough answered.¶ McDonough was referring to Obama's Jan. 29 speech on immigration reform in which he warned members of Congress that if they did not pass an immigration reform bill, he would propose his own bill. The threat is odd because a bill proposed by Obama would certainly have less support than the bills worked on by bipartisan groups in the House and Senate.¶ "An Obama immigration plan is not going to pass the House," former speaker of the House and presidential candidate Newt Gingrich pointed out in the panel discussion.¶ A bipartisan House immigration bill negotiated with a bipartisan Senate immigration bill "could actually get to the president's desk," Gingrich added. "But an Obama plan, led and driven by Obama, in this atmosphere, with the level of hostility towards the president, and the way he goads the hostility, I think it's very hard to imagine that his bill is going to pass the House."¶ Liberal Washington Post columnist Ruth Marcus added that Gingrich's point raises a "really interesting leadership conundrum with Obama" because Republicans are asking Obama to show more leadership on the debt crisis but are asking him to stay out of the way on the immigration issue.¶ The fear among some Republicans is that the White House will seek to add a "poison pill" to the bill, or a provision that will make the bill unattractive to Republicans who otherwise want immigration reform. The bill would not pass, but then Obama could blame Republicans for killing the bill and use it as an issue in the 2014 midterm elections.¶ **The leaked White House immigration proposal had several issues of concern for Republicans: it would not include adequate border security, it would not require unauthorized immigrants to wait until all immigrants who have applied to enter the country through legal means are processed first, and there would be no guest worker program**. A bill that did not include, at least, these three would not be able to pass in the Republican-controlled House.¶ Obama has already called for giving gay partners family status in the legislation, and there have been discussions in the House and Senate about adding that to the bill. Such a proposal, though, would diminish support among many, mostly Republican, members of Congress.¶ The Catholic Church and many evangelical groups are lending their support to immigration reform, but adding a controversial provision about gay partners could cause some of them to withdraw their support.

#### It LOOKS like it will pass but it WON’T---politicians are doing nothing

Navarrette 2-19 – Ruben Navarrette, CNN Contributor, February 19th, 2013, "Guest worker issue may kill immigration reform" [www.cnn.com/2013/02/19/opinion/navarrette-immigration-reform/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/19/opinion/navarrette-immigration-reform/index.html)

 (CNN) -- All those who are hoping that comprehensive immigration reform is going to happen this year -- Latinos, businesses, churches, agriculture industry, law enforcement and others -- are in for a rude awakening.¶ The trick for politicians will be to look as if they're doing something, when really they're doing nothing. But, **regardless of how it looks,** it's a long shot that Congress will pass immigration reform this year.¶ That's bad news for those who want to give the undocumented a chance to get right with the law and develop a sensible, fair and efficient policy for future immigrants. But it's good news for those who resist legalizing the undocumented because they're afraid of foreigners -- either because of competition with their work ethic, or that they're changing the culture and complexion of the country.¶ The problem isn't just Republicans, who can't get on the same page about whether they want to be reformers. It's also **Democrats, who seem to be playing the immigration reform camp for chumps**.¶ The signs are everywhere, if you know where to look. For instance, a few days ago, a draft of President Obama's immigration reform plan was leaked. It took four years to write, and yet its key points fit on a cocktail napkin with room to spare.¶ Here's what is in the plan: more border security, a requirement that employers use an electronic system to verify if prospective hires are eligible to work, and a long path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States.

#### Won’t pass the Senate, and House leaders won’t push

The National 2-6 – National Journal Staff, February 6th, 2013, "The Edge: House to Senate: You Go First on Immigration" [www.nationaljournal.com/congress/the-edge-house-to-senate-you-go-first-on-immigration-20130206](http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/the-edge-house-to-senate-you-go-first-on-immigration-20130206)

So when immigration reform gained bipartisan momentum after the election, this group came out of the shadows and GOP House Speaker John Boehner said the group basically had a deal. **The House had an opportunity to lead.**¶ **But** that’s not going to happen.¶ Sure, the House will likely hold hearings and markups, and maybe even offer the bipartisan bill, but they’re not going first. House Republican leadership thinks immigration will likely fail in the Senate, and they’re not wild about the idea of making their members take a politically tough vote only to have reform die. ¶ So despite being light years ahead of the Senate, **the House is unlikely to lead.**

### No Impact---General

#### Comprehensive reform fails – if it passes it has too many compromises that pent solvency

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

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

### No Impact---Timeframe

#### Timeframe is more than 10 years

Navarrette 2-19 – Ruben Navarrette, CNN Contributor, February 19th, 2013, "Guest worker issue may kill immigration reform" [www.cnn.com/2013/02/19/opinion/navarrette-immigration-reform/index.html](http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/19/opinion/navarrette-immigration-reform/index.html)

How long? The undocumented could immediately apply for a special protective status to avoid deportation, but it would take them about eight years to get legal permanent residency (a green card) and another four or five years to become a U.S. citizen.

### PC Not Key

#### Obama not spending PC on immigration

Aguilar 2-11 – Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, February 11th, 2012, “The great absentee on immigration” http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/homeland-security/282219-the-great-absentee-on-immigration

The president loves to pontificate about immigration, but the reality is that since his administration began, he hasn’t done anything to advance the discussion of immigration and help forge the bipartisan consensus necessary to address this important issue. He’s only made promises that he hasn’t kept. As a candidate back in 2008, he told Univision’s Jorge Ramos that “[w]hat I can guarantee is that we will have in the first year [of the presidency] an immigration bill that I strongly support.” Yet, he didn’t lift a finger to keep what Ramos called “la promesa de Obama”–Obama’s promise. The president went at it again a few days ago in Las Vegas where he outlined his immigration reform plan and basically restated “la promesa,” saying, "I’m here today because the time has come for common-sense, comprehensive immigration reform.” Yet, the president has done nothing to reach across the aisle to discuss his ideas on how to solve this tough issue. Since the election, in fact, **he hasn't called one Republican member to talk about immigration.** When asked in an interview why he hadn’t pro-actively reached out to Republicans, **he seemed to indicate that the leadership has to come from Capitol Hill and** not from him. “I am happy to meet with anybody, anytime, anywhere to make sure that this thing happens,” he said. “You know, the truth is oftentimes what happens is members of Congress prefer meeting among themselves to build trust between Democrats and Republicans there.” The question then is: how exactly is he leading and "working on the issue" if he's not talking to anyone on the other side? After all, the most important role of a president is of consensus builder. Presidents outline a vision to resolve specific problems the nation is facing and then work to bring legislators from both parties together. That’s what presidents have always done. A president doesn't lead or govern just by giving speeches. Congressman Luis Gutierrez, a Democrat from Illinois, and an unquestioned leader on immigration reform, just last month vented his frustration with the president in an interview with The Hill: “Who’s missing from these conversations is the president of the United States. When senators from both parties and members of the House are talking, when you have the Senate majority leader and Speaker Boehner both saying that this is an important priority. Who’s the one missing? The president.” Nonetheless, as Congressman Gutierrez mentioned, the good news is that congressional Democrats and Republicans early on, right after the elections, began working together on the issue and have achieved considerable progress. Just recently, after weeks of tough negotiations and discussions, a bipartisan group of senators came out with a framework that fully addresses the immigration challenges that our nation is facing, and that strikes an appropriate balance between the legitimate security concerns of the country and our tradition of being a welcoming nation. And a bipartisan working group in the House is expected to announce a similar blueprint in the next few weeks. The only party that has not been involved in these historic and productive conversations has been the White House. If the president is really being honest about wanting to get immigration reform done, then it would be better for him to quit for now the speaking tour, follow the example of congressional Democrats and Republicans, and work in earnest to expand the bipartisan consensus that has been achieved so far. Many are concerned, though, that the president will only use immigration for political advantage; that he will call on Americans to mobilize and express their support for immigration reform, but **won’t do anything himself to engage congressional leaders** in a serious conversation about the issue. If the president chooses this path, **he will surely disrupt the great progress that has been achieved so far by both parties** in Congress.

#### PC’s a bankrupt concept and isn’t key to immigration

Hirsh 2/7 Michael Hirsh is chief correspondent for National Journal. Hirsh previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek. Hirsh has appeared many times as a commentator on Fox News, CNN, MSNBC, and National Public Radio. He has written for the Associated Press, The New York Times, The Washington Post, Foreign Affairs, Harper’s, and Washington Monthly, and authored two books. “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital,” 2013, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207?page=1

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

### XO Solves

#### Obama will XO immigration reforms

Lillis 2-16 – Mike Lillis, February 16th, 2013, "Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform" thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform

President Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year, according to several House Democratic leaders.¶ While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, **Obama stands poised to use them.**¶ **"I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time**," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "**He's ready to move forward if we're not**."¶ Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major."¶ "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward."¶ Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "**the waiving of deportation**" in order to keep families together.¶ "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … there's a great deal of executive authority that he could deal with."¶ The administration **could also waive visa caps**, Grijalva said, to ensure that industries like agriculture have ample access to low-skilled labor.¶ "Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said.

### Winners Win

#### Winners win

Hirsh 2-7 – Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

## \*2AC Offense

### AO---SPS---Competitiveness

#### Economic benefits occur even before space deployment

SEC 8 – Space Enterprise Council, 2008, NSS, http://www.nss.org/settlement/ssp/library/2008-SECSpaceBasedSolarPowerWhitePaper.pdf

SBSP is unusual among renewable energy options because it might satisfy all four of the following criteria critical to investment decisions: environmental cleanliness, sustainability of supply, flexibility of location, and capacity to generate continuous rather than intermittent power. The cost of SBSP-generated electricity would initially be greater than that provided by fossil fuel or nuclear power but could be comparable to other alternative energy sources, particularly for baseload power. In addition, SBSP might offer an attractive approach, not only for satisfying today's needs but also for meeting tomorrow’s much greater requirements. We cannot accurately predict environmental and other consequences of harvesting energy from natural Earthbound sources (e.g., wind, ocean current, geothermal, biofuels), when these methods are scaled up to considerably higher levels. By providing an additional source of renewable energy, SBSP might help avoid potentially negative consequences if limits to the costeffective expansion of other renewable sources become evident. Beyond enhancement of energy production per se, SBSP might help create new economic opportunities through resultant technology advances in space launch, space utilization, and technological spin-offs applicable to a host of materials and processes. For example, SBSP research might lead to improvements in the efficiency of solar cells that power communications satellites, as well as power management systems for terrestrial solar power systems. Also, to the extent that SBSP is integrated into terrestrial solar power production, development of SBSP ground infrastructure might generate revenue even before deployment of systems in space. In this and related applications, SBSP could emerge as an enhancement for, rather than a competitor with, terrestrial solar power generation.

# 1AR

#### More ev---recession proves no impact

Barnett 9**—**senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC (Thomas, The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis, 25 August 2009, http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide **recession has had** virtually **no impact** whatsoever **on** the **international security** landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly **unrelated to** global **economic trends**. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: •No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); •The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); •Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); •No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); •A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and •No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.