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#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production, this only contributes to environmental problems and neoliberal market based solutions

Princen et al, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Michael Maniates, Professor of Political and Environmental Science at Allegheny College, and Ken Conca, Program Director the School of Global Environmental Politics at American University, Confronting Consumption, “Confronting Consumption.” Pg. 1-20. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Combining the elements of socially embedded consumers and linked chains of resource-use decisions leads to a third theme of our provisional framework: that ‘‘consuming’’ occurs all along the chain, not just at the downstream node of consumer demand. Nodes of raw-material extraction and manufacturing, for example, represent not just production and value added, but also consumption and value subtracted. Producers are consumers; production is consumption. An important implication of this idea is that what is being consumed at each node is not obvious. At the node of primary resource extraction it might be the tree or the fish, or it might be the ecosystem integrity of the forest or the fishery. At the node of final purchase it might be an apple, or a person’s attention, or a community’s social fabric. Another implication of this view is that responsibility shifts from the individuated consumers-as-final-demanders to actors at all nodes of the chain. Producers may add value as they satisfy downstream demand, but they also risk value depletion; they consume value by producing. In using up resources both natural and social, they impose costs on the environment and on people— be they purchasers, workers, caregivers, neighbors, or citizens. This consumption angle on resource use offers a corrective to the production-centered perspective that dominates contemporary discussions of economic affairs, including environmental protection. In that perspective, raw materials feed manufacturing and distribution to produce what people want. It follows that, because goods are good and would not be produced if people did not want them, more goods— and more production— must be better. A productive economy is, as a result, one that produces more goods for a given input (thus increasing the economy’s ‘‘productivity’’), yields more choices for consumers, and increases output. When production creates problems such as pollution, the productive answer is to produce correctives such as scrubbers, filters, and detoxifiers. So goes the logic of production, productiveness, productivity, and products— construing all things economic as producing, as adding value, as, indeed, progress. The consumption angle turns this around to self-consciously construe economic activity as consuming, as depleting value, as risking ecological overshoot, as stressing social capacity.

#### The impact to the mass consumption politics of the affirmative is planetary destruction, loss of value to life, and mass poverty and dehumanization—the alternative’s criticism of consumption is key to ethical engagement with the planet

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

As noted in the introduction, consumption presents itself as an area of ethical concern in at least three ways: first, because Western-­‐style consumption is putting an immense and unsustainable burden on the planet’s ecosystems, so much so that contemporary cultures of consumption are diminishing the capacity of the planet to support life as we know it in the future;50 second, because the high consumption, resource-­‐intensive lifestyles enjoyed by most people in the richest nations coexist in a world where great multitudes live lives oppressed by material deprivation;51 and thirdly, because there is a large and growing body of sociological and psychological literature indicating that once our basic material needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. are met, the limitless pursuit of more money and possessions neither produces any lasting happiness nor satisfies the human need for meaning.52 Far from representing the peak of civilization, cultures of mass consumption are showing distinct signs of widespread social, even spiritual, malaise.53 Any one of these issues, it could be argued, would be sufficient for consumption to become a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ When the three issues are considered together, the case for ethical engagement is compelling. At once, however, we are confronted with a strange incongruity, even a contradiction, of sorts, one that seems to tear the present analysis apart. In an age when the facts of ecological degradation, extreme poverty, and consumer malaise lie quite plainly before our eyes, one might have thought that First World consumption practices were already a subject of widespread ethical engagement. That is, one might have expected consumption practices to be a domain of constant and dedicated ethical attention, given that overconsumption seems to be driving several of the world’s most pressing problems (including the problem of consumer malaise). And yet, it can hardly be denied that any ethical engagement that takes place within consumer cultures does not, as a rule, seek to reduce or moderate consumption but rather encourage, glorify, and increase consumption – and increase it without apparent limit.54 And here is the contradiction: consumption is at once an extremely obvious realm for ethical engagement, for the three reasons stated above, and, at the same time, engaging the self by the self for the purpose of deliberately reducing or moderating consumption seems to be more or less unthinkable within modern consumer societies. Indeed, there seems to be an almost unquestioned assumption throughout consumer societies that consumption practices are somehow ‘beyond ethics,’ in the sense that how much we consume does not really need to inform the answer we give to the question of ‘how one ought to live.’ On the contrary, it is presumed that everyone is justified seeking as high a material standard of living as possible, a pursuit that is limited, it would seem, only by the laws of a free market economy.

#### The alternative is to reject the production based approach of the affirmative in favor of the 1NC criticism of consumption.

#### The purpose of debate should be to fashion ourselves, the alternative opens up space for ethical engagement with the problem of consumption and the embrace of voluntary simplicity, this changes our subjectivity as consumers

Alexander, 2011

[Samuel, University of Melbourne Office for Environmental Programs and Simplicity Institute, Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence, Online] /Wyo-MB

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western-­‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western-­‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption-­‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self engaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

# 2

#### TEXT: The United States Department of Defense should establish a power purchase agreement for the expansion of small modular reactors in the United States.

#### DOD is crucial – plan doesn’t spur investment because tech is still not ready

Andres et al 11

[Richard Andres, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and, Hanna L. Breetz, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,”http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20262%20Andres.pdf, \\wyo-bb]

The preceding analysis suggests that DOD should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors. This new technology has the potential to solve two of the most serious energy-related problems faced by the department today. Small reactors could island domestic military bases and nearby communities, thereby protecting them from grid outages. They could also drastically reduce the need for the highly vulnerable fuel convoys used to supply forward operating bases abroad. The technology being proposed for small reactors (much of which was originally developed in U.S. Government labs) is promising. A number of the planned designs are self-contained and highly mobile, and could meet the needs of either domestic or forward bases. Some promise to be virtually impervious to accidents, with design characteristics that might allow them to be if DOD does not support the U.S. small reactor industry, the industry could be dominated by foreign companies10 SF No. 262 www.ndu.edu/inss used even in active operational environments. These reactors are potentially safer than conventional light water reactors. The argument that this technology could be useful at domestic bases is virtually unassailable. The argument for using this technology in operational units abroad is less conclusive; however, because of its potential to save lives, it warrants serious investigation. Unfortunately, the technology for these reactors is, for the most part, caught between the drawing board and production. Claims regarding the field utility and safety of various reactors are plausible, but authoritative evaluation will require substantial investment and technology demonstration. In the U.S. market, DOD could play an important role in this area. In the event that the U.S. small reactor industry succeeds without DOD support, the types of designs that emerge might not be useful for the department since some of the larger, more efficient designs that have greater appeal to private industry would not fit the department’s needs. Thus, there is significant incentive for DOD to intervene to provide a market, both to help the industry survive and to shape its direction. Since the 1970s, in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well. If DOD leads as a first mover in this market—initially by providing analysis of costs, staffing, reactor lines, and security, and, when possible, by moving forward with a pilot installation—the new technology will likely survive and be applicable to DOD needs. If DOD does not, it is possible the technology will be unavailable in the future for either U.S. military or commercial use.

# 3

#### Compromise bill gave Obama power to take hard stand on upcoming debt ceiling and spending cuts – that’s key

WSJ, Authors Janet Hook, Corey Boles, and Siobhan Hughes, “Congress Passes Cliff Deal,” Wall Street Journal, 1/1/2013

Congress broke a rancorous stalemate Tuesday to pass legislation designed to avert the so-called fiscal cliff. But the compromise bill, which blocked most impending tax increases and postponed spending cuts largely by raising taxes on upper-income Americans, left a host of issues unresolved and guaranteed continued budget clashes between the parties.¶ The bill represented the largest tax increase in the past two decades and was passed over opposition from conservative Republicans in the House who objected to the fact that it contained no long-term spending cuts of any significance.¶ The House voted 257-167, with 172 Democrats joining 85 Republicans in supporting the measure. Voting against the bill were 151 Republicans, and the GOP leadership split over the issue: House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R., Va.) voted against it, while House Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) voted for it. Also supporting the bill was Rep. Paul Ryan (R., Wis.) the GOP vice presidential nominee who has been an ardent opponent of increasing taxes.¶ The bill now goes to President Barack Obama for his signature, ending a tortured drive by Congress to avert the fiscal cliff, a journey that ended up technically breaching the Jan. 1 deadline.¶ The far-reaching agreement will have lasting implications for the tax code, future budget battles and the balance of power in Washington. It raises income-tax rates for the first time in almost two decades and fulfills Mr. Obama's signature campaign promise to prevent rates from rising on the middle class. Not since 1991 has a Republican in Congress supported such a move—a challenge to its brand as the antitax party.¶ In policy terms, it permanently codifies most of the tax rates that were set only temporarily in the Bush era. After years of failed efforts, the bill permanently keeps the middle class from being hit by the alternative minimum tax, a 1960s edifice intended only for America's wealthiest.¶ At the same time, the bill defers some of America's toughest spending problems—in particular the ballooning cost of health care—and it doesn't come close to the kind of $4 trillion deficit-reduction deal the country's leaders had hoped to negotiate. By some estimates, it would cut the deficit by $600 billion over 10 years.¶ "The bill before us is not the Grand Bargain," said Rep. David Dreier (R., Calif.) as the House opened debate. "But we are working hard to pull ourselves back from the cliff."¶ The compromise dodges one cliff, but it sends Congress barreling toward another. In two months, the delayed $110 billion in spending cuts will again kick in. At the same time, the U.S. will face the need to increase its borrowing limit, a change that can only be made by Congress. That sets up another rancorous fight, one with potentially more damaging consequences. Republicans want to use the debt ceiling to extract spending cuts. Mr. Obama has said he won't negotiate.¶ The failure to grapple with the biggest budget questions disappointed business leaders who had hoped for a comprehensive budget agreement that could tackle the deficit and diminish what for some has been a debilitating policy uncertainty.

#### Obama’s leverage is key to new fights over debt ceiling and sequestration

-Political capital high: economy on cusp of revival

-AT: Compromise Bill Disproves: Compromised and merely delayed the big battles

Star Ledger, “Obama's legacy trap”, 1/1/2013. http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_legacy\_trap.html

President Barack Obama hopes -- expects, really -- that '13 will be his lucky number, a year to cement his historical legacy and reap the benefits of an economy on the cusp of real revival.¶ That expectation, as much as anything, explains how Obama approached the fiscal cliff and why he opted for compromise over confrontation. The president, eyes fixed on history, always viewed the fight as an obstacle, not a destination, a thing to be gotten past on his way to breaking the historical pattern of weak, scandal-scarred and anticlimactic second-term presidencies.¶ But the endless battle over the budget -- new fights over the debt ceiling and automatic spending cuts loom in a matter of weeks -- could become a legacy trap for Obama, robbing him of precious leverage to redefine his relationship with Republicans on terms more favorable to an ambitious second-term agenda, scholars of the presidency say.¶ "People don't queue up in lines to see the pens for a budget deal under glass, or 'Hey, I just cut this deal with Boehner,'" says presidential historian Douglas Brinkley.¶ "Presidents are remembered for the big things. FDR did Social Security. Truman created the CIA. There's Eisenhower and the highway system. Kennedy and the moon," Brinkley added. "So, it's going to be Obama and what? Obamacare, that's the big one, and killing Bin Laden. There's room for one more big item. What will it be? Immigration? Climate change? It won't be deficits or the fiscal cliff."¶ The White House is casting the potential fiscal deal as a major victory because it forces Republicans to turn their backs on a two-decade policy of opposing all tax increases, even those on the wealthiest Americans, which is a "big win," in the words of one West Wing adviser.¶ For his part, Obama said Monday, "If we're going to be serious about deficit reduction and debt reduction, then it's going to have to be a matter of shared sacrifice -- at least as long as I'm president. And I'm going to be president for the next four years, I think..." he said with a widening smile on Monday.¶ The challenge for a president unusually attuned to his place in history is how to manage fights like the cliff without being diverted by them, and how to suppress the GOP challenge without it becoming a major drain of his time, popular good will and power.¶ "The question is whether he's willing to use the leverage he has to get a better deal. He has a chance to make history here," said Jared Bernstein, a former adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, reflecting the mixed emotions of many nervous progressives watching the cliff talks from the sidelines. "Standing up to them would not only be a gift to the country, but a big part of his legacy."¶ One staffer for a senior Senate Democrat, summing up the view of several other aides interviewed by POLITICO, called the potential deal a "cave," and warned that Obama's Monday afternoon campaign-style event ahead of the final deal was a "Leon Lett moment" -- a reference to the Dallas Cowboys lineman who fumbled the ball while celebrating a touchdown short of the goal line.¶ But Obama and his staff believe Americans would have blamed him for taking the country over the cliff, and they emphasize his refusal to negotiate over the looming debt ceiling in a couple of months. Nonetheless, even the president concedes that the smaller cliff deal, while possibly postponing bigger battles, prolongs a fight Obama had hoped to move quickly past.¶ Even if he were to become bogged down, Obama's place in history is already assured. He is the nation's first black president, a controversial Beltway neophyte who managed to ram through landmark health reform (the future of which future remains opaque), an incumbent who won a fresh term despite a sour economy, a commander in chief who ended two unwanted wars -- all the while tallying unprecedented national debt and deficits.

#### Democrat opposition to nuclear power and tea party opposition to government incentives

Brent Franzel, Principal, Cardinal Point Partners LLC, “Debate Focuses on ‘Clean’ Rather than ‘Renewable’ Energy”, Solutions.bv.com, Issue No. 1, 2011

On one side, this debate has environmental groups and most Democrats, who are supporting a renewable energy standard that would require a percentage of the nation’s electricity to be generated from wind and solar and other renewable sources. Those on the other side of the debate want a clean energy standard, which would include nuclear and clean coal technologies. Significantly, a few days after Obama’s speech, Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) said he would be working to draft an energy bill that includes a clean energy standard. In the past, Bingaman has positioned himself on the other side of the debate – opposing the inclusion of nuclear and clean coal in the approved technologies. Of course, many Republicans – including many in key leadership positions – believe no national standard should be set and that decisions should be left to individual states to determine. Sen. Jim DeMint (R-SC), a key player in the Tea Party for example, criticized Obama for trying to pick winners and losers. Despite these positive developments, gaining approval of an energy bill this year will still be an uphill climb for congressional leaders. There is only a short window of time before the 2012 presidential and congressional elections overwhelm the congressional agenda. In addition, the primary focus in Congress will be on cutting spending in existing programs – not on enacting new ones. Whether a bill makes it to the president’s desk could be affected more by outside factors than by what happens in Congress. Developments in the Middle East and the resulting impact on oil prices will be the main factors determining whether Congress decides to act. The debate will be complicated by the huge number of Tea Party-affiliated members of Congress now in office. Despite their likely support for nuclear power, many are going to be hesitant to support new government incentives, such as loans and loan guarantees, to build new plants.

#### Lack of debt ceiling raise triggers default and collapses the world economy- bonds are a juggernaut in the world economy

Goldfarb Jan. 1st

[Zachary Goldfarb, January 1st, The Washington Post, ‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f_story_1.html>, uwyo//amp]

The deal fell somewhere in between. But by gaining the support of both sides, it did not achieve what many economists believe is necessary for the short- and long-term success of the U.S. economy. Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending. In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy. And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later. In the midst of the recession, the government stepped in with spending programs and deep tax cuts to lift growth and reduce unemployment. A majority of economists say those efforts worked. But federal stimulus has been winding down. And the spending cuts and tax hikes set for 2013 are expected to be a drag on the economy — with government policy offsetting much of the robust recovery being experienced in the private sector. Nor does the agreement do what many analysts say is necessary to achieve long-term budget savings and tame the federal debt, which is projected to grow rapidly as a percentage of the economy in the coming decades.

#### Economic decline causes protectionism and war – their defense doesn’t assume accompanying shifts in global power.

Royal 10 – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crisis could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Seperately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that ‘future expectation of trade’ is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavious of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations, However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crisis could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. P. 89) Economic decline has been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. ‘**D**iversionary theory’ suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increase incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a ‘rally around the flag’ effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlated economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crisis and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

# Solvency

#### Plan takes 10 years to solve

King 11

[Marcus King, Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team at Center for Naval Analyses, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, "Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations", March 11, <http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45].
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#### Nuclear desalination turns case- infiltrates fresh water aquifers, resulting in a net decrease in the amount of available freshwater AND it salinates soil, devastating agricultural production

IAEA, 2010

[International atomic energy agency study, Environmental impact assessment of nuclear desalination, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1642_web.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Although never applied in a nuclear desalination facility, indirect (subsurface) seawater ¶ intakes remain an option. From an environmental impact perspective, their greatest problem ¶ lies in possible fresh groundwater aquifer deterioration from seawater intrusion, if not well ¶ designed and constructed. Most commonly this happens by disturbing the flow balance that ¶ exists between waters with different salinity. When water is pumped out of a beach well, ¶ higher salinity water moves in the upper layers thus, for instance, enlarging the coastal ¶ brackish water zone where the fresh water is mixed with seawater. (Figure 10) Intake pipes positioned through aquifers present another potential danger due to possible leaks ¶ of seawater, which is why, for instance, this option was ruled out in advance for the ¶ desalination plant in Ashkelon, Israel [49]. Over time, increased salinity of the fresh aquifer ¶ water can lead to soil salinization and subsequently to floral deterioration including ¶ agricultural decline. Changes in the salinity stratification of the aquifer waters may also lead ¶ to lower quality of the desalination feedwater, affecting the performance of the desalination ¶ process. Finally, the initial disturbance due to construction may be higher when indirect ¶ intakes are applied, as seabed sediments are replaced or resuspended [25]. Their entrainment ¶ and impingement potential though, is negligible.

#### Nuclear Power can’t solve world shortages- uses more water than all other energy types

Smith 11

[Gar Smith, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War, June, , “NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE”, International Forum on Globalization series focused on False Solutions, http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf-http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf, p. 30, wyo-bb]

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today. But nuclear desalination is another False Solution.The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology.Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate. 154 Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce highpurity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit. 155 Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156

#### Only solves near coastal areas

DC, 2009

[Depleted cranium bad science blog, Evaluating the Potential of a Nuclear Desalination Plant, 5-9-2009, http://depletedcranium.com/evaluating-the-potential-of-a-nuclear-desalination-plant/] /Wyo-MB

One solution to this problem is desalination. Currently, it is used primarily in areas where water is simply not avaliable by other means. It is expensive due to the large amounts of energy needed to extract fresh water from sea water, however, it also offers the only source of water that is effectively unlimited and avaliable anywhere within reasonable distance of the coastline.

#### Means no solvency, can’t develop on coastal areas—too much population density

Chellaney, 2011

[Brahma, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Center for Policy Research in New Delhi, “The paradox of nuclear power: A water-guzzling technology, yet very vulnerable to water.” 3-14-2011, Online, http://chellaney.net/2011/03/14/paradox-of-nuclear-power-water-guzzler-yet-vulnerable-to-water/] /Wyo-MB

Nuclear plants located by the sea do not face similar problems in hot conditions, because ocean waters do not heat up anywhere near as rapidly as rivers or lakes. And, because they rely on seawater, they cause no freshwater scarcity. But, as Japan’s reactors have shown, coastal nuclear-power plants confront more serious dangers.¶ When the Indian Ocean tsunami struck, the Madras reactor’s core could be kept in safe shutdown condition because the electrical systems had been ingeniously installed on higher ground than the plant itself. And, unlike Fukushima, which bore a direct impact, Madras was far away from the epicenter of the earthquake that unleashed the tsunami.¶ The central dilemma of nuclear power in an increasingly water-stressed world is that it is a water guzzler, yet vulnerable to water. And, decades after Lewis L. Strauss, the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Agency, claimed that nuclear power would become “too cheap to meter,” the nuclear industry everywhere still subsists on munificent government subsidies.¶ While the appeal of nuclear power has declined considerably in the West, it has grown among the so-called “nuclear newcomers,” which brings with it new challenges, including concerns about proliferation of nuclear weapons. Moreover, with nearly two-fifths of the world’s population living within 100 kilometers of a coastline, finding suitable seaside sites for initiation or expansion of a nuclear-power program is no longer easy.

#### Nuclear desalination uniquely destroys marine biodiversity-requires larger water intake for cooling

IAEA, 2010

[International atomic energy agency study, Environmental impact assessment of nuclear desalination, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1642_web.pdf> uwyo//amp]

Owing to the economic and logistic reasons which tend to dictate intake location as close as ¶ possible to the coastline, the predominant concern on affected areas is on coastal water ¶ habitats. These habitats are full of nutrients, brightly illuminated and warm, sited in the areas ¶ where most of the primary production¶ 3¶ is to be found, provided by phytoplankton. Corals, ¶ seagrass, seaweed, and other marine plants also provide food, in addition to oxygen and much ¶ needed habitat for other organisms. Such suitable conditions are the basis for the intricate ¶ marine life ecosystems consisting of myriad different benthic, nektic and planktonic ¶ communities (as spores, eggs, larvae, juvenile or adult individuals) in quantities dependant on ¶ the local eco-balance. ¶ Having in mind that seawater is a habitat rich in biodiversity, intake systems, especially the ¶ direct ones, become a matter of concern regarding their environmental impact. This impact is ¶ harder to identify and quantify compared to the discharge impact [28, 34]. There are two main ¶ pathways of environmental damage to marine organisms: entrainment and impingement. Both ¶ introduce an additional source of mortality in seawater habitats alongside natural mortality ¶ due to age, disease and predation [44]. ¶ Entrainment refers to organisms that have passed through the openings of the seawater intake ¶ screens and were drawn into the water manufacturing process. Due to the extreme pressures to ¶ which organisms will be subjected, collision with parts of the pump, high temperatures, as well as the biocides that are used to prevent biofouling (e.g. chlorine), entrainment is ¶ considered to be deadly for all organisms. ¶ Impingement occurs when marine life forms are trapped against the intake screens by the ¶ suction force and velocity of water. Experiencing starvation, exhaustion and asphyxiation, ¶ they do not necessarily succumb to either latent or immediate death. However, very often ¶ impingement does lethally affect marine organisms. If they do not die by injuries from the ¶ collision with the screen or suffocation while being trapped, there is a possibility that some ¶ life support function of these returned organisms will be damaged. If the organisms suffer ¶ from internal or external injuries that reduce their ability to move through the environment, ¶ and thus become an easier target for predation, their chances for survival can be significantly ¶ lower. More robust species of marine organisms can have higher impingement survival rates, ¶ but some species have a survival rate below 10% [45]. ¶ Impingement usually affects larger organisms. Fish, invertebrates, mammals, birds etc. can ¶ get trapped and killed on the intake screens, which is the real concern with impingement. For ¶ smaller organisms like phytoplankton and zooplankton, fish eggs and larvae, spores of kelp, ¶ seaweed and seagrass, entrainment is of higher concern (Figure 8). Depending on the size of ¶ the screen mesh, one or the other will have higher influence on the marine life. Of course ¶ there are technologies that have been applied with some success or currently are being tested ¶ as promising in reducing the impingement and entrainment effects. ¶ Nevertheless, water withdrawal as a marine impact factor cannot be ignored and intakes of ¶ nuclear desalination plants should be of great concern, especially when direct intakes for ¶ once-through cooling are involved. The main reason for this is that nuclear power plants ¶ require greater specific quantities of cooling water compared with other thermal plants ¶ (Table 3) [46] and hence higher specific entrainment and impingement rates should be ¶ expected.
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#### Sequestration collapses Asia-Pacific pivot, power projection, ability to solve escalation, and air, sea, and land capabilities

Horowitz 12

[Michael Horowitz, NDT Champion, associate professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, 8/9/12, How Defense Austerity Will Test U.S. Strategy in Asia, thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/08/09/how-defense-austerity-will-test-u-s-strategy-in-asia/]

Decisions about defense spending are integrally linked to the United States’ overall strategy in the Asia-Pacific. Given ongoing uncertainty surrounding North Korea, China’s continuing development of anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities, and disputes over the East and South China seas, maintaining a robust presence in the region will be a high priority for any future administration. However, sequestration or other major defense cuts could undermine perceptions of U.S. resolve in the Asia-Pacific and make core U.S. allies such as Japan and South Korea doubt Washington’s willingness to invest appropriately in relevant capabilities. Concretely, such cuts could make it more difficult for the United States to maintain its current presence. The United States’ predominant military strategy for ensuring continued superiority in the Asia-Pacific is AirSea battle (ASB)—an operational concept designed to help the U.S. Air Force and Navy jointly respond to A2/AD challenges, enhance deterrence, and ensure freedom of action around the world over the next generation. Implementing ASB will require significant investments in advanced technologies, including long-range precision-strike capabilities and submarine modernization. Furthermore, ASB primarily involves investments in the air force and navy, raising questions about how best to rebuild the readiness of the army and marines. There is a trade-off between providing relatively equal budget shares to the services—potentially reducing inter-service rivalries—and rebalancing toward the Asia-Pacific. Even within the air force and navy, there are disagreements about which programs represent the highest priority for the U.S. military. One concern is the potential for large decreases in the procurement of F-35s—the multirole replacement fighter for the air force and navy. Unless the military can find substitutes, further cuts beyond those already planned could potentially make it more difficult for the U.S. military to control the skies in a future confrontation in the Asia-Pacific. Decreases in F-35 procurement could also make U.S. allies less likely to purchase the F-35, thereby reducing interoperability with allied Asian militaries and further raising F-35 unit costs. Budget cuts may also lead to the scaling back of plans to purchase the full slate of Virginia-class attack submarines that the navy has requested. Given China’s continuing investments in submarines and anti-ship missiles, the modernization of the U.S. fleet is critical to maintaining U.S. naval capabilities in the Asia-Pacific, particularly for antisubmarine warfare and strike operations. Major cuts could affect the size of the navy, in terms of ships afloat, and compromise the United States’ ability to project power in crisis situations. At even greater risk of funding cuts is research and development. R&D into next-generation robotics, a new long-range bomber, and C4ISR (command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance) is essential to guaranteeing U.S. military power over the long term. R&D for basic programs is also likely to be on the chopping block during periods of defense austerity. One example is the X-47B drone designed to launch from and recover to aircraft carriers. Decreases in funding for such cutting-edge programs could undermine the United States’ long-term capacity to control the commons in the Asia-Pacific. The unparalleled access the United States enjoys to air, sea, and space could decline if other nations develop new technologies capable of placing legacy platforms such as large carriers or manned fighters at risk. Rising powers in the region are not standing still. The United States will only maintain its conventional superiority if it continues investing in R&D that will pay off with new weapon systems down the road.

#### Lack of asia pivot collapses heg and causes miscalc/WWIII

Macgregor Oct. 26th

[Douglas A. Mcgregor, contributor and is executive vice president of Burke-Macgregor Group, LLC. He is also a retired Army colonel, decorated combat veteran and the author of four books on military affairs.

Read more: <http://nation.time.com/2012/10/26/affording-the-pacific-pivot/#ixzz2AqlmAi5s>, , October 26th, 2012, Affording the “Pacific Pivot”, <http://nation.time.com/2012/10/26/affording-the-pacific-pivot/>, uwyo//amp]

In the turbulent decade leading up to the outbreak of World War I, Winston Churchill, Britain’s First Lord of the Admiralty, urged Britain’s national leadership to concentrate British naval power in the Atlantic and the North Sea where Germany’s rapidly expanding high seas fleet seemed determined to challenge British naval supremacy. Churchill reasoned, “It would be very foolish to lose England in safeguarding Egypt. If we win the big battle in the decisive theater, we can put everything else straight afterwards. If we lose it, there will not be any afterwards.” On the precipice of sequestration and with the survival of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid at stake, Churchill’s strategic rationale is instructive, particularly for leaders in Washington, D.C., who advocate a U.S. military buildup in the Pacific. When Churchill made the case for concentrating the British fleet in the Atlantic, he was practicing economy of force, a time honored principle in British military affairs. In 1902, in the midst of a financial crisis brought on, in part, by the Boer War, London had already turned to Japan for military assistance in blocking Russian expansion in the Far East. By 1911, the Russian threat had disappeared beneath the waters of the Tsushima Strait, but the Anglo-Japanese Treaty still allowed the withdrawal of British naval and ground forces from Asia, facilitating the concentration of British military power in the Atlantic. The result was a debilitating blockade Germany could not overcome throughout the First World War.Like the British at the beginning of the 20th Century, Washington suffers from a case of “Imperial Overstretch.” Washington needs a new national security strategy, one designed to halt the dissipation of American military resources around the world and to concentrate it wherever it is needed. For the moment, the point of concentration is Asia, where China’s assertiveness opens the door to the kind of instability and potential for strategic miscalculation that is eerily similar to the crises and conflicts that preceded the outbreak of World War I in Europe.

Debt ceiling will be next big battle

Helderman Jan 1st

[Rosalind S. Helderman, reporter, January 1st, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/after-a-fiscal-cliff-deal-what-next/2012/12/31/b9d9a452-5384-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_story.html uwyo//amp]

The next big deadline is likely to come around the end of February, when the Treasury Department will exhaust the measures now in place to extend the nation’s $16.4 trillion debt ceiling. At that point, the government will not be able to pay its bills unless Congress votes to raise the nation’s legal borrowing limit. Republicans hope to use that moment to force Obama and congressional Democrats to agree to major spending cuts in return for the increase — in what could be a sequel to the contentious face-off over the debt limit in the summer of 2011.

#### SMR debates are polarizing

Carper and Schmid 11

[Ross Carper (rosscarper@gmail.com), a writer based in Washington state, is the founding editor of the creative nonfiction project BeyondtheBracelet.com. Sonja Schmid (sschmid@vt.edu) is an assistant professor in Science and Technology Studies at Virginia Tech. “The Little Reactor That Could?” Issues in Science and Technology, <http://www.issues.org/27.4/carper.html>]

Historically, nuclear energy has been entangled in one of the most polarizing debates in this country. Promoters and adversaries of nuclear power alike have accused the other side of oversimplification and exaggeration. For today’s industry, reassuring a wary public and nervous government regulators that small reactors are completely safe might not be the most promising strategy. People may not remember much history, but they usually do remember who let them down before. It would make more sense to admit that nuclear power is an inherently risky technology, with enormous benefits that might justify taking these risks. So instead of framing small reactors as qualitatively different and “passively safe,” why not address the risks involved head-on? This would require that the industry not only invite the public to ask questions, but also that they respond, even—or perhaps especially—when these questions cross preestablished boundaries. Relevant historical experience with small compact reactors in military submarines, for example, should not be off limits, just because information about them has traditionally been classified.

#### Nuclear power plant closing in Wisconsin due to cheap natural gas- other’s expected to follow

Owen 12/11

[Bruce, Winnipeg Free Press “Wisconsin nuclear plant to close” 12.11.12. <http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/blogs/under-the-dome/183048145.html>//wyo-hdm]

It didn't make the news here, but it opened a few eyes at Manitoba Hydro. Back in late October, Dominion Resources Inc. announced it was closing its [Kewaunee Power Station](https://www.dom.com/about/stations/nuclear/kewaunee/index.jsp), a small Wisconsin nuclear plant built in 1974 on Lake Michigan about 40 kilometres southeast of Green Bay. There were two reasons, according to news reports. Dominion had been shopping around for a buyer and couldn't find one and the other was because of the low price of natural gas in North America. The 556-megawatt facility is expected to stop producing power in mid 2013 and begin the slow process of shutting down. Reports also say that late last year, Alliant Energy Corp.-- its supplies energy to Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota--ended negotiations with Dominion on a power purchase deal. The remainder of Kewaunee's power is sold to Green Bay-based Public Service Corp. To try to localize this, Alliant, Public Service Corp. and Manitoba Hydro belong to the same club. They are each part of MISO, the [Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc](https://www.midwestiso.org/Pages/Home.aspx). MISO manages the grid in 11 U.S. states. Manitoba is the only Canadian province that's a member. The move to mothball the Kewaunee plant is dependent upon a review to be conducted by MISO on the impact of its closure on the grid. In 2008, Manitoba Hydro signed a ‘term sheet’ with Public Service Corp. to provide up to 500 megawatts hydro power to Wisconsin over 15 years starting in 2018. That deal was [scaled back](http://news.gov.mb.ca/news/index.html?archive=&item=11570) somewhat three years later. The question now is does Kewaunee's closure change things back in Manitoba Hydro's favour? The answer, it appears, is no. The boom in North America's gas production, tied to hydraulic fracking, has kept [natural gas prices](http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/blogs/under-the-dome/183048145.html) so low that some U.S. utilities are switching over their power generation to natural gas from coal. It's that, coupled with the poor economy in the U.S., that's created a low demand for Manitoba Hydro's surplus power. And for now at least, it appears the plant's shutdown, and the loss 556 megawatts, will have little impact on the state's power supply. Wisconsin just doesn't need it, some [observers](http://www.jsonline.com/news/opinion/market-has-spoken-in-kewaunee-shutdown-1b7bcjh-176502791.html) say. [Energy conservation](http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/opinion/blogs/under-the-dome/183048145.html) plus natural gas plus wind power have in a short time thrown the market upside down. Which begs the question: If it can happen in Wisconsin can it happen here? Hydro still wants go ahead with its new Keeyask generation station on the lower Nelson River near Split Lake to meet the growing domestic demand in southern Manitoba. Keeyask is expected to produce 695 megawatts. Manitoba Hydro wants Keeyask's first turbine turning by 2019 with the other six spinning by 2021. Soon a panel of Manitoba's Public Ultilities Board will start to [ask that question](http://news.gov.mb.ca/news/index.html?item=15563). What they come up with will define the province's place in hydro development for generations to come

#### Second, His pc is key-

#### [a.] key to persuade Republicans over new revenue versus new cuts

Financial Times Jan. 2nd

[FinancialTimes.com, Jan 2, 2013, Obama trades one US cliff for another,http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b983357c-54d8-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html#axzz2Gt9dH0xY, uwyo//amp]

Mr Obama has said consistently he will not negotiate with the Republicans over the debt ceiling. But it is difficult to see how he will be able to delink his request for a debt-ceiling increase from the parallel negotiations over the sequester. Republicans are demanding a dollar in spending cuts for every dollar they approve in higher borrowing limits. Mr Obama insists that any spending cuts must be matched equally by new taxes. Quite how, or whether, these divisions can be reconciled in time to avert a technical sovereign default is worryingly unclear. In the next eight weeks Mr Obama must persuade Republicans to avoid triggering a sovereign default. Given Mr Boehner’s tenuous position as Speaker, Mr Obama will need to make a serious offer of reforming entitlements, notably Medicare and Social Security. These are reasonable trade-offs, as the president’s own SimpsonBowles commission pointed out.

#### [b.] needs to use the bully pulpit-casts blame on Republicans

Shear & Calmes Jan. 2nd

[MICHAEL D. SHEAR, chief writer for The Caucus, the political blog for The New York Times., and JACKIE CALMES, Lawmakers Gird for Next Fiscal Clash, on the Debt Ceiling, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/03/us/politics/for-obama-no-clear-path-to-avoid-a-debt-ceiling-fight.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>, uwyo//amp]

In saying he will refuse to bargain over the debt limit, Mr. Obama is counting on help from the business community, given its traditional ties to Republicans. Recently, for example, the head of the Business Roundtable, John Engler, a Republican and former governor of Michigan, called for extending the debt limit for five years. “You don’t put the full faith and credit of the United States’ finances at risk,” said David M. Cote, chairman of Honeywell and a Republican member of the 2010 Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission. “The whole idea of using debt ceiling that way or saying ‘I’ll do this horrible thing to all of us unless you give in’ just doesn’t make any sense for anybody. It makes me very nervous. It’s not a smart way to run the country.” Mr. Obama might also take to the road again, using the power of his office in an effort to convince the public that another fight over the debt ceiling risks another economic crisis. Public polls after the last debt ceiling fight suggested that more people blamed Republicans for the threat of a shutdown.

#### A second downgrade would cause investors to shift to international investments

Adriana Reyneri, Millionaire Corner, Investor Website, 06/27/2012, [Would a New U.S. Credit Downgrade Worry the High Net Worth?, <http://www.millionairecorner.com/article/would-new-us-credit-downgrade-worry-high-net-worth>] VN

How have rumblings of a second downgrade to the U.S. credit rating affected high net worth investors? According to the latest Millionaire Corner research, the majority of Millionaires would change some of their investment strategies in response to a credit rating cut. Earlier this month Standard and Poor’s Ratings Services reaffirmed its long-term negative outlook for the U.S. credit rating and, in a statement, said it could downgrade the current AA+ long-term rating by 2014. The ratings agency issued the first-ever downgrade to the nation’s once-perfect AAA credit rating in August 2011. Key factors contributing to this negative outlook are the nation’s debt burden and the waning effectiveness of policymakers and political institutions, according to the S&P statement, which predicts little will change as a result of the 2012 presidential election. (Millionaire Corner research shows the economy is the biggest factor for affluent investors selecting a new president) How would high net worth investors respond to another downgrade? A large share of high net worth investors do not appear concerned by the prospect, according a Millionaire Corner survey conducted in June, which shows that more than 47 percent of Millionaires would not alter their investment strategies in response to a downgrade. (Millionaire Corner research also shows that investor confidence among Millionaires has reached a five-month low due to concerns on the economy.) But, a drop in the U.S. credit rating would prompt most high net worth investors to take some sort of action. More than one-third (35 percent) of high net worth investors said they would consult with a financial advisor or other expert to “know what to do” in the event of a downgrade. And, 20 percent said they would invest more conservatively. A small percentage (4 percent) would allocate more assets from domestic to foreign holdings, and a few (3 percent) would buy more Treasury bonds. Close to 2 percent said a downgrade would prompt them to sell their Treasuries. The first U.S. credit downgrade had a sobering effect on high net worth investors surveyed by Millionaire Corner at the end of 2011. More than 80 percent of investors with a net worth of $5 million to $25 million said they would invest more conservatively as a result of the downgrade, and 10 percent of these high net worth individuals said they would invest more internationally.

#### Immigration won’t be a big fight—GOP can’t oppose

Dallas News 2012

[William McKenzie: 2013 is upon us with big issues, www.dallasnews.com/opinion/latest-columns/20121231-william-mckenzie-2013-is-upon-us-with-big-issues.ece]

Plenty of House Republicans will object to a comprehensive overhaul of immigration laws. But other members of their party, such as George W. and Jeb Bush, have spoken out since the election for a humane immigration reform. And numerous Republicans realize that the GOP must do better with Hispanics. Boehner should capitalize on this moment and risk even more of his standing for better immigration laws, including giving illegal immigrants the chance to legalize their status.

# case

#### Marine biodiversity key to the supportability of the biosphere- also key to check warming

BBB 2012

[Biodiversity, Bioinfomatics, Biotechnology, 07/23/2012, Marine microorganisms hold the key to life on earth, <http://www.microb3.eu/news/marine-microorganisms-hold-key-life-earth>, uwyo//amp]

New Marine Board position paper reveals the importance of marine microbial diversity for our environment and society and proposes concrete actions to guide future European research Few people realize that all life on earth evolved from microorganisms in the sea. Microorganisms, or microbes, are those organisms too small to be observed by the human eye and they are everywhere, often in huge numbers. Just one litre of coastal seawater contains up to a billion microbes including thousands of different types. Scientists have long recognized the importance of microbes, which form the basis of all food webs and drive the complex biogeochemical cycles which recycle key elements such as carbon and nitrogen. Given that the oceans account for more than 90% of the Earth’s biosphere - that portion of the earth able to support life - it is hardly surprising that marine microorganisms account for a large part of the total biomass of life on Earth. They also produce more than half of the entire global oxygen supply and, in doing so, use up a large proportion of human-generated CO2, a greenhouse gas that is accelerating global warming.
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#### SMRs are dangerous, produce toxic waste, and weapons grade material.

MacPerson 2012 (writer for nuclear news online, “A reminder that Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) are neither clean nor safe” <http://nuclear-news.net/2012/04/21/a-reminder-that-small-modular-reactors-smrs-are-neither-clean-nor-safe/>) JA

The heading on Julian Cribb’s glowing recommendation of thorium reactor research (April 26, p11) poses the question ”Why is no one talking about safe nuclear power?” The answer is that it doesn’t exist. Cribb states that thorium reactors do not produce weapons grade material. This is misleading. To fuel a reactor, thorium-232 must first be converted to uranium-233, which can be used as nuclear bomb fuel. In 1955, the US detonated a weapon fuelled with U-233. The waste issue is certainly reduced with thorium reactors compared to standard reactors, but that’s not very reassuring. Cribb acknowledges that the waste would have to be stored for around 300 years or so, compared to tens of thousands of years for current reactors. Only in the world of nuclear technology could a requirement for 300 years of dangerous waste storage be seen as an advantage. India has been trying for decades to commercialise thorium reactors, unsuccessfully. As with conventional reactors, the costs are just one of the problems. The US tried for many years, but abandoned their efforts, and the stocks of U-233 were added to the radioactive mess the industry leaves there and elsewhere. Thorium reactors are yet another diversion from renewable energies and energy efficiencies that create no waste problems, cannot be used to fuel weapons and don’t need lengthy research and development programs that have already been tried and failed. Renewables are our future. Nuclear technologies have had their day.

#### SMRs are more expensive than large reactors – no adoption.

Baker 2012 (writer for the American Security Project(ASP) “Do Small Modular Reactors Present a Serious Option for the Military’s Energy Needs?” http://americansecurityproject.org/blog/2012/do-small-modular-reactors-present-a-serious-option-for-the-militarys-energy-needs/ ) JA

Secondly, SMRs pose many of the same problems that regular nuclear facilities face, sometimes to a larger degree. Because SMRs are smaller than conventional reactors and can be installed underground, they can be [more difficult](http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2012/05/23/small-modular-reactors-by-2022-but-no-market-for-them/) to access should an emergency occur. There are also reports that because the upfront costs of nuclear reactors go up as surface area per kilowatt of capacity decreases, SMRs will in fact be [more expensive](http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf) than conventional reactors.
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#### Perm fails—production focus will inevitably constrain analysis of consumption—need a more radical critique of our use of resources—instead of seeing binaries between consumption and production we should view all resource use as consumption

Princen, 2002

[Thomas, Ph.D., Political Economy and Government, 1988, Harvard University and Associate professor at the Univ. of Michigan school of natural resources and environment, Confronting Consumption, “Consumption and its externalities: where economy meets ecology.” Pg. 23-42. Published by The MIT press] /Wyo-MB

Conducting such research within the framework of the supply-demand, producer-consumer dichotomy is important, as noted, because production has been the dominant focus not only in economics but in the economic strands of other disciplines. It may also be the safest research tact, given the hegemony of the economistic belief system. Unpacking the demand function for environmental impacts can enrich existing research traditions and inform policymaking and do so without challenging their underlying assumptions. But for those seeking a more transformative approach to environmental problems, an approach that goes beyond ‘‘environmental improvement,’’ the prevailing dichotomy is probably more of a hindrance than an aid. It tends to constrain the analysis to market functioning (and malfunctioning) where ‘‘the environment’’ is merely an externality. A more radical approach, one that challenges this dichotomy and its propensity to relegate consumption to a black box or to the marginal status of emotion or personal values, is to treat all resource use as consuming and ask what risks are entailed in patterns of resource acquisition, processing, and distribution. This approach is more consistent with the ecological economics perspective where human economic activity is seen as an open subset of a finite and closed biophysical system. 17 Consuming is that part of human activity that ‘‘uses up’’ material, energy, and other valued things.