# RND ONE

# 1st Off

#### The Department of Defense should authorize and fund the creation of a thorium bank in the United States.

#### Your solvency evidence has no warrant as to why congress is key- only need to win we establish the bank to solve, your ev says you don’t solve production, just the construction of a bank

Halper 2012

[Mark Halper, July 24, 2012, Solve the energy AND rare earth crisis: Join the Thorium Bank, <http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/intelligent-energy/solve-the-energy-and-rare-earth-crisis-join-the-thorium-bank/17845>, uwyo//amp]

Kennedy, one of the organizers of the recent Thorium Energy Alliance Conference in Chicago, made a compelling case at the conference for Congress to authorize - but not fund - a “cooperative” responsible for not only taking the thorium off the hands of rare earth mining companies, but also for developing thorium uses and markets, including energy. You can watch a video of Kennedy making his case below. In it, he describes how he and fellow TEAC organizer John Kutsch you don’t solve have been lobbying Congress - so far unsuccessfully. Kennedy is a St. Louis consultant who is also president of a company called ThREEM3 that owns rights to the rare earth byproducts from Missouri’s Pea Ridge iron ore mine (which would come from monazite at the mine, I believe). He notes, ”As John and I have been trying to convince Congress…you could create a rare earth cooperative that could receive the thorium-baring monazites, and essentially pull out the rare earths, and then take the thorium liability and hand it over to another entity, something we can just simply call the thorium bank. “And the thorium bank would have a very simple elegant one sentence piece of legislation along with it that says, ‘Congress gives the thorium bank the authority to develop uses and markets for thorium, including energy.’ ” That, he says, would provide “the big tent to develop a thorium energy economy,” and would include Western partners and owners who would participate in the revenue stream and, by the way, create jobs. Kennedy suggests calling the entity the “Thorium Storage and Industrial Products Corporation.” He describes it as, “Something to give the public confidence - a federally chartered facility that’s going to accept every single gram of thorium and all the other actinides that are produced. “That thorium bank would solve the rare earth crisis in the United States in Japan in Korea in Europe. Everyone could participate and own. And own the offtake. Because it would be a co-op. And then you would relegate the risk over to this facility. And this facility would be the big tent where people could come in and either contribute capital or IP.” Kennedy, a firm believer in market forces, bristles at people who have objected to his proposed co-operative as “socialistic.” “They forgot how the highway system was built, or how we led the world in avionics.” He points out that the plan put forth by him and Kutsch, “Isn’t askng the government for a dime. We’re just saying give us a pathway so that people can invest intelligently and safely.”

# 2nd Off

#### Obama pc key and will pass now- Hard line key to defeat Republicans

Spetalnick & Crowan Feb. 4th

[Matt Spetalnick and Richard Cowan, Reuters, February 4th, 2013, Obama, aides seek momentum on immigration reform this week, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204>, uwyo//amp]

The flurry of activity, including new moves in Congress, comes amid disagreement between the Democratic president and Republicans over the question of citizenship for illegal immigrants, an obstacle that could make it hard to reach a final deal on sweeping legislation. Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election. But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades. Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants, and has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion. But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept. Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### Nuclear power has significant opposition – public and congressional

Andrew Freedman, Editor and Senior Science writer for Climate Central, “Feds Approve First Nuclear Reactors Since 1970s”, Climatecentral.org, February 9th, 2012.

By a v ote of 4 to 1 , the Nuclear Regulatory Commission approv ed the construction of the first new nuclear reactors to be built in the United States since 1 97 8. The reactors would be built at the Vogtle power plant near Way nesboro, Ga., which is a nuclear power plant operated by the Southern Company . As The Hill's E-2 Wire blog noted, the lone dissenting v ote was cast by NRC Chairman Gregory Jaczko. The nuclear industry has faced numerous obstacles, most recently the backlash following the Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan, in its efforts to build new nuclear plants in the U.S., and the Commission has issued recommendations on how to better protect U.S. reactors from earthquakes and floods. The country currently operates 1 04 nuclear reactors, but all were approv ed at least three decades ago. “This is a historic day ,” said Marv in Fertel, president of the Nuclear Energy Institute, the industry ’s trade group in a statement. “Today ’s licensing action sounds a clarion call to the world that the United States recognizes the importance of expanding nuclear energy as a key component of a low-carbon energy future that is central to job creation, div ersity of electricity supply and energy security .” Andrew Restuccia, writing for The Hill, noted the project still needs to ov ercome public opposition to nuclear power that may result in a lawsuit against the project, and congressional opposition to a hefty $8.3 billion federal conditional loan guarantee for reactor construction. "Some Democrats in Congress — noting that the loan guarantee is more than 1 5 times the size of the one granted to the failed solar firm Soly ndra — hav e called on Obama not to finalize the loan." “Ithink we are putting our taxpay er money at unnecessary risk giv en the unresolv ed safety issues and the lessons that hav e been learned from Fukushima,” Rep. Edward Markey (D-Mass.), a senior Democrat on the House Energy and Commerce Committee and a v ocal critic of nuclear power, told The Hill Wednesday . The Obama administration has supported the dev elopment of new nuclear power plants as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissons and cut the use of fossil fuels.

#### Critical to US economic recovery

Aaron Terrazas, Migration Policy Institute, July 2011, The Economic Integration of Immigrants in the United States: Long- and Short-Term Perspectives, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/EconomicIntegration.pdf

The fate of immigrants in the United States and their integration into the labor market are impossible to separate from the state of the overall US economy and the fate of all US workers. During periods of economic expansion and relative prosperity, upward economic mobility among the native born generates opportunities for immigrants to gain a foothold in the US labor market and to gradually improve their status over time. In many respects, a growing economy during the 1990s and early 2000s provided ample opportunity for immigrants — and especially their children — to gradually improve their status over time. However, the story of immigrants’ integration into the US labor force during the years leading to the recession was also mixed: In general, the foreign born had high labor force participation, but they were also more likely to occupy low-paying jobs. The most notable advances toward economic integration occur over generations, due in large part to the openness of US educational institutions to the children of immigrants and the historic lack of employment discrimination against workers with an immigrant background. In the wake of the global economic crisis, there is substantial uncertainty regarding the future trajectory of the US economy and labor market. Most forecasts suggest that the next decade will be substantially different from the past26 and it is not clear if previous trends in immigrants’ economic integration will continue. The recession, weak recovery, and prospect of prolonged stagnation as a result of continuing high public debt, could realign the economic and social forces that have historically propelled the the less-educated labor force have been dismal for decades. In some respects, the recession accelerated these trends. While the prospect of greater demand for US manufactured goods from emerging markets might slow gradual decay of the US manufacturing industry, the outlook for the industry remains weak. Steady educational gains throughout the developing world have simultaneously increased downward wage pressure on highly skilled workers who, in the past, generated substantial secondary demand for services that immigrants often provide.

#### **Nuclear war**

Harris and Burrows ‘9

(Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>, AM)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

# 3rd Off

### 1NC – Nuke Power Critique

#### Nuclear industry fuels the power of the state and militarism enables social repression and control through the establishment of hierarchal social relationships and technology

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

The nuclear industry then has been largely state-developed, owned and promoted. We can't explain the phenomenon of its development, in the face of apparently major problems, risks and disadvantages, without seeing the state as having a crucial and largely independent role, independent that is of its more conventionally attributed role of protecting long-term capitalist interests.¶ Nuclear technology is not obviously in the interests of capital, although it does have numerous features which make it attractive for profit-making e.g. it is capital- intensive, large-scale, centralised and suitable for monopolisation. So of course are many other possible energy sources. But capital has required constant coaxing and reassurance to continue to participate, and the industry would apparently have become defunct some time ago if those mythical ft market forces had been allowed to prevail. Thus there have been no new orders for reactors in the U.S. since 1977, and the industry is in a financial mess even with the highly favourable conditions provided by the state. [2]¶ The industry does however seem to be highly suited to increasing the power of the state itself, both through its military connection, and through its contribution to overall technological, social and bureaucratic centralisation.¶ This seems to present a fairly clear case then where the state has operated with some relative autonomy in promoting a technology which appears to be in its own interests rather than primarily that of capital, and to be the chief promoter and beneficiary of the industry which capitalism has to be coaxed to support.¶ So far the data I have presented is consistent both with a sophisticated Marxist theory which allows some relative autonomy [3] to institutions such as the state, and with more traditional anarchist theories which see the state as the central organ of social repression and the production of hierarchical social relationships and associated technologies (this last a modern addition). There are however other factors which have to be taken into account to understand the kind of social control being exercised here, and which show that the state reduction model - the reduction of all significant factors to the state (or to some combination of state and capital) is too simple and has other defects as well. These factors show the need to press on beyond purely state or other reductive models and to develop a more pluralistic model of the operation of power which sees power as " a productive network which runs through the entire social body much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression". [4]

#### This technological control through nuclear power makes nuclear apocalypse inevitable through technological development—the tools that the state uses to monopolize centralized control and power lead to destruction of life

Hubbard, 1997

[Bryan, MA Thesis at Arizona state University, Nuclear criticism after the cold war: a rhetorical analysis of two contemporary atomic campaigns, 8-1-1997, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA327948] /Wyo-MB

Brummett (1989) notes the entelechial drive toward perfection at work in the rhetoric of nuclear weapons strategy. Hirschbein (1989) also saw the eventual progress of nuclear science enabling an "ersatz immortality -- immortalization through making a lasting monumental impact on history" (p. 167). This impulse to power is not new. Humanity has always feared death, seized the greatest power available to avoid death and then created rationalizations to romanticize death. Like other continuities flowing into the nuclear age, the drive toward perfection accelerates with nuclear knowledge and its accompanying industrial capacity. The drive toward perfection informs the other two continuities present in the nuclear age -- the desire to cut and control and a shared fascination with the apocalypse.¶ Since humanity became a problem-solving organism, it has strived to cut and control its environment in hopes of improving its strategic situation. Harris (1991) claimed the drive to control the environment involves an attempt to master energy. He¶ traced the search for energy through ancient times noting that the control of energy enabled the control not only of the environment but of its inhabiting organisms. As people became more organized and specialized, the control of energy became centralized. The modem experience of nuclear energy enables an acceleration of this process placing virtually unlimited power (energy) in the hands of an unprecedented few (Mumford, 1980). The tendency Harris observed is one continuity flowing through our current nuclear experiences. J. Burke and Omstein (1995) call this continuity the drive to cut and control.¶ This desire to cut and control nature makes human beings human and links our creativity and destructive capacities, our tool-using nature, and our problem-solving inclinations (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995). In The Chalice and The Blade: Our History, Our Future, Eisler (1988) sees the modem nuclear predicament as the logical perfection of ancient traditions which claim authority and legitimacy through the "power of the lethal Blade" (p. 184). She sees the current path of society set along a grim trajectory and says, "[a] dominator future is therefore, sooner or later, almost certainly also a future of global nuclear war -- and the end of all of humanity's problems and aspirations" (Eisler, p. 184). This trajectory for her originates thousands of years prior to the discovery of the atom. The cult of the blade originated in the "Initial Kurganization" of Old Europe from 4000-3500 B.C.E. according to Eisler (p. 250). The impulse to cut and control (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995) guides the development of humanity from its earliest tool-making days. The potential destructive power parallels the productive capacity of humanity's tools. This trajectory accelerates into the twentieth century creating a situation where,¶ according to Eisler, would-be totalitarians and their "faith in the power of the lethal Blade as the instrument of deliverance" (p. 184) become one source of today's nuclearism.

#### The alternative is to refuse nuclear power production in favor of the 1NC criticism.

#### And the alt solves—need analysis of power relationships embedded in nuclear knowledge and structures—key to resist centralized development of knowledge and power (green highlighting)

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

What is clear from recent events in Australia is the importance of moving beyond a narrow, 'political' approach to the nuclear issue to one which is based on an analysis of the power structures embedded in it. This is important for the survival of the anti-nuclear movement as an important social force in Australia. The anti-nuclear movement in Australia has had great strength and by some criteria, great success. But the recent treatment of the issue at the hands of politicians illustrates vividly the ultimate bankruptcy of elite-oriented strategies for change based on appeals to decision-makers and working within a state and electoral framework. An inability to focus on alternative strategies will probably cause the death or serious weakening of the movement in the coming period of political confrontation, yet its demise as a widespread activist issue would be a serious loss. An alternative approach, stressing long-term strategies and institutional analysis, has great promise because the multiplicity of factors, critiques and sites of resistance to nuclear power gives the issue great potential. And such a social movement also has the ability to bring about or reinforce social awareness of the undemocratic character of social life and of the need for other sorts of fundamental changes in social relations, provided of course that the means adopted, for example, for working in groups, are themselves appropriate to these multiple goals and sufficiently challenging to day-to-day hierarchical social relationships and power structures e.g. sexist and racist ones. [9]¶ In this strategy then the critique of the role of the state is critical, but it must be combined with a critique of the wider power structure involved. What implications does this analysis have for anarchism itself? Does anarchism emerge as just another form of activism and critique, and anarchists as anti-state activists along with feminists as anti-patriarchy activists for example? This may seem quite threatening to many anarchists, since it threatens the claim to a more central or 'purer' position.¶ Such a view however ignores the relation between the different critiques - it assumes that they just coexist peacefully side-by-side as separate pieces of an overall puzzle, needing only to be assembled in their separate purity to providing a critique, not only of general power structures, but of the means and strategies adopted by other social movements. This concern with means and the stress on appropriate ways of pursuing other political goals, has been traditionally important in anarchist thought.¶ If anarchism is conceived, to a large extent at least, as involving another way of doing something else, of pursuing other social and political goals and effecting social changes in appropriate ways, rather than just as a utopian and unrealizable goal, disconnected from strategies and from other movements for social change, then there is an important relationship between anarchism and other social movements for change. Links with other activist groups become crucial, as does attention to the means by which particular resistances to particular forms of power are conducted. Stress on purity of anarchist doctrine, on 'keeping the hands clean' by not mixing it with less idealistic or utopian social movements must then be seen as sterile and self-defeating, and as removing this fertile area for achieving change. The real challenge to contemporary anarchism, conceived of as a general resistance to hierarchical and centralising structures, would then be in the struggle within movements for social change for appropriate non-hierarchical processes and to achieve alternative social relations, as well as for the adoption of non-centralising means for achieving particular social goals.¶ Anarchism in this picture has a crucial role to play for other social movements in maintaining the means/ends critique, and in promoting non-centralising and non state-strengthening strategies for other activist movements. Other social movements such as the anti-nuclear movement then provide a crucial 'field' for anarchism, which, to the extent that it is a general critique of power and of processes for achieving change, may still have some claim to a central (if not centralising or reductive) role.

# Space

### 1NC- Adv F/L

#### 1st, Competition over space is bad: The paranoia over space militarization has started a cycle of foreign reaction in the status quo–all of their impacts are both exaggerated and inevitable

USA TODAY 6-13-05

Is the sanctity of the heavens about to be violated by the United States making a unilateral introduction of aggressive weapons that could spark a destabilizing arms race? Is the White House about to unleash an unprecedented expansion of regions to fight over in the future? You'd be forgiven for thinking so, based on news reports in recent weeks and on complaints from foreign countries such as Russia and China. According to major U.S. newspapers, a wide range of high-tech armaments may soon be approved and funded, with deployment in space only a matter of time. At that point, reluctant foreign nations will feel compelled to "respond in kind," unleashing an expensive and dangerous new arms race. But a sober reality check can put the issue into better perspective. If anything is likely to spark a "new arms race," this time in outer space, it's unlikely to be the usual suspects. Gung-ho space-superiority mantras have been coming from U.S. Air Force leaders for decades, but without funding, it has mostly been just bold talk. Space hardware with weapons-like applications has also been around, on Earth and in space, for decades — but using it to break things in orbit never made much military sense, then or now or in the foreseeable future. Nothing here has changed. No, the impetus for a future foreign "reaction" doesn't need a genuine U.S. "action" — it only needs the near-hysterical ranting from American newspapers, from lobby groups posing as "information centers" but having long-familiar agendas, and from foreign nations eager to score cheap propaganda points. By whipping up anxieties with little rational justification, these self-serving fear mongers may actually lead to the creation of something well worth fearing: the arming of a new battleground, out in space.

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

Bell 05

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

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

#### Space Travel Impossible: Humans Cannot Biologically Function For Extended Periods Without Gravity, Heart Atrophy, Muscle Degeneration, Decreased Immunities, And Significant Bone Density Loss.

Theunis, 10

(Why space is the impossible frontier,16 November 2010 by PiersmaTheunis. Piersma is professor of animal ecology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and senior research scientist at the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research in Den Burg. This article draws on his new book [The Flexible Phenotype: A body-centred integration of ecology, physiology, and behaviour](http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/LifeSciences/EvolutionaryBiology/?view=usa&ci=9780199597246) (with Jan A. van Gils, Oxford University Press) <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827860.100-why-space-is-the-impossible-frontier.html//> UWOKB)

Theunis, 10

(Why space is the impossible frontier,16 November 2010 by PiersmaTheunis. Piersma is professor of animal ecology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and senior research scientist at the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research in Den Burg. This article draws on his new book [The Flexible Phenotype: A body-centred integration of ecology, physiology, and behaviour](http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/LifeSciences/EvolutionaryBiology/?view=usa&ci=9780199597246) (with Jan A. van Gils, Oxford University Press) <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827860.100-why-space-is-the-impossible-frontier.html//> UWOKB)

**Hawking, Obama and other proponents of long-term space travel are making a grave error. Humans cannot leave Earth for the several years that it takes to travel to Mars and back, for the simple reason that our biology is intimately connected to Earth. To function properly, we need gravity**. Without it, the environment is less demanding on the human body in several ways, and this shows upon the return to Earth. **Remember the sight of weakened astronauts emerging after the Apollo missions? That is as nothing compared with what would happen to astronauts returning from Mars. One of the first things to be affected is the heart, which shrinks by as much as a quarter after just one week in orbit** ([The New England Journal of Medicine, vol 358, p 1370](http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMra072139)). **Heart atrophy leads to decreases in blood pressure and the amount of blood pushed out by the heart**. In this way heart atrophy leads to reduced exercise capacity. Astronauts returning to Earth after several months in the International Space Station experience dizziness and blackouts because blood does not reach their brains in sufficient quantities. Six weeks in bed leads to about as much atrophy of the heart as one week in space, suggesting that the atrophy is caused by both weightlessness and the concomitant reduction in exercise. Other muscle tissue suffers too. The effects of weightlessness on the muscles of the limbs are easy to verify experimentally. **Because they bear the body's weight, the "anti-gravity" muscles of the thighs and calves degenerate** significantly when they are made redundant during space flight. Despite the best attempts to give replacement exercise to crew members on the International Space Station, after six months they had still lost 13 per cent of their calf muscle volume and 32 per cent of the maximum power that their leg muscles could deliver ([Journal of Applied Physiology, vol 106, p 1159](http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.91578.2008)). **Various metabolic changes** also occur, including a decreased capacity for fat oxidation, which can lead to the build-up of fat in atrophied muscle. **Space travellers also suffer deterioration of immune function both during and after their missions** ([Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine, vol 79, p 835](http://dx.doi.org/10.3357/ASEM.2276.2008)). Arguably the most fearsome effect on bodies is bone loss ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1569](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(80)02208-8)). Although the hardness and strength of bone, and the relative ease with which it fossilises, give it an appearance of permanence, bone is actually a living and remarkably flexible tissue. In the late 19th century, the German anatomist Julius Wolff discovered that bones adjust to the loads that they are placed under. **A decrease in load leads to the loss of bone material**, while an increase leads to thicker bone. It is no surprise, then, that in the microgravity of space bones demineralise, especially those which normally bear the greatest load. Cosmonauts who spent half a year in space lost up to a quarter of the material in their shin bones, despite intensive exercise ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1607](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02217-0)). Although experiments on chicken embryos on the International Space Station have established that bone formation does continue in microgravity, formation rates are overtaken by bone loss. What is of greatest concern here is that, unlike muscle loss which levels off with time, **bone loss seems to continue at a steady rate of 1 to 2 per cent for every month of weightlessness**. During a three-year mission to Mars, space travellers could lose around 50 per cent of their bone material, which would make it extremely difficult to return to Earth and its gravitational forces. **Bone loss during space travel certainly brings home the maxim "use it or lose it".**

# Warming

### 1NC- Adv. F/L

#### 1st, no warming scenario:

#### Warming not real/anthropogenic- IPCC predictions fail and rely on faulty computer models – even if they win that the earth is warming, the rate is too slow to trigger their impacts

Bast & Taylor ‘11

[Joseph and James, CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools, Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care, Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism, Education & Capitalism, Climate Change Reconsidered, and The Patriot’s Toolbox, and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelor degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8.2.11., http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //wyo-hdm]

How Much Warming? NASA satellite data recorded since 1979 allow us to check the accuracy of claims that the past three decades have been warming at an alarming rate. The data show a warming rate of 0.123 degrees C per decade. This is considerably less than what land-based temperature stations report during the same time period, and which are relied on by the IPCC (Christy, 2009). If the Earth’s temperature continues to rise at the rate of the past three decades, the planet would see only 1.23 degrees C warming over the course of an entire century. Most climate scientists, even “skeptics,” acknowledge that rising CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere would, all other things held constant, cause some small amount of warming. Alarmists claim that small amount will trigger increases in the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, which in turn will cause further warming. But other scientists have found no evidence of rising levels of moisture in those areas of the atmosphere where the models claim it should be found. Without this “amplification,” there is no global warming crisis (Singer, 2011). While the global climate warmed slightly during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not warmed at all since 2000, and there is some evidence that a cooling trend has begun (Taylor, 2007). This contradicts the predictions of the IPCC and poses a challenge to the theory that CO2 concentrations play a major role in global temperature trends. It confirms the views of many less-politicized climate scientists who acknowledge that the global climate is always warming or cooling (Michaels, 2005; Christy, 2006). The scientific community’s lack of certainty about future climate trends is rooted in the shortcomings of computer models. These models are the centerpiece of the IPCC’‘s reports, yet it is widely recognized that they fail to account for changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds that are likely to occur in a warmer world. It is a case of “garbage in, garbage out.” If we cannot predict how much warming will occur, how can we claim that continued human emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful?

#### Nuke power doesn’t solve emissions—

#### long timeframe-high carbon abatement costs mean natural gas swamps

Sokolski, 2010

[Henry, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, "The high and hidden costs of nuclear power." Policy Review 162 (2010): 53+. Academic OneFile. Web. 5 June 2012] /Wyo-MB

Another assertion nuclear power supporters frequently make is that once carbon is no longer free, their zero carbon emission power plants will be the clear, clean-energy victor. Yet nuclear power may already have priced itself out of the running in any carbon abatement competition. Factoring in industry construction, operation, and decommissioning costs, the total cost of abating one ton of carbon by substituting a new nuclear power plant for a modern coal-fired generator has been pegged by nuclear power critics at $120 or more. (3) This figure, which includes the costs of public subsidies, assumes fairly low capital construction costs (roughly one half of the industry's latest high-end cost projections). If one uses high-end projections, the cost for each ton of carbon abated approaches $200. Certainly there are much cheaper and quicker ways to reduce carbon emissions (see Figure 2). Just how rapidly nuclear power can abate carbon emissions is also a significant issue. Certainly, if one is interested in abating carbon in the quickest, least expensive fashion, building expensive nuclear plants that take up to a decade to bring on line will not be an appealing option. That's why in North and South America and the Middle East, the building of natural gas burning generators is currently an attractive, near-term option. Advanced gas-fired power plants can halve carbon emissions as compared to coal-fired plants, can serve as base or peak power generators, and can be brought on line in 18 to 30 months rather than the years upon years needed to build large reactors. Advanced gas-fired generator construction costs, moreover, are a fraction of those projected for nuclear power. (5)

#### Cant solve emissions that cause warming—multiple reasons

Totty, 2008

[Michael, WSJ, “The case for and against nuclear power.” 6-30-2008, Online, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121432182593500119.html] /Wyo-MB

Nuclear power isn't a solution to global warming. Rather, global warming is just a convenient rationale for an obsolete energy source that makes no sense when compared to the alternatives.¶ Sure, nuclear power generates lots of electricity while producing virtually no carbon dioxide. But it still faces the same problems that have stymied the development of new nuclear plants for the past 20 years -- exorbitant costs, the risks of an accident or terrorist attack, the threat of proliferation and the challenge of disposing of nuclear waste.¶ The cost issue alone will mean that few if any new nuclear power stations will get built in the next few years, at least in the U.S., and any that do will require expensive taxpayer subsidies. Instead of subsidizing the development of new plants that have all these other problems, the U.S. would be better off investing in other ways to meet growing energy demands and reduce carbon-dioxide emissions.¶ In fact, the sheer number of nuclear plants needed to make a major dent in greenhouse emissions means the industry hasn't a prayer of turning nuclear power into the solution to global warming. One study from last year determined that to make a significant contribution toward stabilizing atmospheric carbon dioxide, about 21 new 1,000-megawatt plants would have to be built each year for the next 50 years, including those needed to replace existing reactors, all of which are expected to be retired by 2050. That's considerably more than the most ambitious industry growth projections.

#### B. Causes warming----------

#### 1. Radiative Heat From Nuclear waste causes warming

Beyeneb et. al 11

[R. Zevenhovena, Department of Chemical Engineering, Thermal and Flow Engineering Laboratory, Åbo Akademi University, A. Beyeneb, Department of Mechanical Engineering, San Diego State University, “The relative contribution of waste heat from power plants to global warming”, Energy

Volume 36, Issue 6, June 2011, Pages 3754–3762, Accessed via Science direct [\\wyo-bb](file:///\\wyo-bb)]

A comparison was made of the heating effects as a result of globalwarming, i.e. radiative forcing due to emissions of the greenhouse CO2, from powerplant and as a result of the waste heat releases from the same units. The arguments developed and the results produced will put more emphasis on energy efficiency not as a merely economic value but also for climate mitigation, showing also that replacing fossil fuel-derived power production by (for example) nuclear fission will not eliminate the enhanced greenhouse gas effect. An immediate radiative forcing effect for a 1000 MWe fossil fuel-fired powerplant occurs within the range half-sphere (dome) with a radius of around 10 km, outside which the CO2 emissions have been diluted to less than 0.1 ppm-vol above the background level (assuming a typical wind speed of 10 m/s). Nonetheless this background level increases with ∼2 ppm-vol/year at the moment, which gives a global heat-up effect of 0.0028 °C annually. For electricity production in year 2005 the estimated total waste heat release from electricity production resulted in a global heat-up effect of 0.0021 °C for that year, i.e., an almost equally strong warming effect.

#### 2. Nuclear power production speeds up warming- construction

Caldicott 6 (Helen, “Nuclear power is not the answer to global warming or anything else”, p.4)

What exactly is nuclear power? It is a very expensive, sophisticated, and dangerous way to boil water. Uranium fuel rods are placed in water in a reactor core, they reach critical mass, and they produce vast quantities of heat, which boils the water. Steam is directed through pipes to turn a turbine, which generates electricity. The scientists who were involved in the Manhattan Project creating nuclear weapons developed a way to harness nuclear energy to generate electricity. Because their guilt was so great, they were determined to use their ghastly new invention to help the human race. Nuclear fission harnessed “atoms for peace,” and the nuclear PR industry proclaimed that nuclear power would provide an endless supply of electcitiy – referred to as “sunshine units” – that would be good for the environment and “too cheap to meter.” They were wrong. Although a nuclear power plant itself releases no carbon dioxide, the production of nuclear electricity depends upon a vast, complex, and hidden industrial infrastructure that is never featured by the nuclear industry in its propaganda, but that actually releases a large amount of carbon dioxide as well as other global warming gases. One is led to believe that the nuclear reactor stands alone, an autonomous creator of energy. In fact, the vast infrastrcutre necessary to create nuclear energy, called the nuclear fuel cycle, is a prodigious user of fossil fuel and coal. The production of carbon dioxide (CO2) is one measurement that indicates the amount of energy used in the production of the nuclear fuel cycle. Most of the energy used to create nuclear energy – to mine uranium ore for fuel, to crush and mill the ore, to enrich the uranium, to create the concrete and steel for the reacotr, and to store the thermally and radioactively hot nuclear waste – comes from the consumption of fossil fuels, that is coal or oil. When these materials are burned to produce energy, they form CO2 (reflecting coal and oil’s origins in ancient trees and other organic carboniferous material laid down under the earth’s crust millions of years ago). For each ton of carbon burned, 3.7 tons of CO2 gas added to the atmosphere, and thisis the source of today’s global warming.

#### C. No risk of impact- impacts won’t take hold for several centuries and in order to kill off the planet they would have to occur within one lifespan

Lomborg 8

[Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School

Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>]

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

# \*\*\*A2 Warming

#### 2nd, no biodiversity scenario:

#### Coral reefs are resilient – multiple factors allow them to adapt to anthropogenic disturbances

Bruno 8

(John, editor of Encyclopedia of Earth, <http://www.eoearth.org/article/Coral_reef_resilience>)

Reef resistance is how well a coral reef is able to tolerate disturbances such as rising temperatures or the degree to which such impacts alter reef communities and ecosystems. **Corals are** often **resistant to** natural stresses and **disturbances because they have** naturally **adapted to living in stressful environments.** Corals in the shallow Red Sea, for example, can withstand much higher temperatures than corals anywhere else in the world without bleaching. This may be **due to physiological adaptations to temperature extremes or other adaptations such as antibiotic enzymes or certain fluorescence pigments** which allow corals to be more resistant to disease or increased UV radiation. In addition to **acclimation, local upwelling, currents, and shading all are major factors in reef resistance**. Local upwelling can aid in the resistance of corals reefs **by acclimating the organisms to a variety of temperatures and sediment loads**. Currents act in a similar manner, as currents washing over reef systems are often of a different temperature and makeup than the local water. **Shading by ledges** or even other corals could **increase resistance by providing cover for corals that are particularly sensitive** to high levels of UV radiation. **Each of these resistance mechanisms increases the chances of coral survival when exposed to** stressful environments or **catastrophic events**. Another possible resistance factor is known as the ‘adaptive bleaching hypothesis’; this theory suggests that **corals can self select for a specific strain of heat-tolerant zooxanthellae which allow them to be more resistant** to ocean warming. The adaptive bleaching hypothesis is still being investigated but if corals can in fact obtain zooxanthellae that are more heat-tolerant, they will be more likely to adapt and survive in the face of climate change. **Coral reef resilience is the ability of the ecosystem to recover from natural or anthropogenic disturbances**. Coral resilience is often measured as the ability of coral colonies to regenerate after a coral bleaching event. **For example**, in Bolinao, Pangasinan **in the northwestern Philippines, a global bleaching event caused near 100% mortality of the corals on the reef slope. Over a decade later, the same reef slope is thriving with corals.** Resilience factors can be grouped into two categories: ecological and spatial. Ecological factors are the species and functional diversity of the reef ecosystem. Species diversity is the variety of different species that make up the coral reef ecosystem, anything from corals themselves to fish, invertebrates, and algae. Functional diversity (aka response diversity), on the other hand, is the variety of roles the organisms living within the reef ecosystem play; these roles include top predators such as large fish and sharks, herbivores such as parrotfish or sea urchins, structure builders like corals, and many more. For example, coral reef diversity and species abundance is often dependant on a wide array of herbivorous fish and invertebrates that keep the amount of algae on the reef in check. (See section below on reef resilience and phase shifts). Those reefs exhibiting both high levels of species and functional diversity are thought to be the most resilient, although this hypothesis has never been tested. Spatial resilience is the other main factor in determining total reef resilience. Spatial factors that effect resilience include genetic diversity and connectivity between reefs for larval dispersal and larval recruitment. Corals and fish release eggs by spawning and larval dispersal is often subject to tidal and current patterns. In order to ensure for the success of the larvae, there must be suitable habitat located within the dispersal range. This is very important for managing coral reefs in that successful marine protected areas must be designed with genetic diversity and connectivity in mind. Coral reefs with high levels of both spatial and functional diversity are usually thought of as the most resilient to disturbances in their natural environment.

#### life to grow shells-alt causes put the ocean more at risk

Goreham 2012

[Steve Goreham, a speaker, author, and researcher on environmental issues as well as an engineer and business executive, December 12, 2012, PBS News Hour spreads false Ocean Acidification alarm, <http://polymontana.com/pbs-news-hour-spreads-false-ocean-acidification-alarm/>, uwyo//amp]

But PBS wrongly told viewers that reef degradation was due to warmer ocean temperatures and “ocean acidification,” both allegedly caused by human carbon dioxide emissions. Sreenivasan concluded with, “Time that maybe is running out for coral reefs in Florida and elsewhere.” Scientists, environmental groups, and the United Nations promote the fear of ocean acidification. According to claims, man-made emissions of carbon dioxide are absorbed by the oceans and converted into carbonic acid, thereby changing the chemical balance of the oceans. The basic concept of acidification is correct, but hugely exaggerated. The PBS segment is wrong in several ways. First, while today’s temperatures are the warmest in the last 400 years, oceans were warmer still during the Medieval Warm Period ten centuries ago. Peer-reviewed studies found that both the Gulf of Mexico and nearby Sargasso Sea were warmer about 1000 AD than at present. These warm temperatures were due to natural climatic changes o f Earth―not man-made emissions. Caribbean reefs adapted to these warm seas to remain with us today. Second, the segment paints a misleading picture of carbon dioxide entering the oceans, without providing perspective for the viewer. Sreenivasan interviews scientist Chris Landon who states, “And it’s enough railroad cars stacked end to end to wrap around the earth seven times. That’s how much carbon is going into the ocean every single year.” This sounds alarming, unless you know that the oceans absorb and release about 90 times that amount of CO2 every year from the atmosphere naturally. In addition, carbon dioxide is absorbed by vast deposits of limestone rock in the ocean floor, removing it from sea water. Third, the oceans are alkaline, not acidic. We’re discussing a reduction in alkalinity. Solutions are measured as acidic or alkaline (basic) on a logarithmic 14-point scale, called the pH Scale. Battery acid has a pH of about one, while the base lye has a pH as high as thirteen. Milk is slightly acidic, as are most of the foods we eat. Measured in the open ocean, sea water is alkaline, with a pH of about 8.2. According to computer models, doubling of atmospheric CO2 would decrease ocean pH to about 7.9, still basic, but less so. The concern is that this change would destroy the coral reefs by dissolving the carbonate shells and skeletons of reef creatures. Sreenivasan states, “Acidification acts a lot like osteoporosis does in humans. But in marine animals, it makes their shells and skeletons brittle. The more acidic the water, the harder it is for corals to grow their skeletons.” But, empirical evidence does not show it harder for today’s marine animals to grow their shells. A study of corals at the Great Barrier Reef shows that shell calcium growth rates today are about 25 percent higher than 300‒400 years ago when both ocean temperatures and levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide were lower. Scientists still know little about the alkalinity of today’s ocean or the oceans of past centuries. Ocean pH varies by depth, becoming less basic as one goes deeper. It varies by latitude from the equator to the poles. It varies by location, such as the open ocean, coral reef, or kelp bed. But the PBS segment ignores this uncertainty and implies that the rate of change in ocean pH is alarming. Dr. Langdon states, “What’s really and completely unique about what’s going on now is the rate of change. And that’s what is so difficult for organisms.” However, evidence shows that a high rate of change in ocean alkalinity is natural. A 2011 study by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found large variations in ocean pH by day, week, and month. Changes in some locations were as high as 0.35 units over the course of a day, higher than computer models are predicting for the next century. Scuba divers know that reef creatures already experience acidic conditions near CO2 vents in the ocean floor. These vents bubble CO2 gas amidst coral reefs and grassy ocean pastures in millions of locations. Fish and reefs appear to be doing quite well near these CO2 vents. The coral reefs in the Caribbean and other seas may be endangered due overfishing, chemical pollution, and human abuse. But let’s not blame reef degradation on misguided fears about global warming.

#### No impact to biodiversity loss – Ecosystems are resilient

Sedjo, 00

Roger A Sedjo 2k, Sr. Fellow, Resources for the Future, Conserving Nature’s Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics & economics, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, p 114

As a critical input into the existence of humans and of life on earth, biodiversity obviously has a very high value (at least to humans). But, as with other resource questions, including public goods, biodiversity is not an either/or question, but rather a question of “how much.” Thus, we may argue as to how much biodiversity is desirable or is required for human life (threshold) and how much is desirable (insurance) and at what price, just as societies argue over the appropriate amount and cost of national defense. As discussed by Simpson, the value of water is small even though it is essential to human life, while diamonds are inessential but valuable to humans. The reason has to do with relative abundance and scarcity, with market value pertaining to the marginal unit. This water-diamond paradox can be applied to biodiversity. Although biological diversity is essential, a single species has only limited value, since the global system will continue to function without that species. Similarly, the value of a piece of biodiversity (e.g., 10 ha of tropical forest) is small to negligible since its contribution to the functioning of the global biodiversity is negligible. The global ecosystem can function with “somewhat more” or “somewhat less” biodiversity, since there have been larger amounts in times past and some losses in recent times. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to indicate that small habitat losses threaten the functioning of the global life support system, the value of these marginal habitats is negligible. The “value question” is that of how valuable to the life support function are species at the margin. While this, in principle, is an empirical question, in practice it is probably unknowable. However, thus far, biodiversity losses appear to have had little or no effect on the functioning of the earth’s life support system, presumably due to the resiliency of the system, which perhaps is due to the redundancy found in the system. Through most of its existence, earth has had far less biological diversity. Thus, as in the water-diamond paradox, the value of the marginal unit of biodiversity appears to be very small.
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Solves 100% of case

#### DOD financing reduces costs and spurs commercial spillover

Fitzpatrick, Freed and Eyoan, 11

Ryan Fitzpatrick, Senior Policy Advisor for Clean Energy at Third Way, Josh Freed, Vice President for Clean Energy at Third Way, and Mieke Eoyan, Director for National Security at Third Way, June 2011, Fighting for Innovation: How DoD Can Advance CleanEnergy Technology... And Why It Has To, content.thirdway.org/publications/414/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Fighting\_for\_Innovation.pdf

The DoD has over $400 billion in annual purchasing power, which meansthe Pentagon could provide a sizeable market for new technologies. This can increase a technology’s scale of production, bringing down costs, and making the product more likely to successfully reach commercial markets. Unfortunately, many potentially significant clean energy innovations never get to the marketplace, due to a lack of capital during the development and demonstration stages. As a result, technologies that could help the military meet its clean energy security and cost goals are being abandoned or co-opted by competetors like China before they are commercially viable here in the U.S. By focusing its purchasing power on innovative products that will help meet its energy goals, DoD can provide more secure and cost-effective energy to the military—producing tremendous long-term savings, while also bringing potentially revolutionary technologies to the public. Currently, many of these technologies are passed over during the procurement process because of higher upfront costs—even if these technologies can reduce life-cycle costs to DoD. The Department has only recently begun to consider life-cycle costs and the “fullyburdened cost of fuel” (FBCF) when making acquisition decisions. However, initial reports from within DoD suggest that the methodology for determining the actual FBCF needs to be refined and made more consistent before it can be successfully used in the acquisition process.32 The Department should fast-track this process to better maximize taxpayer dollars. Congressional appropriators— and the Congressional Budget Office—should also recognize the savings that can be achieved by procuring advanced technologies to promote DoD’s energy goals, even if these procurements come with higher upfront costs. Even if the Pentagon makes procurement of emerging clean energy technologies a higher priority, it still faces real roadblocks in developing relationships with the companies that make them. Many clean energy innovations are developed by small businesses or companies that have no previous experience working with military procurement officers. Conversely, many procurement officers do not know the clean energy sector and are not incentivized to develop relationships with emerging clean energy companies. Given the stakes in developing domestic technologies that would help reduce costs and improve mission success, the Pentagon should develop a program to encourage a better flow of information between procurement officers and clean energy companies—especially small businesses. Leverage Savings From Efficiency and Alternative Financing to Pay for Innovation. In an age of government-wide austerity and tight Pentagon budgets, current congressional appropriations are simply not sufficient to fund clean energy innovation. Until Congress decides to direct additional resources for this purpose, the Defense Department must leverage the money and other tools it already has to help develop clean energy. This can take two forms: repurposing money that was saved through energy efficiency programs for innovation and using alternative methods of financing to reduce the cost to the Pentagon of deploying clean energy. For several decades the military has made modest use alternative financing mechanisms to fund clean energy and efficiency projects when appropriated funds were insufficient. In a 2010 report, GAO found that while only 18% of renewable energy projects on DoD lands used alternative financing, these projects account for 86% of all renewable energy produced on the Department’s property.33 This indicates that alternative financing can be particularly helpful to DoD in terms of bringing larger and more expensive projects to fruition. One advanced financing tool available to DoD is the energy savings performance contract (ESPC). These agreements allow DoD to contract a private firm to make upgrades to a building or other facility that result in energy savings, reducing overall energy costs without appropriated funds. The firm finances the cost, maintenance and operation of these upgrades and recovers a profit over the life of the contract. While mobile applications consume 75% of the Department’s energy,34 DoD is only authorized to enter an ESPC for energy improvements done at stationary sites. As such, Congress should allow DoD to conduct pilot programs in which ESPCs are used to enhance mobile components like aircraft and vehicle engines. This could accelerate the needed replacement or updating of aging equipment and a significant reduction of energy with no upfront cost. To maximize the potential benefits of ESPCs, DoD should work with the Department of Energy to develop additional training and best practices to ensure that terms are carefully negotiated and provide benefits for the federal government throughout the term of the contract.35 This effort could possibly be achieved through the existing memorandum of understanding between these two departments.36 The Pentagon should also consider using any long-term savings realized by these contracts for other energy purposes, including the promotion of innovative technologies to further reduce demand or increase general energy security. In addition to ESPCs, the Pentagon also can enter into extended agreements with utilities to use DoD land to generate electricity, or for the long-term purchase of energy. These innovative financing mechanisms, known respectively as enhanced use leases (EULs) and power purchase agreements (PPAs), provide a valuable degree of certainty to third party generators. In exchange, the Department can leverage its existing resources—either its land or its purchasing power—to negotiate lower electricity rates and dedicated sources of locallyproduced power with its utility partners. DoD has unique authority among federal agencies to enter extended 30-year PPAs, but only for geothermal energy projects and only with direct approval from the Secretary of Defense. Again, limiting incentives for clean energy generation to just geothermal power inhibits the tremendous potential of other clean energy sources to help meet DoD’s energy goals. Congress should consider opening this incentive up to other forms of clean energy generation, including the production of advanced fuels. Also, given procurement officials’ lack of familiarity with these extended agreements and the cumbersome nature of such a high-level approval process, the unique authority to enter into extended 30-year PPAs is very rarely used.37 DoD should provide officials with additional policy guidance for using extended PPAs and Congress should simplify the process by allowing the secretary of each service to approve these contracts. Congress should also investigate options for encouraging regulated utility markets to permit PPA use by DoD. Finally, when entering these agreements, the Department should make every effort to promote the use of innovative and fledgling technologies in the terms of its EULs and PPAs. CON C L U S ION The Defense Department is in a unique position to foster and deploy innovation in clean energy technologies. This has two enormous benefits for our military: it will make our troops and our facilities more secure and it will reduce the amount of money the Pentagon spends on energy, freeing it up for other mission critical needs. If the right steps are taken by Congress and the Pentagon, the military will be able to put its resources to work developing technologies that will lead to a stronger fighting force, a safer nation, and a critical emerging sector of the American economy. The Defense Department has helped give birth to technologies and new economic sectors dozens of times before. For its own sake and the sake of the economy, it should make clean energy innovation its newest priority.

### 2NC – AT: Links To Politics

#### DOD spending is insulated from politics

Appelbaum 12

[Binyamin Appelbaum 12, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R%26D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8-12,http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say, \\wyo-bb]

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been more successful than other federal agencies because it is the main user of the innovations that it finances. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an unusually direct stake in the outcome of its research and development projects. "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes." Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda in controversial areas. No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

#### DOD is key – solves, overcomes restrictions and doesn’t link to politics

Madia 12

[William Madia, Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, Spring, "Small ModularReactors:APotential Game-changingTechnology",energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_by\_William\_Madia,\\wyo-bb]

To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes. If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### DOD energy spending isn’t perceived by the public, even though other government spending is

Gail Reitenbach 12, Managing Editor, POWER Magazine, Senior Editor at The McGraw-Hill Companies, 1/1/12, “The U.S. Military Gets Smart Grid,” <http://www.powermag.com/print/smart_grid/The-U-S-Military-Gets-Smart-Grid_4228.html>

The military has an almost perfect set of conditions for developing a variety of advanced, "smart" technologies centered on electricity generation, delivery, and use.¶ Necessity. The DOD is one of the largest energy consumers worldwide and the single largest energy consumer in the U.S. At a White House Energy Security Forum in April 2011, Deputy Defense Secretary William J. Lynn III noted that the DOD accounts for 80% of U.S. federal energy use (and somewhere between 1% and 2% of nationwide consumption), consumes more energy than is used by two-thirds of all the nations on Earth, and has annual energy bills in the tens of billions of dollars ($15 billion in 2010). As in the civilian world, the number of electrically powered devices keeps increasing, so demand tends to rise as well. Consequently, ensuring a reliable supply of energy for both transportation and power can be challenging. ¶ Surety of supply poses challenges for both stationary and FOB installations. According to Lynn, more than 70% of convoys in Afghanistan are used to transport fuel or water and are easy targets for insurgents' roadside bombs. More than 3,000 U.S. troops and contractors had been killed or wounded protecting them as of April 2011. ¶ The desire to keep its people safe—by minimizing the amount of fuel that U.S. forces need to move around in combat zones to fuel electricity generators and vehicles—is a powerful motivating factor for many of the military's smart grid, energy efficiency, and renewable energy initiatives. ¶ Sharon E. Burke, assistant secretary of defense for operational energy plans and programs, told the audience at the Military Smart Grids and Microgrids Conference in October 2011: "When you consider that we move about 50 million gallons of fuel every month right now in Afghanistan, much of which is for power generation, you begin to understand the huge financial cost of this fuel." Burke noted that the fuel powers more than 15,000 generators in Afghanistan alone. She added that better combat power generation has benefits that include less need for fuel, reduced noise and heat signatures, less maintenance, and a lighter force. ¶ Protecting defense-related people, projects, and property at home is also a concern. Remember that DOD facilities are, for the most part, connected to the national grid, making them vulnerable to massive outages like those experienced in 2003 in the Northeast and in 2011 in the Southwest. ¶ Money. Though some Americans may balk at the Department of Energy (DOE) issuing grants and loan guarantees to advance utility smart grid or renewable projects, they are much less aware of the money spent through the Pentagon on similar projects for the military. ¶ For example, Dorothy Robyn, DOD deputy undersecretary for installations and environment, told Defense News on Oct. 31, 2011: "I've been delegated the authority to sign off on renewable projects that go out beyond the 10-year authority that most federal agencies have. We're the only federal agency that has the authority to go out to 30 years. What that does is allow us to do projects that are bigger and have a longer payback period." Robyn also noted that her department can take advantage of third-party financing for renewable and energy efficiency projects.

# Space

### Can’t Get off Fast Enough

#### Colonization impossible- can’t move enough people for it to be viable

Giancarlo Genta, Technical University of Turin and Michael Rycroft, International Space University, Space, The Final Frontier? 2003 p. 309-10

The colonisatjon of nearby, or even more distant, planetary systems is unlikely to be a realistic means for easing the overpopulation problems of the Earth. It will never be possible for a significant number of human beings to leave our planet to find a better life on some extrasolar system or, for that matter, on some other body in our own solar system. What would be valuable would be for a few members of the human species to establish remote space colonies, thereby en- abling the species to perpetuate itself if — or rather when — human life becomes extinct, for whatever reason, on planet Earth.

#### b. Can’t get off fast enough to avoid the impact

Nikos Prantzos, nuclear astrophysicist in the Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, France Our Cosmic Future, 2000 p. 84

Not only science fiction readers, but also quite a few scientists are dreaming of ways to bring life to other planets in the Solar System, and in particular to Mars. Their motivation is certainly not a solution to overpopulation problems on Earth. Even though Mars has an area equal to all the land area on Earth, it would be impossible to transport any significant fraction of the population. In order to send a hundred million people (which constitutes a negligible fraction of the present population) , in let us say one century, three thousand departures would have to be organised each day. Therefore, the fascination for terraforming Mars is more closely related to the new frontier it represents. Conquest of such a frontier would help our civilisation to release its creative potential and find new vitality. Some have com

pared the situation with the American frontier, several centuries ago.

#### Only a dozen people could get off the rock in time if at all.

William Ophuls 97, Professor of Political Science at Northwestern, 1997, Requiem For Modern Politics, p. 9

Contrary to the pronouncements of diehard technological optimists, space colonization is not an answer. The entropic costs of lifting mass into orbit will restrict space exploration and eventual colonization to a tiny vanguard. Extensive trade in matter and energy is also ruled out, except in some remote science-fictional future in which we have mastered the force of gravity. Nor can we “decouple” ourselves from nature here on Earth, at least to the extent envisioned by those who would have us live in artificial ecologies based on such emergent technologies as biotechnology, nanotechnology, and fusion power. Even if these unproven technologies are eventually found to be both economically practical and ecologically harmless, replacing nature as the maker of all the basic requisites of life for large numbers of people will take infinitely more capital, knowledge, and managerial skill than we now possess or are ever likely to acquire.

### Space Doesn’t’ Solve Extinction

#### Every scenario they have for earth being destroyed applies as much to any other location in space- Asteroids can hit other planets or the moon so there is never a try or die scenario with space because long-term extinction is probably inevitable

#### Black holes would wipe out colonies

David Lamb, The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, 2001 p. 167-8

David Brin (1 990) offers a range of explanations of the Great Silence. He notes out that the 250-million-year orbit around the galaxy poses major survival problems for various solar systems. When they pass the spiral arms where new stars are formed in superexplosions they are likely to be destroyed. But a very advanced civilization (for example, a Kardaschev—Dyson Type II or III, see apter 7) may simply leave this dangerous place taking their solar system far away. Consequently the very advanced civilizations would be further away and less likely to make contact; only the less advanced would remain and they might not have evolved the ability to communicate over long distances. Brin also notes that there may be many unforeseen disasters in the galaxy, such as huge black holes, which could destroy potentially colonizing civilizations. There may be holocausts caused by the effects of colonization such that the colonizers leave nothing behind them. But on a more friendly note, Brin suggests that it is likely that the most habitable planets — not too hot and not too cold — with ample water and oxygen, wifi be far less dry than ours. Hence land creatures would - barely develop. In this respect we are unique. But intelligent life, such as dolphins

and whales, will develop in the water, without our technology derived from the use of hand and fire, and hence an intelligence with no likelihood of reaching the stars.

### Microgravity Take-out

#### Microgravity means that humans won’t survive in space even if they can get off the rock

Giancarlo Genta, Technical University of Turin and Michael Rycroft, International Space University, Space, The Final Frontier? 2003 p. 115-6

Even if microgravity is a very interesting condition for many scientific experiments, it could be detrimental for all living organisms. Our human anatomy has evolved on the surface of the Earth in an environment with a well-determined value of gravitational acceleration. Any decrease (or, even more, any increase) of gravitational acceleration will affect the operation of many Vital organs. Before Laika, the first liVing being to withstand micrograVity conditions, survived for a fairly long time on the Sputnik 2 satellite, some biologists held that life was utterly impossible without a gravitational field. Now we know that humans (and animals) can survive for a very long time in conditions of weightlessness, but their health is affected. Sdme effects, like space sickness, a combination of nausea, sweating, vomiting and loss of appetite, occur in the first few days of a space mis- sion. Other symptoms develop more gradually, but have more lasting consequences. There is a general redistribution of all bodily fluids, car- diovascular changes, loss of bone material, and a height increase. The human body is grossly overdesigned for conditions of weightlessness and, in an effort to compensate, reduces the superfluous parts — the bones, the muscles, the heart, and so on. These changes are of little consequence in orbit, but problematical for withstanding the stresses of re-entry and on returning to Earth. Very long periods in space, as experienced by Russian cosmonauts aboard the Mu space station, show that such damage may be limited with regular physical exercise. After more than one year in orbit, re-adaptation to normal gravity conditions on Earth was fairly easy, if a proper exercise regime had been followed in space.

#### Astronauts wouldn’t survive going to Mars, much less another planet

Krueger 2-18-08 [Curtis Krueger, “Dangers of Space,” St. Petersburg Times, February 18, 2008, LexisNexis]

An undisclosed medical problem forced German astronaut Hans Schlegel to miss his first planned space walk last week. But Schlegel was lucky. He recovered in time for Wednesday's excursion outside the space station to help swap out a cooling system. It could be a much different picture for astronauts who travel to Mars, a treacherous 30-million-mile journey that NASA has begun to plan. The trip there would take half a year. Along the way, astronaut's bones would shrink 1.5 percent each month, making them more fragile. Their bodies would be exposed to radiation that could damage their DNA or cause cancer. Their hearts would weaken from the months of pumping blood inside a weightless body. Space travel could tear down their minds, as well as their bodies. Imagine stepping outside the space shuttle, staring back at Earth. Unlike Apollo astronauts who stood on the moon, Earth would not look like a giant, swirling-blue globe. It would look like one of the stars. "I think going to Mars and looking back to Earth and seeing Earth as a bluish star, that's got to have some impact on you, as to how remote you are," said Don Thomas, a former NASA astronaut who traveled to space four times. All these dangers show the challenges of NASA's plan for the future, which is to develop a spacecraft that would take Americans back to the moon as soon as 2018, and eventually on to Mars.

#### Can’t survive without gravity

The Guardian (London) October 31, 2002

Humans were never designed for zero-G. We evolved to thrive, where muscles and skeleton, working against the Earth's gravity, makes them grow strong. Even with rigorous exercise, cosmonauts on the Mir space station lost 1-2% of their bone mass each month. The risk of breaking a bone during a three-year mission to Mars has been calculated at around 30%, with horrific consequences. "A limb fracture involving one of a six-person space crew could seriously compromise a mission's objectives," explains Jay Shapiro, at the National Space Biomedical Research Institute. For a human body, being weightless is like being confined to bed in a total body cast. Apart from bones, the muscles also waste away from lack of use, and some, like those in the calves, can lose around 20% of their mass in zero-G. Tendons and ligaments can weaken to the point that they tear like tissue paper. The lungs and other major organs suffer. Blood feels the lack of gravity, too. When we're standing on Earth, blood sinks to the feet and leaves the brain lighter, creating a gradient of blood pressure through the body. But in space, the pressure gradient disappears and the body thinks it's in trouble and makes less blood, which spells trouble for the heart.

# Warming

### 2NC- Warming Not Real/Anthropogenic

#### 1st, Bast and Taylor indicate that there is no correlation between Co2 emissions and warming- the earth has started a colling trend and is not warming at a tipping point rate- new NASA satellite data proves that IPCC models are skewed because they are only done from land and don’t account for precipitation, clouds, humidity, etc. that can all skew temperature models- the earth naturally warms and cools

#### More evidence:

#### historic warming trends occurred without CO2 emissions- roman era proves

Waugh ‘12

[Rob, Columnist Archive for MailOnline, “Tree-rings prove climate was WARMER in Roman and Medieval times than it is now - and world has been cooling for 2,000 years”, 11.7.12., Mail Online, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2171973/Tree-ring-study-proves-climate-WARMER-Roman-Medieval-times-modern-industrial-age.html>> //wyo-hdm]

Rings in fossilised pine trees have proven that the world was much warmer than previously thought - and the earth has been slowly COOLING for 2,000 years. Measurements stretching back to 138BC prove that the Earth is slowly cooling due to changes in the distance between the Earth and the sun. The finding may force scientists to rethink current theories of the impact of global warming. It is the first time that researchers have been able to accurately measure trends in global temperature over the last two millennia. Over that time, the world has been getting cooler - and previous estimates, used as the basis for current climate science, are wrong. Their findings demonstrate that this trend involves a cooling of -0.3°C per millennium due to gradual changes to the position of the sun and an increase in the distance between the Earth and the sun. ‘This figure we calculated may not seem particularly significant,’ says Esper, ‘however, it is also not negligible when compared to global warming, which up to now has been less than 1°C. 'Our results suggest that the large-scale climate reconstruction shown by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) likely underestimate this long-term cooling trend over the past few millennia.’ The finding was based on semi-fossilised tree rings found in Finnish lapland. Professor Dr. Jan Esper's group at the Institute of Geography at JGU used tree-ring density measurements from sub-fossil pine trees originating from Finnish Lapland to produce a reconstruction reaching back to 138 BC. In so doing, the researchers have been able for the first time to precisely demonstrate that the long-term trend over the past two MARKEDmillennia has been towards climatic cooling. ‘We found that previous estimates of historical temperatures during the Roman era and the Middle Ages were too low,’ says Esper. ‘Such findings are also significant with regard to climate policy, as they will influence the way today's climate changes are seen in context of historical warm periods.’ The annual growth rings in trees are the most important witnesses over the past 1,000 to 2,000 years as they indicate how warm and cool past climate conditions were.

# 1NR

#### Turns space- Labor crisis in aerospace now – temporary workers key to industry competitiveness and innovation

**AIAA 10** [American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, "Recruiting, retaining, and developing a world-class aerospace workforce: An AIAA Information Paper, presented at the AIAA's 13th Annual AIAA Congressional Visits Day in March 2010, pdf, <http://www.doleta.gov/brg/indprof/aerospace_report.pdf>]

Without a strong aerospace workforce, the United States will lose the resulting economic and national security benefits. Incentives are needed for industry to invest in domestic aerospace workforce development, and for U.S. students to choose an engineering career. Barriers to employing talented foreign nationals must also be removed. Aerospace represents about $200 billion (or 1.5%) of the domestic economy and in 1997 provided a $56 billion positive trade balance. The aerospace workforce is the foundation of the industry’s success, yet unique workforce demographics present challenges. Figure 11 shows the age distribution of the aerospace business workforce compared to the total U.S. workforce. Up to half of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within five years. Aerospace workforce composition does not match national demographic averages. Compared to the total US workforce, the aerospace industry and NASA have a disproportionately large percentage of workers aged 4055, and a disproportionately small percentage of workers younger than 40. Student loans, research dollars to support universities, and service scholarships can provide incentives for younger workers to consider aerospace and join the industry. If talented young engineers are not recruited, retained, and developed to replace the workforce generation that is near retirement, then the U.S. stands to lose the valuable economic and critical national security benefits of the domestic aerospace industry. As shown in Figure 22, large percentages of engineers are working outside the science and engineering professions. Engineering students burdened with college loans are seeking greener pastures. As shown in Figure 33, aerospace engineering salaries are low compared to other industries. If the U.S. is to retain its edge in this industry, salaries need to rise and incentives given for entering the industry. Further, since 1980, the number of nonacademic science and engineering jobs has grown at more than four times the rate of the U.S. labor force as a whole2. With a growing number of science and engineering jobs anticipated, the supply of visas set aside under law for “highly qualified foreign workers,” – 65,000 a year4 – is not enough. A decline in student, exchange, and temporary high-skilled worker visas issued since 2001 interrupted a long-term trend of growth. The number of student visas and of temporary high-skilled worker visas issued have both declined by more than 25% since FY 2001. These declines were due both to fewer applications and to an increase in the proportion of visa applications rejected2.To add to the supply pressures of science and engineering workers in our economy, there is increased recruitment of high-skilled labor, including scientists and engineers, by many national governments and private firms. For example, in 1999, 241,000 individuals entered Japan with temporary high-skill work visas, a 75 percent increase over 19925. Research and development [R&D] expenditures keep the aerospace industry strong and help maintain US leadership in this sector. As shown in Figure 46, the R&D tax credit is working to increase corporate spending on this important activity. In the early 1990s, after implementation of the R&D tax credit legislation, private expenditures on R&D rose2. Yet even with this incentive, U.S. industry research and development funding is lagging. In 2001, US industry spent more on tort litigation than on research and development4. Perhaps as a result, American companies are lagging in patents. In 2005, only four American companies ranked among the top 10 corporate recipients of patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office4. And to further add to this distressing R&D dollars situation, federal research funding is lagging as well. The amount invested annually by the US federal government in research in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering combined is less than what Americans spend on potato chips7,8. RECOMMENDATIONS To remain globally competitive, the U.S. must adopt policies to increase our talent base in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), must educate, engage, and retain STEM professionals using means consistent with generational changes in technologies and markets, and must provide incentives for investment in research and development that helps to attract applicable talent. The AIAA recommends policies in three areas to achieve these goals: incentives for college students to study engineering, and corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, and immigration for STEM professionals. In the area of incentives for college students to study engineering, forgivable loan programs should be implemented for students who study engineering and enter the domestic technical workforce. Service scholarships should be created to pay college for students who desire to and will serve in aerospace-related U.S. government agencies after graduation. In addition, investments must be made in aerospace research infrastructure and increasing R&D funding to universities, since good research opportunities attract talented students into graduate STEM studies. R&D dollars provide a fourfold return by supporting graduate students, generating knowledge, creating innovation opportunities for small businesses around universities, and building the next generation of talented engineers. In the area of corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, targeted tax credits or incentives should be instituted for domestic aerospace workforce development expenses. An IR&D-like program for aerospace workforce development should be established by allowing a small percentage of government contract funding to aerospace companies to go into a development fund to be used on effective programs to expand domestic workforce capabilities. In addition, the R&D tax credit should be made permanent, providing stability to corporate fiscal policies, and thereby fostering a critical technology and engineering research environment that attracts the best and brightest into the technology and engineering fields. Lastly, in the area of immigration, barriers should be removed so that the US may retain talented foreign nationals in STEM professions critical to the aerospace industry.

#### Nuclear war turns warming

Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions

Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere – more than UK's annual total. The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms – just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though, the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%." But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming? The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide." "As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."

#### Will pass—top of the docket—overwhelms their pounders

Mike Lillis, The Hill, 1/25/13, Republicans shift gears on immigration ahead of reform debate with Obama, thehill.com/homenews/house/279221-gop-girds-for-immigration-debate-with-obama

The issue of immigration reform has been a third rail of Washington politics for years, but November's elections — which saw more than 70 percent of Hispanic voters supporting President Obama — has created a new appetite for reform on Capitol Hill, as GOP leaders are scrambling to ensure that the Democrats' advantage with Latinos doesn't become a permanent one. Obama has made immigration reform a top priority of 2013, and Congress is lining up behind that effort. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) has said he'll hold hearings on the issue in February. And Goodlatte's House panel has slated a hearing for early next month, according to a GOP aide briefed on the schedule. “We are a nation of immigrants and our immigration system has contributed to the greatness of the United States," Goodlatte said Thursday in an email. "However, we are also a nation of laws. It is clear that our immigration system is in desperate need of repair and is not working as efficiently and fairly as it should be." Fueling the push, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), a rising star in the Republican Party, is advocating targeted immigration reforms that have already won the endorsement of conservative standard-bearer Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.). Sensing the shift in tone, Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), Congress's loudest immigrant-rights advocate, gave up his seat on the Financial Services Committee this year in favor of a temporary Judiciary Committee spot that will bring him to the center of the debate. The outspoken Democrat had predicted the Republicans "would get religion" after the election numbers came in, and he's scrambling to ensure Congress doesn't fritter away the rare political opportunity to enact sweeping reforms.

#### Will pass-Republican change of heart

Lilley Feb. 4th

[Sandra Lilley, writer for NBC Latino, Feb. 4h, 2013, Bipartisan House group hopes to unveil immigration reform plan by next week, <http://nbclatino.com/2013/02/04/bipartisan-house-group-hopes-to-unveil-immigration-reform-plan-by-next-week/>, uwyo//amp]

In fact, Gonzales says, out of all the issues the House debates this term, including gun control legislation and the debt ceiling, he thinks immigration legislation has the best chance of passing. ”The two parties are interested in reform for two different reasons. Democrats see it as a fairness issue, and for Republicans there is a political component, “says Gonzales. ”Overall, the rhetoric on the Republican side has shifted, and traditional Republican business groups are more open to find a way to reach an agreement,” he adds.

#### Will pass now but the fight will be tough

Abdullah Jan. 29th

[Haimah Abdullah, CNN reporter, Jan. 29th, 2013, Immigration plan: A new era of bipartisanship or a political necessity?, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/29/politics/immigration-plan-bipartisanship>, uwyo//amp]

There aren't a whole lot of other issues where Republicans think they need to compromise or Democrats think they need to compromise," said Clyde Wilcox, a government professor at Georgetown University. "There's two different ways this could be viewed this. It's either a Kumbaya moment ... or both sides see that on this particular issue there's a necessity for compromise." But the deal is far from done. The plan could face stiff opposition in the House of Representatives, where conservatives and tea party leaders have resisted any compromise that even hints at relief or amnesty for those already in the country illegally. House Republicans are also working on a plan of their own, seeking bipartisan support. And Obama is said to have drafted his own detailed plan, which could differ from the Senate proposal in key areas, including border security and a path to legality.

#### Will pass- most opportune time

FoxNews.com Jan. 28th

[FoxNews.com, Jan. 28th, 2013, Obama wades back into immigration debate as senators pitch new blueprint, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/01/29/bipartisan-group-8-senators-reach-deal-on-immigration-changes/#ixzz2JyyxhVIY>, uwyo//amp]

An Obama administration official tells Fox News the senators' plan is on a trajectory that mirrors Obama’s immigration plan almost exactly, and that the White House is willing to let the group take the lead. The aide says requiring illegal immigrants to pay back taxes and a fine and ensuring they would be at the back of the line after would-be legal immigrants have always been part of the president's immigration proposal. The president has also advocated for a path to citizenship. Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., one of the eight senators called the new proposal a "major breakthrough" and said he hopes to turn it into legislation by March -- with the goal of passing something out of the Senate "by late spring or summer." Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., standing beside him, claimed 2013 is the "best chance" lawmakers will have to tackle immigration for years.

#### GOP’s getting on board

Chait 1/23

[Jonathan is a writer @ New York Magazine. “How Obama Can Have a Great Second Term,” 2013, <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2013/01/how-obama-can-have-a-great-second-term.html>]

The strongest prospect for domestic legislation appears to be immigration reform. The key dynamic here is the desire by Republican leaders to suture off the party’s wound among Latino and Asian voters, and the figure here is Marco Rubio. In the immediate wake of the election, Rubio called for “step by step” reform rather than a comprehensive overhaul, which I read as code for opposing anything real. But I read Rubio wrong. He has backed off his opposition to comprehensive reform and has advocated policies eerily similar to Obama’s own proposal, while framing it in a way that has gained advocates on the right. Fox News, ground zero for a panicked reaction by the conservative base, seems to be climbing onboard, and Republican voters seem to be getting the message.

#### 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.

#### - Nuclear power controversial – waste, production dangers, and budget deficit concerns

Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber, work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Development, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The End of Nuclear Energy? International Perspectives after Fukishima”, Freidrich Ebert Stiftung July 2011

Unfortunately, in the case of nuclear energy production, the risk of future disaster is inherently difficult to quantify because it is not known when or if a disaster will happen, and if one does happen, it is unclear what a worst-case scenario will look like . What is easier to quantify, is that more nuclear energy produced means more nuclear waste to be processed and stored, which places a strain on future generations, as they will have to deal with the costs associated with our current consumption . The fact remains that finding a place to store nuclear waste in a country with a decentralised governmental structure such as the United States remains extremely difficult, as was made evident by the political battle over the Yucca Mountain Repository site in Nevada .4 Many of the arguments for or against nuclear power centre around value-based judgments regarding the possible dangers associated with nuclear energy production . This is evidenced by the variety of opinions regarding nuclear power in the United States and the varying positions that different nations took in response to the nuclear disaster in Chernobyl and have taken in response to the more recent disaster in Japan . The situation regarding the future of nuclear energy production in the United States is complicated by political factors such as the perceived negative effect that a shift to renewables would have on the United States economy . Moving forward, the current debates over the budget, the deficit, and the fragile economic recovery will dominate the discussion and have profound impacts on the future of energy production in the United States . Whether this will lead to a shift to greater renewable energy production depends largely on the ability of the United States government to adopt forward-thinking policies that will wean its dependence from fossil fuels and nuclear power and towards a more sustainable energy future .

#### - Politically divisive

Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber, work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Development, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The End of Nuclear Energy? International Perspectives after Fukishima”, Freidrich Ebert Stiftung July 2011

3.1 Political Discourse Representative Edward Markey (Democrat-Massachusetts), who was also a proponent of comprehensive climate change legislation in the past Congress, has led the charge for greater oversight of the nuclear industry, introducing House Resolution 1242, The Nuclear Power Plant Safety Act of 2011, which calls for an overhaul of US nuclear safety policy and imposes a moratorium on all new nuclear reactor licences or licence extensions until new safety requirements are in place that reflect the lessons learnt from the nuclear disaster in Japan . Other members of Congress such as Representative Joe Barton (Republican-Texas) have staunchly defended the US nuclear power industry . Recently, after visiting a nuclear power plant in Texas, Representative Barton said, »Nuclear power is very safe … Our new safety systems are passive in the sense that if the worst case happens, they don’t require human intervention .«Traditionally, nuclear energy production has been politically divisive along party lines, with Republicans favouring increased nuclear energy production and Democrats advising caution because of the high risks associated with the production and waste processing of nuclear power . Over the past few years, this line has blurred, with many Democrats coming to the side of the nuclear industry because of the perceived advantage of carbon-free production of energy as a way to combat climate change .

#### Contentious debate ensures plan is not perceived as a victory

Mann, Brookings Governance Studies senior fellow, 10

[Thomas, Brookings, November, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections”, <http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2010/11_midterm_elections_mann.aspx>, accessed 6-20-11]

The well-documented successes of the financial stabilisation and stimulus initiatives are invisible to a public reacting to the here and now, not to the counterfactual of how much worse it might have been. The painfully slow recovery from the global financial crisis and Great Recession have led most Americans to believe these programmes have failed and as a consequence they judge the President and Congress harshly. HIGHLY POLARISED That perception of failure has been magnified by the highly contentious process by which Obama’s initiatives have been adopted in Congress. America has in recent years developed a highly polarised party system, with striking ideological differences between the parties and unusual unity within each. But these parliamentary-like parties operate in a governmental system in which majorities are unable readily to put their programmes in place. Republicans adopted a strategy of consistent, unified, and aggressive opposition to every major component of the President’s agenda, eschewing negotiation, bargaining and compromise, even on matters of great national import. The Senate filibuster has been the indispensable weapon in killing, weakening, slowing, or discrediting all major legislation proposed by the Democratic majority.

#### Political capital is limited – controversies burn capital

Gerson, 12/17/2010 (Michael, 12/17/10, Washington Post, “When it comes to politics, Obama's ego keeps getting in the way,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/16/AR2010121604039.html>)

In some areas - such as education reform or the tax deal - Obama's governing practice is better than his political skills. But these skills matter precisely because political capital is limited. The early pursuit of ambitious health-care reform was a political mistake, as former chief of staff Rahm Emanuel internally argued. But every president has the right to spend his popularity on what he regards as matters of principle. Political risks, taken out of conviction with open eyes, are an admirable element of leadership. Yet political errors made out of pique or poor planning undermine the possibility of achievement. Rather than being spent, popularity is squandered - something the Obama administration has often done.

#### Winners lose---PC’s not renewable, is zero-sum, and diminishes fast

Ryan 9

[Selwyn, Professor Emeritus and former Director, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, “Obama and political capital,” 1/18 <http://www.trinidadexpress.com/index.pl/article_opinion?id=161426968>]

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised, let alone all of it. Reality will force him to make many "u" turns and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a vast accumulation of political capital, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and fast diminishing asset in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is rarely ever renewable. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who did not know how to husband the political capital with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, some promises have to be deferred beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics is not a winner-take-all system. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything done politically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading. No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

#### extend Crowan from Feb. 4th- Obama’s leverage is key to get a deal done on immigration- holding a hard-line makes Republicans give in to CIR

#### Second, Framing issue—capital gets it through—the plan drains his capital and destroys his agenda prioritization

Chris Cillizza, WaPo, 1/21/13, President Obama’s second term starts today. It ends sooner than you think., www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/01/21/president-obama-second-term-starts-today-it-ends-in-sooner-than-you-think/

At the moment, President Obama is at the height of his political influence. He is less than three months removed from a convincing reelection victory and freed from concerns about ever having to run for office again. He is coming off of two straight legislative wins — fiscal cliff and debt ceiling — and has a huge polling edge over his congressional Republican adversaries. That means that now is the time for Obama to move on his major legislative priorities — the first of which appears to be winning some sort of tightening of existing gun laws in the wake of the Newtown, Conn., tragedy. Obama also seems likely to push on immigration. And then there is the triple-headed economic monster: sequestration, a potential government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The president must choose carefully how hard he pushes on each of his priorities — and for how long. Much of his first term — and the political capital he brought into it — was spent on fights over the economic stimulus package and his health-care plan. While both of those legislative initiatives became law, it was at considerable political cost to Obama and his party — and at the expense of other priorities like energy, for example. No matter what pieces of the Obama agenda mentioned above make it through Congress as spring turns to summer in 2014, the attention of the political world will turn away from legislative fights and to the coming midterm campaign. (Prepare to hear a lot about the so-called “six-year itch” election.) In expectation of that election, Congress will avoid any sort of major legislative action from the summer on as both parties seek to avoid exposure as they make their case to voters in the fall. Once the midterms end, the 2016 presidential race, which is already showing signs of getting started, will burst out into the open with a few candidates likely declaring their intent to run by the close of 2014. With the race expected to be open on both sides — assuming Vice President Biden decides not to run — the level of interest in the contest to come will be substantial. (Human nature dictates that we love the next big thing more than the current big thing.) Add it all up and what you get is this: By the start of 2015, Obama’s power to drive his legislative agenda will be significantly less than it is today. What his second term meant (or didn’t) will have already be largely determined by then. The president has 18 months, then — give or take a few months — to build out his political legacy. Which means he needs to get moving as quickly as possible or run the risk of running out of political power before he can get done even most of what he hopes will round out his presidency in this second term.

# RND FOUR

# 1NC

# Off case

### 1st Off

#### Text: The 50 states, Washington D.C., and relevant territories should offer to fund substantial power purchase agreements for the United States Federal Government for electricity from small modular nuclear reactors on military bases in the United States.

#### States can take the lead in SMR development – South Carolina proves

Chourey 6/23/12 (Sarita, Savannah Morning News, “S.C. hopes to lead in small modular nuclear reactors,” <http://savannahnow.com/hardeeville/2012-06-23/sc-hopes-lead-small-modular-nuclear-reactors#.UB1RxshWpJU>, TGA)

COLUMBIA — Thousands of jobs could be coming to South Carolina, if federal funding helps develop small modular reactors in the state, a prospect that drew a challenge from a nuclear safety group during a news conference Tuesday. Government and industry leaders gathered outside the S.C. Statehouse to lay out how a grant program from the U.S. Department of Energy could strengthen the state’s economy and plug it into the potential $100 billion market. During Tuesday’s event, nuclear-safety activist Tom Clements tried to ask Republican Gov. Nikki Haley how the Palmetto State would address the risk that South Carolina could be stuck with spent fuel as a result of the new small modular reactors (SMR). “It’s logical that the spent reactors and all the spent nuclear fuel would come back here to South Carolina. Are you advocating that we become some kind of holding ground?” said Clements, addressing Haley. “That’s a different conversation altogether,” she responded. “This is about new technology and the new way that we look at nuclear. And so this is not a side conversation that we’re going to have ... .” Clements was then confronted by a Haley staff member, who sought to curtail his questions. Holtec International, whose corporate headquarters are in Jupiter, Fla., is among those competing for federal energy funding to design, license, manufacture and commercialize SMR technology. Representatives from Holtec, SCE&G and Areva, as well as Columbia Mayor Steve Benjamin, others, also convened around the podium at Tuesday’s news conference. SCE&G has offered to operate the reactor if Holtec builds it at the Savannah River Site. “Not only do we have the incredible regulatory environment, we have great support at the federal level, at the state level, and certainly at the local level ... which is, I must say, rare,” said Benjamin. Haley said landing the new industry would benefit generations. “We want the country to see South Carolina is stepping forward not backward,” she said.

### 2nd Off

#### Obama pc key to immigration and will pass now- Hard line key to defeat Republicans

Spetalnick & Crowan Feb. 4th

[Matt Spetalnick and Richard Cowan, Reuters, February 4th, 2013, Obama, aides seek momentum on immigration reform this week, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204>, uwyo//amp]

The flurry of activity, including new moves in Congress, comes amid disagreement between the Democratic president and Republicans over the question of citizenship for illegal immigrants, an obstacle that could make it hard to reach a final deal on sweeping legislation. Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election. But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades. Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants, and has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion. But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept. Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### SMR debates are polarizing- saps capital

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.

#### Critical to US economic recovery

Aaron Terrazas, Migration Policy Institute, July 2011, The Economic Integration of Immigrants in the United States: Long- and Short-Term Perspectives, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/EconomicIntegration.pdf

The fate of immigrants in the United States and their integration into the labor market are impossible to separate from the state of the overall US economy and the fate of all US workers. During periods of economic expansion and relative prosperity, upward economic mobility among the native born generates opportunities for immigrants to gain a foothold in the US labor market and to gradually improve their status over time. In many respects, a growing economy during the 1990s and early 2000s provided ample opportunity for immigrants — and especially their children — to gradually improve their status over time. However, the story of immigrants’ integration into the US labor force during the years leading to the recession was also mixed: In general, the foreign born had high labor force participation, but they were also more likely to occupy low-paying jobs. The most notable advances toward economic integration occur over generations, due in large part to the openness of US educational institutions to the children of immigrants and the historic lack of employment discrimination against workers with an immigrant background. In the wake of the global economic crisis, there is substantial uncertainty regarding the future trajectory of the US economy and labor market. Most forecasts suggest that the next decade will be substantially different from the past26 and it is not clear if previous trends in immigrants’ economic integration will continue. The recession, weak recovery, and prospect of prolonged stagnation as a result of continuing high public debt, could realign the economic and social forces that have historically propelled the the less-educated labor force have been dismal for decades. In some respects, the recession accelerated these trends. While the prospect of greater demand for US manufactured goods from emerging markets might slow gradual decay of the US manufacturing industry, the outlook for the industry remains weak. Steady educational gains throughout the developing world have simultaneously increased downward wage pressure on highly skilled workers who, in the past, generated substantial secondary demand for services that immigrants often provide.

#### **Nuclear war**

Harris and Burrows ‘9

(Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>, AM)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 3rd Off

#### US regulatory climate causing shift to China to develop next generation reactors

Hall-Energy Digital-1/23/12

US to Explore Small Nuclear Reactor Designs

<http://www.energydigital.com/green_technology/us-to-explore-small-nuclear-reactor-designs>

In the wake of the Fukushima nuclear power plant disaster last year, technology companies are stepping up to develop safer, more economical nuclear reactors in an attempt to wean dependence on conventional, large-scale nuclear used all over the world today. After Bill Gates took his concepts to China—where regulations on nuclear plants are less stringent and innovations gain support—the DOE's announcement is a positive step in spurring more US manufacturing. “America’s choice is clear - we can either develop the next generation of clean energy technologies, which will help create thousands of new jobs and export opportunities here in America, or we can wait for other countries to take the lead,” said Energy Secretary Steven Chu. “The funding opportunity announced today is a significant step forward in designing, manufacturing, and exporting U.S. small modular reactors, advancing our competitive edge in the global clean energy race.”

#### Revitalizing the US industry undermines Chinese export markets – that’s the 1AC advantage

#### Chinese nuclear exports key to soft power

Blank-prof strategic studies institute, Army War College-6/16/10

China puts down marker in nuclear power race<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China_Business/LF16Cb01.html>

Therefore, China's recent nuclear exports to Pakistan and the future of its nuclear exports in general need to be examined in these three contexts. The first context is that of the overall growth of the assertiveness of China's diplomacy in general and efforts to use nuclear power and military instruments like missiles as sources of influence abroad. In the case of exports to Pakistan, a second context is the long-standing geopolitical rivalry among India, China and Pakistan in which China's "all-weather" friendship with Pakistan has been a deliberate and conscious Chinese strategy to inhibit the growth of Indian power. Finally, we must keep in mind that China is not only an exporter of nuclear energy, it also is a consumer of that energy and so it will be a key market for other exports from the likes of Russia, the United States, France, South Korea, and Japan. As an importer, it obviously will welcome the rivalry of exporters who wish to sell to it so that it can obtain more favorable terms. However, as an exporter of nuclear energy and a power that wants to export more of it for both economic and political gain, it cannot afford to let either its rivals outpace it in Asia or in other areas that China deems as essential to the pursuit of its larger strategic goals.

#### Chinese soft power key to international security and resolving all global problems

Zhang-professor at the Geneva School of Diplomacy and International Relations-9/4/12

http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2012-09/04/content\_26421330.htm

The rise of China's political soft power

As China plays an increasingly significant role in the world, its soft power must be attractive both domestically as well as internationally. The world faces many difficulties, including widespread poverty, international conflict, the clash of civilizations and environmental protection. Thus far, the Western model has not been able to decisively address these issues; the China model therefore brings hope that we can make progress in conquering these dilemmas. Poverty and development The Western-dominated global economic order has worsened poverty in developing countries. Per-capita consumption of resources in developed countries is 32 times as large as that in developing countries. Almost half of the population in the world still lives in poverty. Western countries nevertheless still are striving to consolidate their wealth using any and all necessary means. In contrast, China forged a new path of development for its citizens in spite of this unfair international order which enabled it to virtually eliminate extreme poverty at home. This extensive experience would indeed be helpful in the fight against global poverty. War and peace In the past few years, the American model of "exporting democracy'" has produced a more turbulent world, as the increased risk of terrorism threatens global security. In contrast, China insists that "harmony is most precious". It is more practical, the Chinese system argues, to strengthen international cooperation while addressing both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism. The clash of civilizations Conflict between Western countries and the Islamic world is intensifying. "In a world, which is diversified and where multiple civilizations coexist, the obligation of Western countries is to protect their own benefits yet promote benefits of other nations," wrote Harvard University professor Samuel P. Huntington in his seminal 1993 essay "The Clash of Civilizations?". China strives for "being harmonious yet remaining different", which means to respect other nations, and learn from each other. This philosophy is, in fact, wiser than that of Huntington, and it's also the reason why few religious conflicts have broken out in China. China's stance in regards to reconciling cultural conflicts, therefore, is more preferable than its "self-centered" Western counterargument. Environmental protection Poorer countries and their people are the most obvious victims of global warming, yet they are the least responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases. Although Europeans and Americans have a strong awareness of environmental protection, it is still hard to change their extravagant lifestyles. Chinese environmental protection standards are not yet ideal, but some effective environmental ideas can be extracted from the China model. Perfecting the China model The China model is still being perfected, but its unique influence in dealing with the above four issues grows as China becomes stronger. China's experiences in eliminating poverty, prioritizing modernization while maintaining traditional values, and creating core values for its citizens demonstrate our insight and sense of human consciousness. Indeed, the success of the China model has not only brought about China's rise, but also a new trend that can't be explained by Western theory. In essence, the rise of China is the rise of China's political soft power, which has significantly helped China deal with challenges, assist developing countries in reducing poverty, and manage global issues. As the China model improves, it will continue to surprise the world.

### 4th Off

#### Nuclear industry fuels the power of the state and militarism enables social repression and control through the establishment of hierarchal social relationships and technology

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

The nuclear industry then has been largely state-developed, owned and promoted. We can't explain the phenomenon of its development, in the face of apparently major problems, risks and disadvantages, without seeing the state as having a crucial and largely independent role, independent that is of its more conventionally attributed role of protecting long-term capitalist interests.¶ Nuclear technology is not obviously in the interests of capital, although it does have numerous features which make it attractive for profit-making e.g. it is capital- intensive, large-scale, centralised and suitable for monopolisation. So of course are many other possible energy sources. But capital has required constant coaxing and reassurance to continue to participate, and the industry would apparently have become defunct some time ago if those mythical ft market forces had been allowed to prevail. Thus there have been no new orders for reactors in the U.S. since 1977, and the industry is in a financial mess even with the highly favourable conditions provided by the state. [2]¶ The industry does however seem to be highly suited to increasing the power of the state itself, both through its military connection, and through its contribution to overall technological, social and bureaucratic centralisation.¶ This seems to present a fairly clear case then where the state has operated with some relative autonomy in promoting a technology which appears to be in its own interests rather than primarily that of capital, and to be the chief promoter and beneficiary of the industry which capitalism has to be coaxed to support.¶ So far the data I have presented is consistent both with a sophisticated Marxist theory which allows some relative autonomy [3] to institutions such as the state, and with more traditional anarchist theories which see the state as the central organ of social repression and the production of hierarchical social relationships and associated technologies (this last a modern addition). There are however other factors which have to be taken into account to understand the kind of social control being exercised here, and which show that the state reduction model - the reduction of all significant factors to the state (or to some combination of state and capital) is too simple and has other defects as well. These factors show the need to press on beyond purely state or other reductive models and to develop a more pluralistic model of the operation of power which sees power as " a productive network which runs through the entire social body much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression". [4]

#### This technological control through nuclear power makes nuclear apocalypse inevitable through technological development—the tools that the state uses to monopolize centralized control and power lead to destruction of life

Hubbard, 1997

[Bryan, MA Thesis at Arizona state University, Nuclear criticism after the cold war: a rhetorical analysis of two contemporary atomic campaigns, 8-1-1997, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA327948] /Wyo-MB

Brummett (1989) notes the entelechial drive toward perfection at work in the rhetoric of nuclear weapons strategy. Hirschbein (1989) also saw the eventual progress of nuclear science enabling an "ersatz immortality -- immortalization through making a lasting monumental impact on history" (p. 167). This impulse to power is not new. Humanity has always feared death, seized the greatest power available to avoid death and then created rationalizations to romanticize death. Like other continuities flowing into the nuclear age, the drive toward perfection accelerates with nuclear knowledge and its accompanying industrial capacity. The drive toward perfection informs the other two continuities present in the nuclear age -- the desire to cut and control and a shared fascination with the apocalypse.¶ Since humanity became a problem-solving organism, it has strived to cut and control its environment in hopes of improving its strategic situation. Harris (1991) claimed the drive to control the environment involves an attempt to master energy. He¶ traced the search for energy through ancient times noting that the control of energy enabled the control not only of the environment but of its inhabiting organisms. As people became more organized and specialized, the control of energy became centralized. The modem experience of nuclear energy enables an acceleration of this process placing virtually unlimited power (energy) in the hands of an unprecedented few (Mumford, 1980). The tendency Harris observed is one continuity flowing through our current nuclear experiences. J. Burke and Omstein (1995) call this continuity the drive to cut and control.¶ This desire to cut and control nature makes human beings human and links our creativity and destructive capacities, our tool-using nature, and our problem-solving inclinations (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995). In The Chalice and The Blade: Our History, Our Future, Eisler (1988) sees the modem nuclear predicament as the logical perfection of ancient traditions which claim authority and legitimacy through the "power of the lethal Blade" (p. 184). She sees the current path of society set along a grim trajectory and says, "[a] dominator future is therefore, sooner or later, almost certainly also a future of global nuclear war -- and the end of all of humanity's problems and aspirations" (Eisler, p. 184). This trajectory for her originates thousands of years prior to the discovery of the atom. The cult of the blade originated in the "Initial Kurganization" of Old Europe from 4000-3500 B.C.E. according to Eisler (p. 250). The impulse to cut and control (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995) guides the development of humanity from its earliest tool-making days. The potential destructive power parallels the productive capacity of humanity's tools. This trajectory accelerates into the twentieth century creating a situation where,¶ according to Eisler, would-be totalitarians and their "faith in the power of the lethal Blade as the instrument of deliverance" (p. 184) become one source of today's nuclearism.

#### The alternative is to refuse nuclear power production in favor of the 1NC criticism.

#### And the alt solves—need analysis of power relationships embedded in nuclear knowledge and structures—key to resist centralized development of knowledge and power (green highlighting)

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

What is clear from recent events in Australia is the importance of moving beyond a narrow, 'political' approach to the nuclear issue to one which is based on an analysis of the power structures embedded in it. This is important for the survival of the anti-nuclear movement as an important social force in Australia. The anti-nuclear movement in Australia has had great strength and by some criteria, great success. But the recent treatment of the issue at the hands of politicians illustrates vividly the ultimate bankruptcy of elite-oriented strategies for change based on appeals to decision-makers and working within a state and electoral framework. An inability to focus on alternative strategies will probably cause the death or serious weakening of the movement in the coming period of political confrontation, yet its demise as a widespread activist issue would be a serious loss. An alternative approach, stressing long-term strategies and institutional analysis, has great promise because the multiplicity of factors, critiques and sites of resistance to nuclear power gives the issue great potential. And such a social movement also has the ability to bring about or reinforce social awareness of the undemocratic character of social life and of the need for other sorts of fundamental changes in social relations, provided of course that the means adopted, for example, for working in groups, are themselves appropriate to these multiple goals and sufficiently challenging to day-to-day hierarchical social relationships and power structures e.g. sexist and racist ones. [9]¶ In this strategy then the critique of the role of the state is critical, but it must be combined with a critique of the wider power structure involved. What implications does this analysis have for anarchism itself? Does anarchism emerge as just another form of activism and critique, and anarchists as anti-state activists along with feminists as anti-patriarchy activists for example? This may seem quite threatening to many anarchists, since it threatens the claim to a more central or 'purer' position.¶ Such a view however ignores the relation between the different critiques - it assumes that they just coexist peacefully side-by-side as separate pieces of an overall puzzle, needing only to be assembled in their separate purity to providing a critique, not only of general power structures, but of the means and strategies adopted by other social movements. This concern with means and the stress on appropriate ways of pursuing other political goals, has been traditionally important in anarchist thought.¶ If anarchism is conceived, to a large extent at least, as involving another way of doing something else, of pursuing other social and political goals and effecting social changes in appropriate ways, rather than just as a utopian and unrealizable goal, disconnected from strategies and from other movements for social change, then there is an important relationship between anarchism and other social movements for change. Links with other activist groups become crucial, as does attention to the means by which particular resistances to particular forms of power are conducted. Stress on purity of anarchist doctrine, on 'keeping the hands clean' by not mixing it with less idealistic or utopian social movements must then be seen as sterile and self-defeating, and as removing this fertile area for achieving change. The real challenge to contemporary anarchism, conceived of as a general resistance to hierarchical and centralising structures, would then be in the struggle within movements for social change for appropriate non-hierarchical processes and to achieve alternative social relations, as well as for the adoption of non-centralising means for achieving particular social goals.¶ Anarchism in this picture has a crucial role to play for other social movements in maintaining the means/ends critique, and in promoting non-centralising and non state-strengthening strategies for other activist movements. Other social movements such as the anti-nuclear movement then provide a crucial 'field' for anarchism, which, to the extent that it is a general critique of power and of processes for achieving change, may still have some claim to a central (if not centralising or reductive) role.

# Grid

### 1NC –Grid/Islanding Advantage

#### 1st, squo solves--

#### A. DOD taking efforts to shield itself from grid outages now

GAO 9

[Government Accountability Office, “Defense Critical Infrastructure:” , http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/297169.html, \\wyo-bb]

DOD has taken some steps to assure the availability of its electrical power supplies by identifying and addressing the vulnerabilities and risks of its critical assets to electrical power disruptions. For example, from August 2005 through October 2008, DOD issued Defense Critical Infrastructure Program guidance for identifying critical assets, assessing their vulnerabilities, and making risk management decisions about those vulnerabilities. Also, as previously discussed, DOD has conducted DCIP vulnerability assessments on 14 of the 34 most critical assets and has scheduled assessments for 13 of the remaining assets, but it has not yet scheduled assessments for 5 of the non-DOD- owned most critical assets.[Footnote 56] The DCIP vulnerability assessments conducted so far have identified specific electrical power- related vulnerabilities to some of the critical assets, including vulnerabilities associated with the reliability of the assets' supporting commercial electrical power grid, the availability of backup electrical power supplies, and single points of failure in electrical power systems supporting the assets.[Footnote 57] Addressing the risks associated with these vulnerabilities--by remediating, mitigating, or accepting those risks--can help DOD assure the availability of electrical power to the critical assets. For example, at all 6 most critical assets we visited, the DOD asset owners have installed diesel- based electrical power generators as backup sources of electricity during electrical power disruptions. Other (non-DCIP) DOD mission assurance programs also have the potential to help DOD assure the availability of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, we found that Joint Service Integrated Vulnerability Assessments and similar vulnerability assessments from the military services, which have been conducted on some of the installations with critical assets for antiterrorism and force protection purposes, also have identified vulnerabilities related to electrical power. Furthermore, DOD also has taken steps to coordinate with other federal agencies, including DOE and DHS, as well as electrical industry organizations, and these steps may help to assure the supply of electricity to its critical assets. For example, to represent its concerns and interests on electricity, DOD participates in the Energy Government Coordinating Council. The council provides DOD and other federal agencies with a forum for sharing their concerns, comments, and questions on energy-related matters--including critical infrastructure protection--with DOE, which chairs the group.[Footnote 58] In another effort involving DOE, several DOD combatant commands--including U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command--have recently agreed to accept a DOE departmental representative to serve as an energy attaché to the commands. The DOE representatives will provide energy-related expertise to their respective commands, particularly with respect to the commands' energy-related planning activities and the security and reliability of the commands' energy infrastructure. DOD has also partnered with various federal agencies and industry organizations to further increase the assurance of electrical power. For example, DOD serves as co-chair of the federal Task Force on Electric Grid Vulnerability of the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Homeland and National Security, which was established in January 2009 to identify research and development needs for electrical grid vulnerabilities and to coordinate with other federal agencies to address those needs.[Footnote 59] In addition, DOD officials are collaborating with a working group established by the Edison Electric Institute in early 2009 called the Energy Security Partnership Group. The group focuses on improving communications between DOD and its utilities and on identifying and removing barriers to the development of comprehensive energy security programs at DOD installations. Also, in July 2009, DOD participated in an interagency exercise cosponsored by DHS, DOE, and DOD called Secure Grid 2009, Electric Grid Tabletop Exercise, for which officials from DOD, DOE, DHS, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, and the Edison Electric Institute, among others, jointly developed recommendations and potential responses to two scenarios involving theoretical physical and cyber-related attacks on U.S. electrical power grids. Our survey results confirm that some steps are being taken at various levels within DOD to improve the assurance of electrical power supplies to its most critical assets. For example, according to the survey and reports we reviewed, DOD conducted vulnerability and risk assessments involving electrical power on 24 of the most critical assets through a variety of DOD mission assurance reviews, including DCIP assessments, Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments, combatant command assessments, DOD agency assessments, and local installation assessments. The survey results also indicate that secondary sources of electricity--such as uninterruptible power supply systems and diesel generators--provide some backup electrical power capabilities to almost all of the critical assets. In addition, according to the survey, asset owners and host installations for some of the critical assets whose vulnerabilities have been assessed have taken specific measures to address those vulnerabilities, such as eliminating single points of failure, developing electrical power disruption contingency plans, installing emergency electrical power generators, and increasing physical security measures around electrical power facilities.

#### 2nd, Nuke power doesn’t solve the grid--

#### A. Nuke energy contributes to grid and electricity problems

Dittmar, 2012

[Michael, Institute of particle physics, “Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations.” Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, 7th Biennial International Workshop “Advances in Energy Studies” Accessed online via science direct] /Wyo-MB

The status of nuclear energy today and its potential evolution during the next 10–20 years is discussed. Nuclear energy contributes only about 14% of the world’s electric energy mix today, and as electric energy contributes itself only about 16% to the end energy use, its contribution is essentially negligible. Still, nuclear energy is plagued already with a long list of unsolved problems. Among the less known problems one finds the difficulties that nuclear plants cannot provide power according to needs, but have to be operated at full power also during times of low demand and regions with large contributions from nuclear power need some backup hydropower storage systems. The better known problems, without solutions since at least 40 years, are the final safe storage of the accumulated highly radioactive nuclear waste, that uranium itself is a very limited and non renewable energy resource and that enormous amounts of human resources, urgently needed to find a still unknown path towards a low energy future, are blocked by useless research on fusion energy. Thus, nuclear energy is not a solution to our energy worries but part of the problem.

#### B. Can’t solve electricity demand on the grid

Dittmar, 2012

[Michael, Institute of particle physics, “Nuclear energy: Status and future limitations.” Energy, Volume 37, Issue 1, January 2012, Pages 35–40, 7th Biennial International Workshop “Advances in Energy Studies” Accessed online via science direct] /Wyo-MB

A more accurate world energy accounting system would perhaps be slightly more complicated, but it would allow making more realistic estimates of the impacts from the coming decline of oil and gas. One would thus first separate electric energy, which makes 16% of the current world energy mix, from the other demanded forms of energy for transport, heating and other uses and secondly argue about the possibility to transform electric energy efficiently back into the other required forms. Furthermore, a realistic analysis of the contribution of nuclear energy should also mention the problem that nuclear power plants can provide essentially only base load power, while electric energy coming from hydropower and gas fired power plants has a much higher value, as production can follow the huge demand variations for electric energy. § Marked 16:24 § Thus, in fact nuclear produced electric energy should receive some kind of penalty factor in comparison with hydropower. Ignoring such details, one calculates easily that nuclear energy contributes currently only an almost negligible amount of about 2.3% (14% × 16%) to the worlds useful end energy. Taking the European Union as an example of an industrialized area, one finds that the contribution of electric energy is about 23% from which nuclear power plants contributed about one 25% in 2009 [2]. It follows that even with their relatively large density in Europe, nuclear power plants hardly contribute 6% (23% × 25%) to the European energy system. These numbers show, contrary to most official declarations, that even in developed industrial countries nuclear fission energy contributed only a relatively small amount to the total energy use. If one takes an envisioned 1–2% annual increase in nuclear energy [3] and [4] as a guideline, one finds that such a new nuclear capacity would correspond to an additional annual grid connection of at least between 5–10 new nuclear reactors during the next decade. While such increases do not sound totally unrealistic on paper it is important to note that even a 5% annual increase, about 20 new nuclear power plants per year, would result only in a doubling of the overall fraction of nuclear fission energy after 14 years. Thus not even 30% of the electric energy would come from nuclear fission energy in the year 2025. Such hypothetical increases would also be much larger than the one observed during the past three years. Taking the worldwide numbers from the International Atomic Energy Administration (IAEA) data base [5], one finds that between 2008 and 2010 seven new reactors with a combined capacity of about 4.6 GWe were added to the electric grid and 5 reactors with a capacity of about 3.1 GWe were terminated. These slow changes have been acknowledged in the 2009 [6] update of their 2003 MIT study “The Future of Nuclear Power” where one can read: “The slow pace of this deployment means that the mid-century scenario of 1000 GWe of operating nuclear power around the globe and 300 GWe in the United States is less likely than when it was considered in the 2003 study”. Depending on assumptions about the time scale for the unavoidable phase out of fossil fuels in the electric energy production, one finds that even a hypothetical annual increase from today’s 14% in the nuclear power sector by 0.3% per year (e.g. a 2% growth of the nuclear produced electric energy) would not even allow to satisfy the demand growth of electric energy, imagined by the IEA [1] during the next decades.

#### 3rd, Plan fails and doesn’t solve--

#### C. Subsidies for SMR’s fail—stifle investment and development—plan fails

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Neucleonics week vol 52 no 6, Think tanks differ on government's role in SMR development, lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

Breakthrough Chairman Ted Nordhaus, who spoke at the same event, said the government needs to "accelerate the deployment and commercialization" of SMRs through a "procurement mechanism." A policy paper on energy innovation released by Breakthrough last fall urged that the departments of Energy and Defense "procure and demonstrate small modular reactors at DOE nuclear facilities and DOD military bases."¶ The Washington-based Heritage Foundation, however, warned last week that government subsidies would stifle innovation in the fledgling SMR industry instead of nurturing it.¶ The Heritage Foundation, which promotes conservative values including free enterprise and limited government, released a report February 2 in which it described "a young, robust, innovative and growing" industry with "companies of all sizes investing in these smaller, safer, and more cost-efficient nuclear reactors." But in order for this industry to thrive, "policymakers should reject the temptation to offer the same sort of subsidies and government programs" as it is doing for large reactors, it said.¶ DOE is preparing to launch a program to pay for part of the costs of commercializing two SMR designs. The program is awaiting budget approval from Congress, but it has received bipartisan support at committee levels in both the House and the Senate and is popular among industry supporters. DOE officials have said only light water reactor designs, the type operating in the US, would be eligible to apply.¶ Government subsidies like the DOE's cost-sharing program would be "detrimental to SMRs," the Heritage report said, because "the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted."¶ Instead of offering subsidies, the report recommended that the government focus on reforming NRC's licensing process, which the report said is "ill-prepared ? for new reactor technologies."¶ "The NRC is built to regulate large light water reactors. It simply does not have the regulatory capability and resources to efficiently regulate other technologies," § Marked 16:24 § the paper said.¶ NRC spokesman Scott Burnell has said the NRC is focusing on reviewing LWR designs and the Next Generation Nuclear Plant, a high-temperature gas-cooled reactor project mandated by Congress. For any other applications, "we are budgeted for limited non-resource intensive activities," which would take "only a few hours of staff time on a non-routine, infrequent basis," Burnell said in a February 1 e-mail.¶ The result of such limits at NRC "is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a time frame that would promote near-term investment," the Heritage report said. It suggested that Congress provide NRC funding "to develop additional broad expertise for liquid-metal cooled, fast reactors and high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors."¶ The report also urged the SMR industry to resist government loan guarantees, an approach it said has not helped accelerate nuclear construction.¶ A smaller, less expensive modular reactor "would be very attractive to private investors even without government intervention," it said.

#### Threat is exaggerated – their impact is rhetorical not real war

Bruce Schneier, Special to CNN, security technologist “The Threat of Cyberwar Has Been Grossly Exaggerated”, CNN, July 7, 2010. http://edition.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/07/07/schneier.cyberwar.hyped/

There's a power struggle going on in the U.S. government right now. It's about who is in charge of cyber security, and how much control the government will exert over civilian networks. And by beating the drums of war, the military is coming out on top. "The United States is fighting a cyberwar today, and we are losing," [said](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/25/AR2010022502493.html?sid=ST2010031901063) former NSA director -- and current cyberwar contractor -- Mike McConnell. "Cyber 9/11 has happened over the last ten years, but it happened slowly so we don't see it," [said](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/06/cyberthreat/) former National Cyber Security Division director Amit Yoran. Richard Clarke, whom Yoran replaced, wrote an [entire book](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0061962236/counterpane/) hyping the threat of cyberwar. General Keith Alexander, the current commander of the U.S. Cyber Command, [hypes](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/04/pentagon-networks-targeted-by-hundreds-of-thousands-of-probes/) it every chance he gets. This isn't just rhetoric of a few over-eager government officials and headline writers; the entire national debate on cyberwar is plagued with [exaggerations](http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9174682/Senators_ramp_up_cyberwar_rhetoric_) and [hyperbole](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/04/top-officer-fears-cyberwar-hearts-karzai-tweets-with-help/). Googling those [names](http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/glenn_greenwald/2010/03/29/mcconnell) [and](http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2010/mar/04/internet-hi-tech-crime) [terms](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2008/01/feds-must-exami/) -- as well as "cyber Pearl Harbor," "[cyber Katrina](http://www.businessweek.com/the_thread/techbeat/archives/2009/02/fearing_cyber_katrina_obama_candidate_for_cyber_czar_urges_a_fema_for_the_internet.html)," and even "[cyber Armageddon](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/04/conficker-war-r/)" -- gives some idea how pervasive these memes are. Prefix "cyber" to something scary, and you end up with [something](http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9173967/Cyberattacks_an_existential_threat_to_U.S._FBI_says) really scary. Cyberspace has all sorts of threats, day in and day out. Cybercrime is by far the largest: fraud, through identity theft and other means, extortion, and so on. Cyber-espionage is another, both government- and corporate-sponsored. Traditional hacking, without a profit motive, is still a threat. So is cyber-activism: people, most often kids, playing politics by attacking government and corporate websites and networks. These threats cover a wide variety of perpetrators, motivations, tactics, and goals. You can see this variety in what the media has mislabeled as "cyberwar." The attacks against Estonian websites in 2007 were [simple hacking](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2007/08/cyber-war-and-e/) attacks by ethnic Russians angry at anti-Russian policies; these were denial-of-service attacks, a normal risk in cyberspace and hardly unprecedented. A real-world comparison might be if an army invaded a country, then all got in line in front of people at the DMV so they couldn't renew their licenses. If that's what war looks like in the 21st century, we have little to fear. Similar attacks against Georgia, which accompanied an actual Russian invasion, were also probably the responsibility of [citizen activists](http://www.csoonline.com/article/443579/georgia-cyber-attacks-from-russian-government-not-so-fast) or [organized crime](http://www.csoonline.com/article/499778/georgia-cyberattacks-linked-to-russian-organized-crime). A series of [power blackouts in Brazil](http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/11/06/60minutes/main5555565.shtml) was caused by criminal extortionists -- or was it [sooty insulators](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/11/brazil_blackout/)? China is [engaging](http://www.schneier.com/essay-227.html) in [espionage](http://www.schneier.com/essay-227.html), not war, in cyberspace. And so on. One problem is that there's no clear [definition](http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/70319-no-line-between-cyber-crime-and-cyber-war) of "cyberwar." What does it look like? How does it start? When is it over? Even cybersecurity experts don't know the answers to these questions, and it's dangerous to broadly apply the term "war" unless we know a war is going on. Yet recent news articles have claimed that China [declared cyberwar](http://techcrunch.com/2007/10/18/cyberwar-china-declares-war-on-western-search-sites/) on Google, that [Germany attacked China](http://news.softpedia.com/news/Germany-Attacks-China-For-Starting-The-Cyber-War-68994.shtml), and that a group of young hackers [declared cyberwar](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/australasia/operation-titstorm-hackers-declare-cyber-war-on-australia-1895838.html) on Australia. (Yes, cyberwar is so easy that even kids can do it.) Clearly we're not talking about real war here, but a rhetorical war: like the war on terror. We have a variety of institutions that can defend us when attacked: the police, the military, the Department of Homeland Security, various commercial products and services, and our own personal or corporate lawyers. The legal framework for any particular attack depends on two things: the attacker and the motive. Those are precisely the two things you don't know when you're being attacked on the Internet. We saw this on July 4 last year, when U.S. and South Korean websites were [attacked](http://www.schneier.com/essay-280.html) by unknown perpetrators from North Korea -- or perhaps England. Or was it Florida?

No impact and no use

Evgeny Morozov, is a fellow at the Open Society Institute and a board member of its Information Program, “Cyber-Scare: The exaggerated fears over digital warfare”, Boston Review, July/August 2009. http://bostonreview.net/BR34.4/morozov.php

Putting these complexities aside and focusing just on states, it is important to bear in mind that the cyber-attacks on Estonia and especially Georgia did little damage, particularly when compared to the physical destruction caused by angry mobs in the former and troops in the latter. One argument about the Georgian case is that cyber-attacks played a strategic role by thwarting Georgia’s ability to communicate with the rest of the world and present its case to the international community. This argument both overestimates the Georgian government’s reliance on the Internet and underestimates how much international PR—particularly during wartime—is done by lobbyists and publicity firms based in Washington, Brussels, and London. There is, probably, an argument to be made about the vast psychological effects of cyber-attacks—particularly those that disrupt ordinary economic life. But there is a line between causing inconvenience and causing human suffering, and cyber-attacks have not crossed it yet. The usefulness of cyber-attacks as a military tool is also contested. Some experts are justifiably skeptical about the arrival of a new age of cyber-war. Marcus J. Ranum, Chief Security Officer of Tenable Network Security, argues that it is pointless for superpowers to develop cyber-war capabilities to attack non-superpowers, as they can crush them in more conventional ways. As for non-superpowers, their use of cyber-capabilities would almost certainly result in what Ranum calls “the Blind Mike Tyson” effect: the superpower would retaliate with offline weaponry (“blind me, I nuke you”). If Ranum is right, we should forget about the prospect of all-out cyber-war until we have technologically advanced superpowers that are hostile to each other. Focusing on cyber-crime, cyber-terrorism, and cyber-espionage may help us address the more pertinent threats in a more rational manner.

### 1NC A2 Drones Impact (Afganistan/Pakistan)

#### Drones can be maintained in Saudi Arabia

The Telegraph, 2-6

[“CIA 'operating drone base in Saudi Arabia',” February 6, 2013, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/al-qaeda/9853119/CIA-operating-drone-base-in-Saudi-Arabia.html //uwyo-baj]

The CIA has been operating drone strikes from a remote base in Saudi Arabia, including the one which killed al-Qaeda's Anwar al-Awlaki. The location of the base was first disclosed by The New York Times online. A drone flown from there to Yemen was used two years ago in the operation to kill Awlaki, a US-born cleric alleged to be the operations chief of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. US media, including the Associated Press, knew of its existence then, but have only reported on it now. Any operation by US military or intelligence officials inside Saudi Arabia is politically and religiously sensitive. Al-Qaeda and other militant groups have used the Gulf kingdom's close working relationship with US counterterrorism officials to stir internal dissent against the Saudi regime. The White House has defended drone strikes against al-Qaeda suspects as legal, ethical and wise and insisted they complied with US law and the Constitution, even if they targeted Americans. The White House defended President Barack Obama's power to wage drone war after a Justice Department memo argued that Americans high up in al-Qaeda could be lawfully killed, even if intelligence fails to show them plotting an attack. The disclosure by NBC news, which posted a link to the white paper on its web page, came as US drone attacks in Pakistan, Yemen and elsewhere face increasing scrutiny and questions from human rights groups.

#### The risk of an impact approaches zero- they have no evidence about how likely it is the drone missions get interrupted, that that segment of the grid is vulnerable, or that there are no backups to run drones through

#### Drones don’t solve terror- failing in Afghanistan and Pakistan

Dawn.com, 12

[“Drone attacks render Pakistan’s anti-terror efforts ineffective: Malik,” October 29, 2013, <http://dawn.com/2012/10/29/drone-attacks-render-pakistans-anti-terror-efforts-ineffective-rehman-malik/> //uwyo-baj]

ISLAMABAD: Interior Minister Rehman Malik demanded a halt to US drone attacks in Pakistan, adding that, the attacks were rendering Pakistan’s efforts to countering terrorism ineffective, DawnNews reported on Monday. In an interview to a US-based television channel, Malik said that despite having all the resources, the United States was not making sufficient gains in Afghanistan. ROBERT SIEGEL, HOST: We turn now to a primary target of U.S. drone strikes: Pakistan. Yesterday, missiles struck a compound in North Waziristan near the border with Afghanistan, killing three people. The strike occurred shortly after Pakistan's ambassador in Washington condemned the use of drones as a violation of Pakistan's sovereignty and international law. Throughout Pakistan, popular reaction to U.S. drone strikes isn't just negative. It is vociferously negative. NPR's Jackie Northam joins us now from Islamabad. And, Jackie, what's been the reaction to this latest drone attack in North Waziristan? JACKIE NORTHAM, BYLINE: Well, the English and Urdu press are certainly covering this latest strike. But, Robert, compared to other drone attacks, this one is quite small and, from all accounts, really, where no major players killed. Drone strikes have become quite common here in Pakistan. There has been hundreds of strikes over the past few years. This is the first one this month, but there were six in January alone, which killed more than 40 people. And then, you know, with each hit, there's just an increasing anger here in Pakistan. And it's something that crops up in every conversation that you have whether you're talking about Afghanistan or foreign policy or the problem with militancy here. Even the weather, I think, you could probably work it in. So it's here, it's present. This whole issue of drones works its way into every part of society, you know?

#### Drones fail in Pakistan- ineffective at advancing goals, unnecessary, creates retaliation and destroys the legitimacy of American leadership in the region

Plaw and Fricker 12

[Avery and Matthew, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, “Tracking the Predators: Evaluating the US Drone Campaign in Pakistan”, International Studies Perspectives (2012) 13, 344–365//wyo-tjc]

Yet to say that the administration’s dramatic expansion of the Predator campaign is tactically sound is not to say that it is strategically wise. This article challenges an important aspect of the expanded targeting policy—specifically, the targeting of low-level Pakistani Taliban. Of course, given the official secrecy that surrounds the campaign and the dubious reliability of media reports emanating from Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), it is difficult to know anything about the strikes beyond a reasonable doubt. But in the absence of counterevidence, the authors of this article think it reasonable to accept provisionally the growing mass of testimony and data indicating that part of the recent expansion of the drone campaign involves targeting low-level Pakistani Taliban. We argue, however, that a campaign expanded along this line is likely to be counter-productive. We advance six arguments in support of this claim: (i) expanded strikes directed against low-level Taliban are likely to increase resentment and hostility both locally and across Pakistan; (ii) they threaten to undermine the fragile international legitimacy of the campaign; (iii) they are unlikely to weaken significantly the Pakistani Taliban; (iv) they are strategically unnecessary; (v) they complicate other crucial adjustments to the campaign (such as increased transparency); and (vi) they are likely to provoke retaliations against the United States. The implication of these arguments is that it would be strategically preferable to pursue a more narrowly focused drone campaign in Pakistan, directed specifically against al-Qaeda, the Afghan Taliban, and senior Pakistani Taliban leadership.3

### 1NC A2 Afganistan Stability Impact

#### Their impact evidence takes-out the internal link. Fox says handing over control to Afghan security will trigger the civil war, their Singh evidence doesn’t make a sufficiency claim that drones prevent that

#### Their impact is inevitable- Singh says the US can’t prevent it and the US will push for power-sharing which their Fox evidence says will fail- this is Singh, their author

Singh 2012 (Colonel Ajay Singh, October 3, 2012, “Afghanistan 2014 and Beyond,” South Asia Defence and Strategic Review, http://www.defstrat.com/exec/frmArticleDetails.aspx?DID=368)

The future of Afghanistan, post 2014, lies in how well they are able to govern themselves. And for that too, the present auguries are not encouraging. President Hamid Karzai's deeply unpopular government has been unable to provide good governance or improve the standard of living of the average Afghan in any measure. And yet there seems to be no other alternative. The elections due in 2014 will be a defining moment for the nation. If Karzai holds on to his Pushtoon base and succeeds in forming another coalition government, it will at least provide some continuity and stability. Yet should the Taliban or its proxies gain political power (which is high on its agenda) it could exert pressure on a divided government and eventually gain legitimate political power. Many, even in the US administration, advocate a power-sharing arrangement with the so called 'moderates' in the Taliban to wean them back into the mainstream and ensure stability post 2014. But this is rife with risk and at best will provide a short term solution. Any Taliban entry within the government will merely set the base for the extremists to gradually take over and push the nation back under a puritanical medieval rule. The re-emergence of the Taliban will suit none, save Pakistan. The rapidly plummeting relations with the US has led to one major change in stance- Pakistan's sensitivities are no longer paramount to the US policies in Afghanistan. In fact, the Pakistani sponsored Haqqani network- which it hopes to foist into power - has been declared a terrorist organization by the US. A greater Pakistani involvement in the post 2014 scenario now seems unlikely. But it is even less likely that Pakistan has forsaken its policy of acquiring “strategic depth” through Afghanistan. The extent of Pakistani involvement in Afghanistan will determine the future stability of the country and continual stability can only be ensured if the Taliban and Al Qaeda bases inside Pakistan are completely neutralized. This may well be a US aim prior to their withdrawal, but it will be impossible to attain it without willing Pakistani cooperation. In the see-saw of US-Pak relations, the status now seems to be, “Allies, but only moderately hostile”. But, even with US-Pak relations rapidly deteriorating, they still hold one trump card - the route from Karachi port, through Peshawar and the Khyber Pass into Afghanistan over which 80 percent of NATO supplies traverse. This route was recently reopened after Hilary Clinton's half-hearted apology for the deaths of 26 Pakistani soldiers in a mistaken NATO attack on a Pakistani post. It will be vital to remove the thousands of tons of US specialized equipment that has accumulated in Afghanistan over a decade of fighting .Some will be handed over to the Afghan Army. Most will be transported back along this same route. The route will also be essential to maintain the residual US force post 2015. The other route, through Central Asia, costs three times as much, but perhaps a smaller force could be maintained over it. With the termination of major combat operations US dependence on Pakistan will cease dramatically and its stance towards it will harden, especially towards its terrorist sanctuaries and unsafe nuclear assets. The phased withdrawal with a reasonably strong residual force beyond 2015 provides greater strategic leverage to India. The US has undergone a major shift in its Afghan Policy vis-à-vis India and Pakistan. After over a decade of upholding Pakistan's interests in Afghanistan; it has now shifted towards India. India's interests in Afghanistan and a viable Indian presence are seen as one of the factors essential for lasting stability. The tripartite talks between USA, India and Afghanistan raised India's role in the post withdrawal era. US urging for India to raise its Security profile there was politely turned down (An act which won rare praise from the Taliban). Instead of a direct presence, India's economic involvement will earn greater dividends. India's $2 Billion investment in projects as diverse as the Kabul electric grid, the Salma Dam Project, the Parliament building, the Zaranj-Delaram highway will be more vital to kick-start Afghanistan's aid-dependent economy. Indian activities in Afghanistan will be intensified with the agreement with Iran to develop the Chahbahar Port. This will help connect directly with Afghanistan and prevent the need for road transit via a reluctant Pakistan. The port will open up Afghanistan's land-locked economy, though it will lead to greater Iranian engagement there- an act which is viewed with suspicion by the USA. Afghanistan does have the potential to develop its own economy, though it will be dependent on aid for at least a decade or so more. The vast deposits of copper, iron, gold, lithium and rare earths have drawn foreign investors and one of the redeeming features of the Afghan economy is that it is extremely open to foreign investments. India has a $ 11 billion stake in the iron ore mines of Hajikak, China too has invested massively in its copper mines. In spite of its land-locked nature, Afghanistan can use its unique strategic position as a transit hub for goods from South and East Asia and incoming gas and oil from Central Asia. But these investments and trade will only come when their security is assured. Its strategic location and now its new found mineral wealth makes Afghanistan such a key player in the 'New Great Game'. The US is unwilling to leave it completely- for its own strategic compulsions. But other nations in the region are also looking to move in. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, with China and Russia in the lead, are likely to play a much greater role after the USA packs its bags. China seems to be veering towards a more direct role and not only through Pakistan. Beijing is all set to sign a “Strategic and Cooperative Partnership”, with Afghanistan. Karzai seems to be extending a hand towards Beijing in anticipation of a bigger role to be played by China post withdrawal. After all both economically and in terms of security arrangements, China has more to offer in the long run. And then there is Russia. In spite of the Soviet Union's bruising experience there, Russia is unlikely to relinquish its century long involvement with Afghanistan. As the US leaves the region, a resurgent Russia may want to expand its footprint towards this strategic high ground of Central Asia. As the US prepares to wind up its operations, one can't help compare the situation to a similar withdrawal it has conducted in Iraq. Iraq is still tethering between stability and chaos and it is only its oil revenues that keep it afloat. In Afghanistan, the situation is different and the stakes are higher. With its past record, History is not on Afghanistan's side. It is difficult to imagine that good governance will take root, the economy will become self sustaining, the Afghan National Security Forces will guarantee national security, Al-Qaeda will be completely banished and the Taliban marginalized. It is even harder to imagine that centuries old tribal affinities and Shia-Sunni animosity will be replaced by nationalism. Yet this is precisely the end state that the USA should be hoping to achieve in the two year window that they have before they finally conclude this war. The post 2014 era will lead to some sort of a vacuum which can draw destabilizing forces into the region. This vacuum can only be filled by Afghanistan itself. Unless it is made responsible for its own security and governance, it could soon plunge back into the civil war and Islamic fundamentalism which marked a similar withdrawal, two and a half decades ago, of another occupying super-power.

#### Indo-Pak relations are likely to remain stable for reasons including national well-being, domestic cohesion, national security, and trade

Krepon 09

[Michael, Founding President of the Henry L. Stimson Foundation, Nuclear Arms and the Future of South Asia, BNET, April 2009, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0KNN/is\_53/ai\_n31464292/pg\_3/?tag=content;col1//UWYO TDA]

The first such dominant trend is that **Pakistan and India will probably keep viewing economic growth as essential to national well-being, domestic cohesion, and national security.** **Trade between the countries** presumably **will** continue to **grow.** While the perceived primacy of economic growth does not ensure peaceful relations between Pakistan and India, **the pursuit of this goal is likely to further ameliorate animosity**. Pakistan's future growth is limited in part by constrained trading partnerships with India and states in Central Asia. As long as Pakistan's ties to neighboring India and Afghanistan remain conflicted, these natural trade routes will generate far less than optimal results. **This** dominant **trend is conducive to improved bilateral relationships on the subcontinent**. Second, in view of the primacy of economics **in** the national security calculations of **Pakistan and India**, **it is probable that the leadership in both countries will seek to avoid major crises and border skirmishes in the years ahead.** **Pakistan's interest in nonhostile relations with India is likely to be reinforced** by continued difficulties along its border with Afghanistan. The leadership goal of peaceful borders between Pakistan and India could, however, be challenged by significant acts of terrorism perpetrated by extremists with quite different agendas. Nonetheless**, there are greater buffers against escalation arising from significant acts of terrorism than in previous years. This dominant trend also points in the direction of improved bilateral relations on the subcontinent. It is hard to envision another standoff** like that of the "Twin Peaks" crisis in 2001-2002. (1) This does not, however, exclude lesser cases in which extremist acts trigger retaliatory measures.
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#### DOD SMR’s don’t solve, first mover theory wrong—don’t develop their own power, and regulatory barriers

Sands, 2012

[Derek, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Several states vie for chance to host DOE-funded small nuclear reactors, 7-9-12, Accessed online via Lexis Nexis] /Wyo-MB

Another option that SMR boosters have pushed in recent years — putting the reactors on US military bases — appears to be off the table, at least for the time being. Col. Paul Roege, the Army's operational energy chief, said that currently, the Pentagon "does not build and operate its own energy systems, saying "we buy it from the civilian energy market§ Marked 16:26 § ."¶ A 2011 report from the Pentagon's Center for Naval Analysis found that relying on the commercial power grid could leave US bases vulnerable to power outages. The report floated the idea of using SMRs at those bases, but the Army has been resistant to the idea, pointing to the high cost of putting a reactor on base, and additional congressional authority that would be needed to implement such a scheme.

#### NRC overstreched and can’t authorize military or civilian SMR’s—no solvency

Boshar, 2009

[Glen, Are mini-nukes the answer? 1 company says yes, but NRC says its resources are tied up, SNL Generation Markets Week (Jun 16, 2009), Proquest] /Wyo-MB

However, the mPower reactors face their own major developmental hurdle: the NRC's limited ability to certify the new design. The agency has not certified any new small nuclear reactors and, squeezed by budget cuts and staff shortages, has indicated that doing so now will be difficult.¶ In a conversation with SNL Energy, NRC spokesman Scott Burnell explained that his agency's staff and other resources are busy reviewing utility proposals to build 18 large reactors that would use four different designs. The NRC has been gearing up to meet that challenge for some time, Burnell continued, such as by boosting its annual budget requests and hiring additional staff in response to the renewed interest in nuclear power that the federal government and utilities began to display several years ago.¶ Burnell said those resources are now being stretched to their limits, and therefore the agency would need to seek additional funding for the 2012 budgeting period if B&W does indeed prepare a certification application in the time line it currently envisions. In the meantime, Burnell said the NRC can offer only to hold occasional, non-resource-intensive meetings with B&W that might lay the groundwork for an eventual certification filing.¶ B&W is not the only company working on small civilian nuclear reactor designs, Burnell stressed. He noted that his agency has had "initial discussions" with various other potential vendors of new small reactor technology, including the Pebble Bed Nuclear Reactor Group, Toshiba Corp., Westinghouse, NuScale Power and others. In fact, he said the NuScale design appears to be quite similar to that being pursued by B&W. Despite those discussions, however, no company has prepared a certification application yet, the spokesman added.¶ Small nukes on military bases?¶ Burnell also acknowledged recent discussions regarding the need for U.S. military bases to become more energy independent, as well as suggestions that one way to accomplish that goal might be to place small nuclear reactors on military bases to generate power. While the NRC's mission is strictly to oversee civilian use of nuclear power, he noted that a nuclear generating plant placed on a military base would, in fact, meet that definition. "It's a gray area" of existing law, Burnell acknowledged, but he said the NRC would have to be involved in some way if the military wants to begin placing nuclear reactors on its bases.

#### First, prolif will be slow-the decision to proliferate is dependent on an individual country’s desires not regional proliferation, empirics prove

Alagappa in ‘8

[Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow at East-West Center, “Reinforcing National Security and Regional Stability”, in The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, ed. M. Alagappa, P. 521-522//wyo-tjc]

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India’s and Pakistan’s nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran’s quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country’s security concerns about the United States and Tehran’s regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S-Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Ii regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circum— stances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country’s decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993. 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### Second, RISK OF ESCALATION IN THE PARADOX CUTS BOTH WAYS, MAKING IT EXCEEDINGLY UNLIKELY THAT NEW NUCLEAR STATES WILL ATTEMPT TO ALTER THE STATUS QUO

Alagappa in ‘8

[Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow at East-West Center, “Reinforcing National Security and Regional Stability”, in The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, ed. M. Alagappa, P. 519//wyo-tjc]

Reviewing the Cold War experience, Robert Jervis has argued that nuclear weapons strengthen the status quo. However, he qualified that assertion by excluding situations where the status quo is ambiguous or when a revisionist power has the power to implement threats, has high resolve, and sees the domestic and international situations as precarious enough to merit great risk and cost (Jervis 1989: 32—34). Along these lines but in a more detailed fashion, Paul Kapur (2006) argues that nuclear weapons may provide incentives for a weaker, revisionist state to engage in limited conventional military action to alter the status quo. Such a state would not engage in aggressive behavior in a conventional world because it would most likely result in failure. In a nuclear world, the stronger state is inhibited from employing its full military might for fear that hostilities would escalate to nuclear war. This risk of escalation emboldens a highly motivated state to behave aggressively. In this study, I argue that the risk of escalation cuts both ways and that the net effect of nuclear weapons has been to reinforce the status quo and enhance stability in the Asian security region in two ways: they make change through violence more difficult arid highly costly; and they dramatically increase the political cost of “adventurist” behavior § Marked 16:27 § by nuclear weapon states. The limit to forcefully alter the status quo and the associated political risks disadvantage the challenger and help entrench the status quo. These points are best illustrated by the India—Pakistan case. They are also evident in a limited manner in the conflict across the Taiwan Strait.

**Terrorists have had limited incentive to go nuclear – no ability to build their own couldn’t steal fissile material, or buy from corrupt insiders.**

**Mueller ‘10**

John Mueller, professor of political science at Ohio State University. “Calming Our Nuclear Jitters”. Issues in Science and Technology. 1/1/2010. Vol.26,Iss.2;p.58-66. Academic Search Premiere.

In contrast to these predictions, terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. The most plausible route for terrorists, according to most experts, would be to manufacture an atomic device themselves from purloined fissile material (plutonium or, more likely, highly enriched uranium). This task, however, remains a daunting one, requiring that a considerable series of difficult hurdles § Marked 16:27 § be conquered and in sequence. Outright armed theft of fissile material is exceedingly unlikely not only because of the resistance of guards, but because chase would be immediate. A more promising approach would be to corrupt insiders to smuggle out the required substances. However, this requires the terrorists to pay off a host of greedy confederates, including brokers and money-transmitters, any one of whom could turn on them or, either out of guile or incompetence, furnish them with stuff that is useless. Insiders might also consider the possibility that once the heist was accomplished, the terrorists would, as analyst Brian Jenkins none too delicately puts it, “have every incentive to cover their trail, beginning with eliminating their confederates.”

#### Nuclear materials in Africa would not be suitable for terrorists- requires further reprocessing

NTI 13

[ABOUT NTITHREATSANALYSISCOUNTRY PROFILES, GLOBAL SECURITY NEWSWIRE
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Jan. 30, 2013, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, http://www.nti.org/analysis/reports/sub-saharan-africa-1540-reporting/

The same factors facilitating these illicit activities, including weak border controls and enforcement capacities, remote and inhospitable terrain, and corruption, could conceivably facilitate the proliferation of NBC weapons related materials. Open source information suggests that there is some NBC trafficking in sub-Saharan Africa. Incidents of illicit trafficking in radioactive materials in the region largely involve smuggling of natural uranium from unsecured mines; the Database on Nuclear Smuggling, Theft, and Orphan Radiation Sources (DTSO) recorded 12 such incidents between 1994 and 2005 in Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Kenya, Namibia, and South Africa. [3] Uranium ore does not present a significant proliferation concern due to the need for further processing and enrichment; however, the concentrations of U-235 in some deposits, particularly in the DRC, are amongst the richest worldwide, having "the potential to make Congolese uranium attractive to threshold states as a starting point for their nuclear weapons programs." [31]

#### TERRORIST ACQUISITION IS SO UNLIKELY AS TO BE A FICTION—STATES WOULD NEVER TRANSFER WEAPONS AND STEALING THEM IS EVEN MORE DIFFICULT

Kapur in ‘8

[S. Paul, Associate Professor of Strategic Research at United States Naval War College, “Nuclear Terrorism: Prospects in Asia”, in The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, ed. M. Alagappa, p. 324-325//wyo-tjc]

If a terrorist group’s goal can be advanced by the use of nuclear weapons, it would still need to meet a second important requirement: it would need to acquire a nuclear capability in the first place. It could do so either by procuring an intact weapon or by producing one. Terrorists could procure an intact weapon in two different ways. First, a nuclear state could voluntarily transfer a weapon to terrorists for use against a designated enemy. This could enable the state to inflict massive damage on the enemy while maintaining deniability and potentially avoiding retaliation (Ferguson and Potter 2004: 55—57). This occurrence, however, is unlikely. In this “transfer” scenario, the nuclear state would lose control of the weapon in question, forcing it to place enormous trust in the terrorists’ loyalty and judgment. It is doubtful that a nuclear state’s leaders would be willing to trust a terrorist organization to this degree (Feiguson and Pottei 2004 57 Glaser and Fetter 2001) Terrorist groups could also acquire an intact weapon by stealing it from a nuclear state This would be an extremely difficult feat even for sophisticated terrorist groups. Nuclear weapons are protected by the most robust security measures that nation—states can devise. Protective measures include programs to ensure the reliability of the personnel in charge of weapons extensive physical barriers including location in heavily guarded, often isolated military bases; electronic systems to prevent unauthorized weapons use; and storage of the fissile core separate from the rest of the weapon. According to Ferguson and Potter, in the absence of significant insider assistance, theft of a nuclear weapon by terrorists is probably better described as “the stuff of fiction than a practicable approach for a terrorist organization.” Even in the event of inside help or major political unrest within a nuclear weapon state, terrorist theft of an intact nuclear device would be difficult and unlikely (Bunn, Holdren, and Wier 2002: 5; Ferguson and Potter 2004: 57—65,119).

**no nuclear retaliation-wouldn’t deter nuke terrorism**

**Kimball ‘9**

Daryl. President of the ACA. Change U.S. Nuclear Policy? Yes, We Can. September 2009. http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009\_09/focus.

Given the United States’ conventional military edge, no plausible circumstance requires or could justify the use of nuclear weapons to deal with a non-nuclear threat. They are useless in deterring or responding to nuclear terrorism. Gen. Colin Powell put it well in his 1995 autobiography: “No matter how small these nuclear payloads were, we would be crossing a threshold. Using nukes at this point would mark one of the most significant political decisions since Hiroshima.”

# 2NC

### 2NC AT: Perm – Do Both

#### [ ] Still links to federal government action disads.

#### [ ] Federal action stifles state action in anticipation

Barry Rabe, Prof Public Policy @ U. of Michigan, “Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy”, Publlius, 2011

The limited scope and uncertain future of new federal climate policy initiatives thus far under contested federalism underscored the reality that much of the American approach to climate policy will in all likelihood continue to be state- and regionally-centered in the coming years. After the surge of sub-federal policy development in the period of state domination, states began to slow their efforts, in large part due to anticipated federal action on a large scale. The collapse of Congressional deliberation on major legislation returned much of the lead in climate governance to states. This raised significant questions of implementation, including a series of major challenges and opportunities.

#### Overlap leads to policy failure

Rivlin, 12

(Sr. Fellow-Economic Studies at Brookings & Founding Director of CBO, 6/12, “Rethinking Federalism for More Effective Governance” http://publius.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/06/12/publius.pjs028.full?keytype=ref&ijkey=j9keOPmOHj0c2xV)

A bolder approach would be for the federal government to cede some major functions to the states and concentrate on carrying out its remaining national responsibilities more effectively. The case for dividing the governmental job rests partly on efficiency—**lowering the administrative cost of federal state overlap and interaction**. It also rests on the perception that the United States is an extremely diverse country and that many governmental services should be tailored to local conditions. Whether the service is education or housing or transportation, residents of inner city Philadelphia have different needs than those of rural Kansas or coastal Alaska. Governments closer to the scene are better able to assess the needs of citizens and design programs to meet them. It is easier for citizens at the state and local level to be actively involved in what their government does and call officials to account for their performance.

#### [ ] No solvency – duplicate action increases implementation problems and undermines solvency

Christopher K. Leman and Robert H. Nelson, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., and Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, , Economics Staff, Office of Policy Analysis, United States Department of the Interior, Summer 1982 (“The Rise of Managerial Federalism” – Environmental Law) p. lexis

When federal policy had limited goals, the hitches and compromises occasioned by intergovernmental bargaining were tolerable; today, however, when more social resources and values are at stake, the costs of joint action are much greater. Efforts to implement intergovernmental programs demonstrate that these programs are prone to disappointing results because of the complexity of joint action and the profusion of opportunities for participants to veto or alter results. The cost of joint action between levels of government may be too high when results are paramount. These views challenge the system of managerial federalism that has emerged since the New Deal. Joint intergovernmental program results may be worse than what either the states or the federal government would produce alone. Is the intergovernmental system, as it is currently conceived, simply unworkable? Would it be better to return to the classical federalism concept with a clear division of responsibilities, with most areas strictly assigned to the states? Or, conceivably, are the states anachronisms that should be replaced by a unified federal system with decentralization taking place through federal administrative regions designed for modern circumstances?

# Grid

### 2NC –-Squo Solves- Grid/Islanding S/L

-GAO 9 says DOD assessed potential grid vulnerabilities and has implemented contingency plans, installed backup generators, and has removed single points of failure-guarantees communication for critical missions is sustained, that the military base grids are segmented to prevent base-wide electricity failure, AND they have backup generators that solve in the squo

#### Squo solves

#### the military adapted. **Michael Aimone 9-12**,

Director, Business Enterprise Integration, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), 9/12/12, Statement Before the House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies,<http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Aimone.pdf>  
DoD’s Facility Energy Strategy

DoD’s facility energy strategy is also focused heavily on grid security in the name of mission assurance. Although the Department’s fixed installations traditionally served largely as a platform for training and deployment of forces, in recent years they have begun to provide direct support for combat operations, such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flown in Afghanistan from fixed installations here in the United States. Our fixed installations also serve as staging platforms for humanitarian and homeland defense missions. These installations are largely dependent on a commercial power grid that is vulnerable to disruption due to aging infrastructure, weather-related events, and potential kinetic, cyber attack. In 2008, the Defense 2 Science Board warned that DoD’s reliance on a fragile power grid to deliver electricity to its bases places critical missions at risk. Standby Power Generation Currently, DoD ensures that it can continue mission critical activities on base largely through its fleet of on-site power generation equipment. This equipment is connected to essential mission systems and automatically operates in the event of a commercial grid outage. In addition, each installation has standby generators in storage for repositioning as required. Facility power production specialists ensure that the generators are primed and ready to work, and that they are maintained and fueled during an emergency. With careful maintenance these generators can bridge the gap for even a lengthy outage. As further back up to this installed equipment, DoD maintains a strategic stockpile of electrical power generators and support equipment that is kept in operational readiness. For example, during Hurricane Katrina, the Air Force transported more than 2 megawatts of specialized diesel generators from Florida, where they were stored, to Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi, to support base recovery.

.

#### fuel cells

Boland, 10

[Rita, “Fuel Cells Power Military Bases,” Signal Magazine, July 2010, <http://www.woodstockctgreenteam.org/green-team-blog/4-green-team-blog/18-military-bases.html> //uwyo-baj]

For backup power, installations can connect fuel cells to a grid so the energy sources will kick in during an emergency without a disruption in electrical services. This ensures the continued operation of mission critical resources such as computer rooms, telephone switching equipment, command centers, hospitals and emergency centers. Nick Josefik, a mechanical engineer at the ERDC-CERL, says that over the years the laboratory has installed more than 200 fuel cells in various sizes. These range from 500-watt models that back up a few computers to 250- to 500-megawatt systems that can power entire subdivisions, hospitals or industrial buildings. The fuel cell installations are split almost evenly between prime power and backup power use. Through this work, CERL is helping the military meet its goal to reduce energy usage 25 percent by 2015.

### Squo Solves- Military moving off grid

#### The Military is moving off-grid now

Pacific Business News 10

[Sophie Cocke, “Barking Sands Going Off Grid” http://islandbreath.blogspot.com/2010/09/barking-sands-going-off-grid.html, \\wyo-bb]

Risks of disruption to foreign oil supplies, rising costs of a declining resources and concerns about the security of the nation’s electric grids have spurred efforts to cultivate alternative-energy sources and curtail energy use, according to reports from the U.S. Pacific Command and the Center for Naval Analyses Military Advisory Board. Security of the electric grid is of particular concern.

### 2NC – No Blackouts- Grid/Islanding S/L

#### GAO 9 says that DOD has eliminated single points of failure- means the grid is segmented and disruptions can’t cause cascades of black outs

#### No widespread blackouts in the US

#### system segmentation checks

Ledger 12

[Donna Leinwand Leger, “Energy experts say blackout like India's is unlikely in U.S.,” USA Today, 7/13/12, <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/story/2012-07-31/usa-india-power-outage/56622978/1> //uwyo-baj]

A massive, countrywide power failure like the one in India on Tuesday is "extremely unlikely" in the United States, energy experts say. In India, three of the country's government-operated power grids failed Tuesday, leaving 620 million people without electricity for several hours. The outage, the second in two days in the country of 1.21 billion people, is the world's biggest blackout on record. The U.S. electricity system is segmented into three parts with safeguards that prevent an outage in one system from tripping a blackout in another system, "making blackouts across the country extremely unlikely," Energy Department spokeswoman Keri Fulton said. Early reports from government officials in India say excessive demand knocked the country's power generators offline. Experts say India's industry and economy are growing faster than its electrical systems. Last year, the economy grew 7.8% and pushed energy needs higher, but electricity generation did not keep pace, government records show. "We are much, much less at risk for something like that happening here, especially from the perspective of demand exceeding supply," said Gregory Reed, a professor of electric power engineering at University of Pittsburgh. "We're much more sophisticated in our operations. Most of our issues have been from natural disasters." The U.S. generates more than enough electricity to meet demand and always have power in reserve, Reed said. "Fundamentally, it's a different world here," said Arshad Mansoor, senior vice president of the Electric Power Research Institute in Washington and an expert on power grids. "It's an order of magnitude more reliable here than in a developing country." Grid operators across the country analyze power usage and generation, factoring outside factors such as weather, in real time and can forecast power supply and demand hour by hour, Mansoor said. "In any large, complex interactive network, the chance of that interconnection breaking up is always there," Mansoor said. "You cannot take your eye off the ball for a minute." Widespread outages in the U.S. caused by weather are common. But the U.S. has also had system failures, said Ellen Vancko, senior energy adviser for the Union of Concerned Scientists, based in Washington. On Aug. 14, 2003, more than 50 million people in the Northeast and Canada lost power after a major U.S. grid collapsed. The problem began in Ohio when a transmission wire overheated and sagged into a tree that had grown too close to the line, Vancko said. That caused other power lines to overheat until so many lines failed that the system shut itself down, she said. "That was less a failure of technology and more a failure of people, a failure of people to follow the rules," Vancko said. "There were a whole bunch of lessons learned." In 2005, in response to an investigation of the blackout, Congress passed a law establishing the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) to enforce reliability standards for bulk electricity generation.

#### would take too much to make the grid fail

Washington Times, 12

August '12; “Lights out for the U.S. Power grid?”; www.communities.washingtontimes.com; <http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/energy-harnassed/2012/aug/1/can-us-grid-blackout/>

**NEW YORK**, August 1, 2012 — In terms of number of people affected, the largest [power grid](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electrical_grid) failure in history occurred in India this week, and it raises a question for America: Is the U.S power grid susceptible to a nationwide collapse? To answer that question, we must understand the layout of the North American power grid. It is divided into four regional power systems, called interconnections, as depicted in the main picture above. On the west coast there is the [Western interconnection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Interconnection). On the east coast, you guessed it, the [Eastern interconnection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern_Interconnection), as well as the Quebec interconnection. The last is the ERCOT interconnection (the Electric Reliability Council of Texas). Texans always seem to do things their way, and electricity is no different. They chose to operate differently than the rest of the grid, and that decision has been both an asset and a liability. But that is another story. These three main interconnections (Western, Eastern and ERCOT) are electrically isolated from each other. They are electrical “islands,” with no wires making connections between each region. If the [Western Interconnection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Interconnection) were to blackout, it would not have an impact on the ERCOT or Eastern interconnections. If ERCOT were to go dark, only the Texans would complain. The [Eastern interconnection](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern_Interconnection) has had its share of difficulties over the last 60 years because [it is so highly interconnected](http://youtu.be/bdBB4byrZ6U) (this explains why the Eastern interconnection system frequency was affected by the loss of transmission lines in Florida), but again, there is no tie operationally and its operations do not affect the Western or [ERCOT](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electric_Reliability_Council_of_Texas) interconnections. This inherent isolation is the saving grace of our power network, but it was born that way out of logistical hurdles, not ingenious forethought. Crossing the north-south running Rocky Mountains with east-west transmission lines would prove too costly to build and maintain in the long run, creating a “natural” segregation in the [power grid](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electrical_grid). Outside of the isolation of the regions, the U.S. has plenty of generating capacity online, and plenty of capability on standby called "operating reserves." The grid operators have a [reserve margin](http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.cfm?id=6510) calculation and keep approximately 14 to 17 percent of the forecasted peak load available as generation on standby, in case a large transmission line or a large generator unexpectedly shuts down, or “trips.” Grid operators look at these large facilities and model them in their networks as contingencies that must be taken into consideration at all times. They must know how the system would react if a tornado took down a large transmission tower that was delivering massive amounts of power, or knocked a large generating station, like Indian Point Energy Center, offline. It will take some time to discover the cause of the blackouts in India, just as it did to discover the cause of the August 2003 blackout which rendered much the northeast powerless. Some blackouts are necessary to avoid equipment failure, and some can be prevented by proper communication and operations. As a result of the August 2003 blackout that left some 50 million Americans without power, the National Electric Reliability Corporation mandated that companies follow reliability protocols that were, up until the blackout, voluntary. If the entire U.S. were to go dark, it would not be the result of regional connectivity, or cascading interconnection issues. All three interconnections, along with Quebec would have to suffer a catastrophic failure simultaneously. Could it happen? Yes, anything is possible. Is it likely to happen? No, not likely at all.

### 2NC – No Cyber Attacks- Grid/Islanding S/L

#### Schneier 10 explains that “cyberwar” is media hype- attacks cited as “cyber terrorism” or “warfare” amount to hacking attacks that are at worst inconvenient- it’s nothing more than heated rhetoric

#### Cyberwar isn’t an extinction threat

#### More humane form of war at worst and at best won’t be used

Evgeny Morozov, is a fellow at the Open Society Institute and a board member of its Information Program, “Cyber-Scare: The exaggerated fears over digital warfare”, Boston Review, July/August 2009. http://bostonreview.net/BR34.4/morozov.php

Common sense dictates that the severity and targets of such attacks should be guided by international law, particularly the Geneva Conventions and associated protocols. Broadly speaking, current norms state that the conduct of war must meet three fundamental standards: belligerents must distinguish military from civilian objects when selecting targets; balance military necessity with humanitarian concern (the choice of weapons is not unlimited and must be made with the avoidance of unnecessary suffering in mind); and shun the use of force that is disproportionate, in the sense that it shows insufficient attention to the unnecessary suffering that might result. These principles have proved very hard, but not impossible, to interpret in conventional conflict; applying them to cyberspace is not an insurmountable challenge. The careful application of these three principles to the conduct of war could explain why militaries might shy away from cyber-attacks. First, it is hard to predict the consequences of such attacks; cyber-attacks typically lack surgical precision and are notorious for side effects—a virus planted in a military network could easily spread to civilian computers, causing much unanticipated collateral damage. Second, precisely targeted cyber-attacks could be a more humane way of conducting warfare. Instead of bombing a military train depot, with collateral civilian deaths, one can temporarily disable it by hacking into its dispatch system. However, the rules of war also stipulate that once a belligerent has used a more humane weapon, it ought to use that weapon in similar situations—and who would voluntarily abandon tanks in favor of computers only? Third, most cyber-attacks are hard to justify in strategic terms and therefore would open associated personnel to prosecution for war crimes. For example, if there is little to be gained from attacking a poorly maintained Web site of the Georgian parliament, Russia could not justify an attack on it in military terms. If it went ahead with such an attack, its commanders woul risk prosecution for a disproportionate use of force.

#### Threat exaggerated

Bruce Schneier, a cybersecurity expert and the author of several bestselling books,

HSNW conversation with Bruce SchneierAttackers have advantage in cyberspace, says cybersecurity expert

8/12, **2011.** http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/attackers-have-advantage-cyberspace-says-cybersecurity-expert

HSNW: Finally, as a broader question, has the threat from hackers been overly inflated or is it as dire as many government officials and security experts make it out to be? BS: Which threat? The threat of cyber-war has been grossly exaggerated, both by government and industry. We are in the early years of a cyber-war arms race, and there is a lot of money and power up for grabs. Same with cyber-terrorism, the threat is being exaggerated. Cyber-espionage is about at the level of popular opinion. On the other hand, the threat of cybercrime is largely being ignored, and that is greater than most people believe. I do not think anyone really knows the full extent of cybercrime – fraud, theft, extortion, and so on – worldwide.

### 2NC – No Solvency- Grid/Islanding S/L

#### Top down mandate for military SMR’s wrong move—needs to have NRC regulatory approval

Weinberger, 2011

[Sharon, Defense Technology International Vol 5 No 3, Sizing Up Small Nukes, 3-1-11, Accessed online via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

One of the hurdles to getting small nuclear reactors into use—not just for the military—but for the civilian world as well, is to receive approvals from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (Though the military, in theory, could self-regulate the process, it is likely that a small reactor used to power a domestic base would go through NRC approval.)¶ «All of the current regulations designed to meet the NRC’s underlying safety and security regulations are based on large reactors and are inappropriate for small reactors,» Genoa says. «Small reactors will achieve the same underlying safety and security goals, but with a different configuration, so we need to work with the NRC to adjust guidance or change rules, or at least understand what the requirements are.»¶ Ultimately, however, the real challenge, at least for the military market, is to find a willing buyer. Though Congress, the services and defense analysts advocate looking at small nuclear reactors for the military, it’s not clear what the next step should be.¶ Deal says Hyperion has talked with all three services and has encountered enthusiasm and interest from base commanders, but the issue hasn’t gone much further. «We were told the Pentagon wanted to see the commanders request feasibility studies,» he says, «and not do it as a top-down push.»

### 2NC-DOD says No

#### DOD won’t use SMR—electricity isn’t cost competitive and don’t have the purchasing authority to buy more expensive energy

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Nucleonics Week Pg. 1 Vol. 52 No. 26, Small Reactors hard a sell for military, 6-30-11, Accessed via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

But even if the DOD is convinced of nuclear power's merits, "the government doesn't really want to be investing its money in the power production capability," Roege said. That means DOD will not be a reactor owner-operator. "We don't want to tie up our people in operating and maintaining the power systems," Roege said in an interview last month, but added that the military could be convinced to sign a power purchase agreement with a utility that wants to build a reactor.¶ The military would need no convincing, if nuclear power could be supplied "as cheaply as other power," he said, but will have to get permission from Congress to spend more money if a military base has to pay more for electricity to help build a small reactor. "We don't have that authority today. We can't go out and buy more expensive power."¶ The CNA study estimates that the cost of electricity produced by a small nuclear power plant ranged from a low of 6.6 cents per kWh to a high of 20 cents/kWh.¶ The report said industrial users are paying less than 6.5 cents per kWh for electricity in half of the US and below 8 cents per kWh in 70% of the country. Therefore, while the floor price makes a small reactor economically attractive "almost everywhere," the report said, "the highest estimates make the option unattractive almost everywhere." Pacific islands, where the military maintains several bases, have the highest power prices of about 20 cents per kWh, it said.¶ To convince the DOD and Congress, it is not enough to make the case that a nuclear reactor is more reliable than other energy sources, Roege said. The industry has to quantify such a "secure energy premium" — measured by "a scale" that assesses the prices of different levels of reliability," he said. So far, the industry has not presented such a model, nor has the military thought of how much it would be willing to pay for more stable power supply, Roege said.

#### SMR’s too expensive for DOD—they reject being a first mover

Xie, 2011

[Yanmei, Nucleonics Week Pg. 1 Vol. 52 No. 26, Small Reactors hard a sell for military, 6-30-11, Accessed via lexis nexis] /Wyo-MB

"This MOU, in an early stage of implementation, could be used for cooperating to build small reactors on military installations," said the CNA report. But it suggested the DOD make sure it is "not responsible" for the expenses of building a first-of-a-kind reactor when negotiating for nuclear power purchases. "The costs associated with moving from the current stage of development of small nuclear reactors to being ready to build a fully operating power plant ? are expected to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars," the report said.¶ Such expenses are a burden the DOD will not shoulder "in the current budgetary environment," when the government is looking for spending cuts to shrink the deficit, said Phil Shubert, manager of the Army Reactor Program. He spoke last month in Washington at a small modular reactor conference organized by Platts.¶ The DOD's "Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan" published in August 2010 outlined a path towards meeting its emissions reduction goals by using energy efficiency measures and renewable energy development. It did not mention nuclear power.

# Market

### 2NC: Defense v. Adv. S/L

#### First, proliferation is slow- Algappa ‘8 explains that states proliferate based on individual aspirations and security concerns that are not regional- this means proliferation doesn’t cascade but is either a) inevitable because of alternative concerns or b) is not reactionary- India and Pakistan’s programs have not led to a flurry of nukes in South Asia and North Korea’s tests have not led to Taiwanese or Mongolian programs

behavior by nuclear weapon states. The limit to forcefully alter the status quo and the associated political risks disadvantage the challenger and help entrench the status quo. These points are best illustrated by the India—Pakistan case. They are also evident in a limited manner in the conflict across the Taiwan Strait.

#### Second, proliferation does not lead to instability, they re-entrench the status quo and disincentivize attempts to change power dynamics due to the unacceptable costs of nuclear action-that’s Algappa no. 2

#### NO RISK OF SNOW-BALL-- MOST STATES HAVE NO NEED FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND WOULD ERR ON THE SIDE OF NOT HAVING THEM

Waltz in 7

[Kenneth, "A Nuclear Iran: Promoting Stability or Courting Disaster", Journal of International Affairs, Summer, p. asp//wyo-tjc]

I don't notice that many religiously-oriented people act in ways that will result in the massacre of thousands of people. I think people are people. I don't think heavenly rewards motivate very many people. So I don't worry about those who have nuclear weapons. I don't want too many countries to have them, but there has been no headlong rush to acquire nuclear weapons. And why not? Most countries don't need them. And if a country doesn't need them, it doesn't want them, because they are a pain in the neck. Scott is right--they are hard to take care of, and it is very important to take care of them very, very carefully. **We should be careful not to give other countries reason to believe that their security requires their having nuclear weapons**.

# 1NR

#### Solves US-India relations

**LA Times**, 11/9/**20**12 (Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, p. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html)

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US/India relations averts South Asian nuclear war

Schaffer, Spring **200**2 (Teresita – Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, p. Lexis)

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

#### U.S./INDIAN COOPERATION CRITICAL IN CHECKING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Mohammed **Ayoob**, Distinguished Professor, International Relations, Michigan State University, “India Matters,” THE WASHINGTON QUARTERLY v. 23 n. 1, Winter 20**00**, p. 27+, LN.

This is an area in which serious differences have existed and continue to persist in Indian-U.S. relations. However, as a result partly of the Strobe Talbott-Jaswant Singh dialogue and partly of its new status as a declared nuclear weapons power, India has moved closer to recognizing the validity of U.S. concerns about global nuclear proliferation. On its part, following the Indian nuclear tests, the United States has demonstrated increasing appreciation of the Indian security concerns that led New Delhi to go nuclear in May 1998. Washington also seems to have realized that these concerns had to do more with China than with Pakistan and that they cannot be alleviated as long as the issue of Chinese nuclear and missile capability that Indians find threatening is not seriously addressed. India's self-imposed moratorium on nuclear testing has further helped improve the atmosphere surrounding the Indian-U.S. dialogue on nuclear proliferation. Recently the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the CTBT, and there is no immediate prospect for the resurrection of its ratification. Therefore, the major source of friction between New Delhi and Washington in the nonproliferation arena seems to have lost most of its relevance for the immediate future. In fact, the Indian position is now almost identical to the U.S. policy of voluntary adherence to the CTBT enunciated by President Clinton in the wake of the Senate's refusal to ratify the treaty. However, in the long run, an understanding between the United States and India is essential for a credible nuclear nonproliferation regime to survive the shocks from the South Asian tests of May 1998. India, having for all practical purposes acquired the status of a nuclear weapons power, has clearly developed a vested interest in limiting further horizontal proliferation and in augmenting its already tight controls over the export of nuclear-related material and technology to nonnuclear countries. Its voluntary adherence to the main provisions of the CTBT as well as to the export control provisions of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) signals this clearly. India shares these objectives with the United States, and they provide a strong basis for future cooperation between the two countries in the nuclear nonproliferation arena. Washington has also begun to realize that India, unlike some other nuclear aspirants such as North Korea, is a responsible member of the international community with a large and relatively self-reliant technological infrastructure capable of producing sophisticated nuclear warheads and delivery systems. This being the case, it is in the U.S. interest that India be co-opted into the nonproliferation regime rather than treated as a pariah, because the latter would undermine the residual credibility of the NPT regime. However, Washington is also concerned that this co-optation be accomplished without unraveling the entire NPT structure. The principal objective of the Indian-U.S. dialogue seems to be to square this circle while protecting the integrity, as far as possible, of the initial positions adopted by both sides. This task is difficult but not altogether impossible. With patience, goodwill, and diplomatic creativity, the two sides are more than likely to succeed in crafting a formula that both New Delhi and Washington can live with until the world becomes used to India's nuclear status. The attempt to find such a formula is, however, by definition a joint venture and, therefore, likely to strengthen rather than damage Indian-U.S. relations.

#### RELATIONS SOLVE TERRORISM

Rajeswari Pillai **Rjagopalan**, Research Officer, IDSA, “Indo-US Relations in the Bush White House,” STRATEGIC ANALYSIS v. 24 n. 4, July 20**01**, <http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_july01rar01.html>, accessed 7/6/04.

In January 2000, the United States and India agreed to establish a Joint Working Group on Counter-Terrorism.19 The agreement was announced following meetings between then Deputy Secretary Strobe Talbott and Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh in London. Inter-agency teams from the two countries also agreed on a range of measures to enhance cooperation between the two countries to combat international terrorism. The two sides realised the necessity to share experiences, exchange information, and coordinate approaches and actions. The Indian government agreed to the US offer of anti-terrorism assistance programmes. Intelligence gathering and sharing of vital information between India and the United States should be important components in their efforts in counter-terrorism. India and the United States have a shared interest in strengthening a regime to counter international terrorism. This mutual interest in countering terrorism should be the ideal platform for, enhanced cooperation between India and the United States. The Bush Administration has also expressed the desire to improve international cooperation against all forms of cross-border criminality, especially the burgeoning threat of cyber-crime that threatens the vitality of American industries as well as American society and the world at large.

#### Will pass- bipartisan

#### Gonzales Feb. 3rd

[Daniel Gonzales, The Arizona Republic writer, Feb. 3rd, 2013, Paths to immigration reform will be bumpy<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/02/03/immigration-reform-path-bumpy/1888233/>, uwyo//amp]

PHOENIX -- President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of eight senators have set the stage for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform this year. But passing a broad bill that addresses all aspects of immigration as Obama and the bipartisan group have proposed is fraught with obstacles, any one of which could derail the entire bill, as it did the last time Congress tried to tackle comprehensive immigration reform. The two plans, announced last week, put forth guidelines for beefing up border security, legalizing undocumented immigrants and cracking down on employers who hire illegal workers. Their vision also would streamline the nation's vast and complicated legal immigration system to better meet the labor needs of the economy and dissuade illegal immigration while trying to prevent families from being split apart.

#### Will pass- momentum and bipartisan support

Levey Feb. 3rd

[Noam Levey, Feb. 3rd, 2013, LA times writer, Reid predicts the Senate will pass immigration reform, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/03/news/la-immigration-reform-reid-predicts-senate-pass-20130203>, uwyo//amp]

WASHINGTON – Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said Sunday he is optimistic the Senate will pass immigration legislation, suggesting Republicans will have no choice but to join the push for a sweeping overhaul. “Things are looking really good,” the Nevada Democrat said in an interview on ABC News’ “This Week.” “Republicans can no longer stop this. They’ve tried it; it hasn’t worked.” A bipartisan group of senators – four Democrats and four Republicans – last week unveiled a blueprint for comprehensive legislation that would tighten border security and set up a path for illegal immigrants to get citizenship. And several leading GOP lawmakers have noted that the party, which lost heavily among Latino voters in the 2012 presidential election, must take action on the immigration issue.

### Link

#### SMRs u/q bad- contentious debate and opposition to small modular reactors due to safety- 1NC Carper/Schmids

#### Feinstein opposes SMRs – views them as unsafe and costly on taxpayers.

Beattie, ‘11

(Jeff, Staff Writer, “Feinstein Frowns On Federal Aid For Small Reactors”, 7-21-11, The Energy Daily, RSR)

Although few areas of energy policy generate as much bipartisan support as small, modular nuclear reactors, count Sen. Dianne Feinstein--the Senate's chief appropriator on energy issues--as unconvinced they are safe or worthy of significant taxpayer investment. In a hearing last week, Feinstein (D-Calif.) suggested that plans for nuclear sites with multiple small modular reactors (SMR) plants might be inappropriate in light of lessons emerging from the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi plant, where the operator was forced to contend with simultaneous meltdowns, radioactive water leakage and spent fuel concerns at six units. Further, she said a proposed Energy Department program to back SMRs was a "one heck of a subsidy" that might cost taxpayers far more than predicted.

#### Feinstein key to the agenda – crucial swing vote and bellwether on legislative decisions.

Goldmacher, ‘12

(Shane, Contributor, “NJ’s Most Influential Women”, The National Journal, 7-13-12,

http://nationaljournal.com/magazine/washington-s-most-influential-women-20120712, accessed 8-2-12, RSR)

Dianne Feinstein occupies that rare and enviable space for a politician: She’s both popular back home and powerful in Washington. The California Democrat is running for her fourth full term in the Senate this year, but running is an overstatement. It’s more of a saunter. She hasn’t faced a serious challenge in a decade, and she finished atop a 24-person field in June’s open primary, with her closest rival a woeful 37 percentage points behind. In an interview, she conceded, “I think there’s a very good chance I’ll be reelected” this year. That electoral security has given Feinstein, 79, the freedom to operate as a political player in Washington. These days, she chairs the Senate Intelligence Committee at a time of drone strikes, cyberwarfare, and counterterrorism intelligence-gathering. A moderate Democrat from a very blue state, she has shown a willingness to buck the party line, such as calling the recent “avalanche of leaks” of classified intelligence “very disturbing.” The issue had been mostly seized on by Republicans accusing the White House of doling out details for political gain. But Feinstein has managed to stay in favor in the highest echelons of the Democratic Party. It was in her living room, after all, that Barack Obama and Hillary Rodham Clinton met face-to-face in 2008 for the first time after Obama became the presumptive Democratic presidential nominee. And as chairwoman of the Senate Rules Committee in 2009, she presided over Obama’s inauguration ceremonies. Throughout her tenure, she has been a Senate bellwether, sometimes on legislation and sometimes, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, on whether judges will be confirmed. “I’ve always felt that the thing that counts is being very practical,” Feinstein says.

#### Top of the agenda and will pass-about to be unveiled

TNW 1/25

[The Next Web. “The Senate will move next week on comprehensive high-skill immigration reform,” 2013, <http://thenextweb.com/us/2013/01/25/the-senate-will-move-next-week-on-comprehensive-high-skill-immigration-reform/>]

Today The Hill obtained a copy of a forthcoming proposed law dubbed the ‘Immigration Innovation Act.’ Critically, it is backed by a bipartisan collection of Senators, giving it a clear shot at clearing the upper chamber of the United States Congress.¶ While likely h, the bill’s two key tenets would dramatically improve the high-skill immigration system of the United States. According to The Hill’s notes, the act would:¶ Completely end the cap on the total, yearly number of H-1B visas that American companies can apply for, providing that they are applying for a foreign graduate with a technical degree of an American university. TNW isn’t sure, but we’re assuming that degrees that fall under the “STEM” rubric are what will be required.¶ Improve the extant H-1B system by adding 40,000 slots each year. Also, the act would grant more H-1B visas based on market demand, provided that the new 115,000 visa ceiling was reached before the end of the year. This system would have a final cap of 300,000.¶ The bill does allow for spouses of H-1B visa holders to live and work inside of the United States. The House will likely have issues with the provision. Given that the House has been home to various immigration conspiracy theories, it would be out of character for it to keep its marbles this time around. This bill is a massive improvement on the laws tossed around during the last Congress.¶ The previous bill included fewer high-skilled visas, did not create the education exception, and perhaps most oddly ended the popular ‘green card lottery.’ That specific provision ended the proposed law’s chance of becoming law.¶ Here is the list of tipped co-sponsors for the Immigration Innovation Act: “Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.).”¶ If it can quickly pass the Senate, and receives a nod from the President, the House will be under immense pressure to pass it as well, but it could become weighed down with ponderous amendments that could be viewed as poison pills, roughly.¶ In his inaugural address, the President called for an improvement of the country’s high-skill immigration system. He may get it.

#### Immigration is Top Priority

Stanton 2/7

[John Stanton, Buzzfeed Staff, “Obama Throws Down The Gauntlet Over Defense Cuts”, http://www.buzzfeed.com/johnstanton/obama-throws-down-the-gauntlet-over-defense-cuts

February 7, 2013, \\wyo-bb]

On immigration reform, Obama noted that "I said this is going to be a top priority and an early priority … [and] I am heartened" by bipartisan talks in the House and Senate. "I recognize that politics aren't always easy … but what I also know is that part of our strength is our youth and dynamism and our history of attracting talent from all over the globe. Ive seen some of that talent in the young DREAMERS I've met," he said. He also urged Congress to address gun violence and to "do so recognizing that again there are regional diff here, and we should respect those … guns means something differ for somebody who grew up on a farm or rural community and someone who grew up in a city." "But we can't have a situation where 20 more of our children or 100 more of our children are shot in a senseless fashion," Obama added.

#### Avoiding controversy for next months is key

Charles Babington, AP Writer, “Obama Agenda Provides Long Work List To Tackle When He Returns”, 12/24/2012

WASHINGTON (AP) — It's hardly a secret that Barack Obama, like every president no doubt, muses about his ultimate legacy and spot in the presidential pantheon. He approaches his second term confronting tough and shifting challenges that will play big roles in shaping the rest of his presidency and his eventual place in history.¶ In the coming months, Obama will have to decide where to be ambitious, where to be cautious, and where to buy time.¶ He draws political strength from his surprisingly easy re-election in a bad economy. It's partly offset, however, by Republicans' continued control of the House, plus their filibuster powers in the Senate.

#### Second, there’s a difference between supporting something, legislation being on the table, and Obama horse-trading on items- to be a thumper they have to prove the legislation is controversial and Obama’s pc will be key to it

#### Third,

Gun control doesn’t htump – bipart

#### Obama pushing immigration NOW – should pass – avoiding political divisions key. Guns and Money fights now won’t thump it. Fighting for high-skilled workers, path to citizenship, and a guest worker program

PRESTON 1 – 12 – 13 NYT Staff [Julia Preston, Obama Will Seek Citizenship Path in One Fast Push, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/13/us/politics/obama-plans-to-push-congress-on-immigration-overhaul.html?_r=0>]

President Obama plans to push Congress to move quickly in the coming months on an ambitious overhaul of the immigration system that would include a path to citizenship for most of the 11 million illegal immigrants in the country, senior administration officials and lawmakers said last week.

Mr. Obama and Senate Democrats will propose the changes in one comprehensive bill, the officials said, resisting efforts by some Republicans to break the overhaul into smaller pieces — separately addressing young illegal immigrants, migrant farmworkers or highly skilled foreigners — which might be easier for reluctant members of their party to accept.

The president and Democrats will also oppose measures that do not allow immigrants who gain legal status to become American citizens one day, the officials said.

Even while Mr. Obama has been focused on fiscal negotiations and gun control, overhauling immigration remains a priority for him this year, White House officials said. Top officials there have been quietly working on a broad proposal. Mr. Obama and lawmakers from both parties believe that the early months of his second term offer the best prospects for passing substantial legislation on the issue.

Mr. Obama is expected to lay out his plan in the coming weeks, perhaps in his State of the Union address early next month, administration officials said. The White House will argue that its solution for illegal immigrants is not an amnesty, as many critics insist, because it would include fines, the payment of back taxes and other hurdles for illegal immigrants who would obtain legal status, the officials said.

The president’s plan would also impose nationwide verification of legal status for all newly hired workers; add visas to relieve backlogs and allow highly skilled immigrants to stay; and create some form of guest-worker program to bring in low-wage immigrants in the future.

A bipartisan group of senators has also been meeting to write a comprehensive bill, with the goal of introducing legislation as early as March and holding a vote in the Senate before August. As a sign of the keen interest in starting action on immigration, White House officials and Democratic leaders in the Senate have been negotiating over which of them will first introduce a bill, Senate aides said.

“This is so important now to both parties that neither the fiscal cliff nor guns will get in the way,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, a Democrat who is a leader of the bipartisan discussions.

A similar attempt at bipartisan legislation early in Mr. Obama’s first term collapsed amid political divisions fueled by surging public wrath over illegal immigration in many states. But both supporters and opponents say conditions are significantly different now.

Memories of the results of the November election are still fresh here. Latinos, the nation’s fastest-growing electorate, turned out in record numbers and cast 71 percent of their ballots for Mr. Obama. Many Latinos said they were put off by Republicans’ harsh language and policies against illegal immigrants.

After the election, a host of Republicans, starting with Speaker John A. Boehner, said it was time for the party to find a more positive, practical approach to immigration. Many party leaders say electoral demographics are compelling them to move beyond policies based only on tough enforcement.

Supporters of comprehensive changes say that the elections were nothing less than a mandate in their favor, and that they are still optimistic that Mr. Obama is prepared to lead the fight.

“Republicans must demonstrate a reasoned approach to start to rebuild their relationship with Latino voters,” said Clarissa Martinez de Castro, the director of immigration policy at the National Council of La Raza, a Latino organization. “Democrats must demonstrate they can deliver on a promise.”

Since the election, Mr. Obama has repeatedly pledged to act on immigration this year. In his weekly radio address on Saturday, he again referred to the urgency of fixing the immigration system, saying it was one of the “difficult missions” the country must take on.

#### Gun control is becoming bipartisan

O’Keefe and Rucker, 2-6

[Ed O’Keefe and Philip Rucker, “GOP opens a door in debate on gun control,” Washington Post, February 6, 2013 , LexisNexis, //uwyo-baj]

The second-ranking House Republican said Tuesday that he supports improving the federal background-check system for gun buyers but stopped short of endorsing universal checks on all weapon purchases.

The comments by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) came as two GOP lawmakers from suburban districts announced plans to co-sponsor legislation to make gun trafficking a federal crime for the first time. The moves signal potential openings for bipartisan compromise on gun control, a debate so far dominated by Democrats with little said or done by Republicans.

Cantor, giving the most specific comments on gun control by a GOP congressional leader since President Obama outlined his proposals in late January, told CNN in an interview that lawmakers could consider adopting a plan implemented by Virginia after the 2007 shootings at Virginia Tech. Since the shootings, the state has linked mental-health information to law enforcement databases used to conduct background checks for gun purchases.

#### Fourth, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### 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.

#### Means republicans won’t hop on board with plan happening because still generates the perception of new plants

Your Congress loves SMRs wrong- was written in 2011- doesn’t account for strapped budget-

#### First, Doesn’t win on energy policy-previous term proves

Eisler 12

[Matthew N. Eisler, Research Fellow at the Center for Contemporary History and Policy at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, 12 “Science, Silver Buckshot, and ‘All of The Above’” Science Progress, April 2, http://scienceprogress.org/2012/04/science-silver-buckshot-and-%E2%80%9Call-of-the-above%E2%80%9D/]

Conservatives take President Obama’s rhetoric at face value. Progressives see the president as disingenuous. No doubt White House planners regard delaying the trans-border section of the Keystone XL pipeline and approving the Gulf of Mexico portion as a stroke of savvy realpolitik, but one has to wonder whether Democratic-leaning voters really are as gullible as this scheme implies. And as for the president’s claims that gasoline prices are determined by forces beyond the government’s control (speculation and unrest in the Middle East), it is probably not beyond the capacity of even the mildly educated to understand that the administration has shown little appetite to reregulate Wall Street and has done its part to inflate the fear premium through confrontational policies in the Persian Gulf. Committed both to alternative energy (but not in a rational, comprehensive way) and cheap fossil fuels (but not in ways benefiting American motorists in an election year), President Obama has accrued no political capital from his energy policy from either the left or the right by the end of his first term. The president long ago lost the legislative capacity for bold action in practically every field, including energy, but because the GOP’s slate of presidential candidates is so extraordinarily weak in 2012, he may not need it to get re-elected. At least, that is the conventional wisdom in Democratic circles. Should President Obama win a second term, Congress is likely to be even more hostile than in his first term, as in the Clinton years. And as in the Clinton years, that will probably mean four more years of inaction and increased resort to cant.

#### Second, Political capital is finite – a win on one issue doesn’t spill over

Gangale, San Francisco State political science lecturer, 5

(Thomas, poli sci lecturer @ SF State, 1/23/5, “To Amend or Not to Amend”, http://pweb.jps.net/~gangale/opsa/ps2/ToAmendOrNotToAmend.htm) JPG

Abolishing the Electoral College is somewhat of a progressive issue in that it is based on the principle of "one person, one vote." However, more than anything it is a "large states vs. small states" issue, and that is why it is a perennial loser. The reality is that there are many more Idahos and Nebraskas than there are Californias and New Yorks, and since a small state has as many votes in the US Senate as a large state, any proposal to do away with the Electoral College cannot hope to win the required two-thirds majority. It is destined to defeat. Even worse, the issue pits progressive states large and small against each other, weakening progressive solidarity. If you fight someone tooth-and-nail on one issue, it’s hard to muster any more than lukewarm support on another issue on which you agree. Political capital is like ammunition: use too much of it up in an unwise action, and you have to wait to be resupplied. Meanwhile, your forces may be in disarray and vulnerable to a counterstrike. Abolishing the Electoral College isn’t the only constitutional amendment that’s being bandied about this year. There’s also talk of an amendment to ban gay marriage.

#### Third, Winners win is wrong -- Obama votes neg

Calmes 2012

[Jackie Calmes, NYTimes, 11/12/12, In Debt Talks, Obama Is Ready to Go Beyond Beltway, mobile.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/us/politics/legacy-at-stake-obama-plans-broader-push-for-budget-deal.xml]

That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies - in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney. George C. Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A & M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama's presidency is titled "Overreach," said, "He didn't understand the limits of what he could do." "They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we'd build this advancing-tide theory of legislation," Mr. Edwards said. "And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they've learned a lot, I think." "Effective leaders," he added, "exploit opportunities rather than create them." The budget showdown is an opportunity. But like many, it holds risks as well as potential rewards. "This election is the second chance to be what he promised in 2008, and that is to break the gridlock in Washington," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, a Reagan White House chief of staff, who voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and later expressed disappointment. "But it seems like this is a replay of 2009 and 2010, when he had huge majorities in the House and Senate, rather than recognizing that 'we've got to figure out ways to work together and it's not just what I want.' " For now, at least, Republican lawmakers say they may be open to raising the tax bill for some earners. "We can increase revenue without increasing the tax rates on anybody in this country," said Representative Tom Price, Republican of Georgia and a leader of House conservatives, on "Fox News Sunday." "We can lower the rates, broaden the base, close the loopholes." The challenge for Mr. Obama is to use his postelection leverage to persuade Republicans - or to help Speaker John A. Boehner persuade Republicans - that a tax compromise is in their party's political interest since most Americans favor compromise and higher taxes on the wealthy to reduce annual deficits. Some of the business leaders the president will meet with on Wednesday are members of the new Fix the Debt coalition, which has raised about $40 million to urge lawmakers and their constituents to support a plan that combines spending cuts with new revenue. That session will follow Mr. Obama's meeting with labor leaders on Tuesday. His first trip outside Washington to engage the public will come after Thanksgiving, since Mr. Obama is scheduled to leave next weekend on a diplomatic trip to Asia. Travel plans are still sketchy, partly because his December calendar is full of the traditional holiday parties. Democrats said the White House's strategy of focusing both inside and outside of Washington was smart. "You want to avoid getting sucked into the Beltway inside-baseball games," said Joel Johnson, a former adviser in the Clinton White House and the Senate. "You can still work toward solutions, but make sure you get out of Washington while you are doing that." The president must use his leverage soon, some Democrats added, because it could quickly wane as Republicans look to the 2014 midterm elections, when the opposition typically takes seats from the president's party in
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#### The Department of Defense should authorize and fund the creation of a thorium bank in the United States.

#### Your solvency evidence has no warrant as to why congress is key- only need to win we establish the bank to solve, your ev says you don’t solve production, just the construction of a bank-

# 2nd Off

#### Obama pc key and will pass now- Hard line key to defeat Republicans

Spetalnick & Crowan Feb. 4th

[Matt Spetalnick and Richard Cowan, Reuters, February 4th, 2013, Obama, aides seek momentum on immigration reform this week, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204>, uwyo//amp]

The flurry of activity, including new moves in Congress, comes amid disagreement between the Democratic president and Republicans over the question of citizenship for illegal immigrants, an obstacle that could make it hard to reach a final deal on sweeping legislation. Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election. But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades. Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants, and has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion. But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept. Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### Nuclear power has significant opposition – public and congressional

Andrew Freedman, Editor and Senior Science writer for Climate Central, “Feds Approve First Nuclear Reactors Since 1970s”, Climatecentral.org, February 9th, 2012.

By a v ote of 4 to 1 , the Nuclear Regulatory Commission approv ed the construction of the first new nuclear reactors to be built in the United States since 1 97 8. The reactors would be built at the Vogtle power plant near Way nesboro, Ga., which is a nuclear power plant operated by the Southern Company . As The Hill's E-2 Wire blog noted, the lone dissenting v ote was cast by NRC Chairman Gregory Jaczko. The nuclear industry has faced numerous obstacles, most recently the backlash following the Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan, in its efforts to build new nuclear plants in the U.S., and the Commission has issued recommendations on how to better protect U.S. reactors from earthquakes and floods. The country currently operates 1 04 nuclear reactors, but all were approv ed at least three decades ago. “This is a historic day ,” said Marv in Fertel, president of the Nuclear Energy Institute, the industry ’s trade group in a statement. “Today ’s licensing action sounds a clarion call to the world that the United States recognizes the importance of expanding nuclear energy as a key component of a low-carbon energy future that is central to job creation, div ersity of electricity supply and energy security .” Andrew Restuccia, writing for The Hill, noted the project still needs to ov ercome public opposition to nuclear power that may result in a lawsuit against the project, and congressional opposition to a hefty $8.3 billion federal conditional loan guarantee for reactor construction. "Some Democrats in Congress — noting that the loan guarantee is more than 1 5 times the size of the one granted to the failed solar firm Soly ndra — hav e called on Obama not to finalize the loan." “Ithink we are putting our taxpay er money at unnecessary risk giv en the unresolv ed safety issues and the lessons that hav e been learned from Fukushima,” Rep. Edward Markey (D-Mass.), a senior Democrat on the House Energy and Commerce Committee and a v ocal critic of nuclear power, told The Hill Wednesday . The Obama administration has supported the dev elopment of new nuclear power plants as a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissons and cut the use of fossil fuels.

#### Critical to US economic recovery

Aaron Terrazas, Migration Policy Institute, July 2011, The Economic Integration of Immigrants in the United States: Long- and Short-Term Perspectives, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/EconomicIntegration.pdf

The fate of immigrants in the United States and their integration into the labor market are impossible to separate from the state of the overall US economy and the fate of all US workers. During periods of economic expansion and relative prosperity, upward economic mobility among the native born generates opportunities for immigrants to gain a foothold in the US labor market and to gradually improve their status over time. In many respects, a growing economy during the 1990s and early 2000s provided ample opportunity for immigrants — and especially their children — to gradually improve their status over time. However, the story of immigrants’ integration into the US labor force during the years leading to the recession was also mixed: In general, the foreign born had high labor force participation, but they were also more likely to occupy low-paying jobs. The most notable advances toward economic integration occur over generations, due in large part to the openness of US educational institutions to the children of immigrants and the historic lack of employment discrimination against workers with an immigrant background. In the wake of the global economic crisis, there is substantial uncertainty regarding the future trajectory of the US economy and labor market. Most forecasts suggest that the next decade will be substantially different from the past26 and it is not clear if previous trends in immigrants’ economic integration will continue. The recession, weak recovery, and prospect of prolonged stagnation as a result of continuing high public debt, could realign the economic and social forces that have historically propelled the the less-educated labor force have been dismal for decades. In some respects, the recession accelerated these trends. While the prospect of greater demand for US manufactured goods from emerging markets might slow gradual decay of the US manufacturing industry, the outlook for the industry remains weak. Steady educational gains throughout the developing world have simultaneously increased downward wage pressure on highly skilled workers who, in the past, generated substantial secondary demand for services that immigrants often provide.

#### **Nuclear war**

Harris and Burrows ‘9

(Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>, AM)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

# 3rd Off

#### Text: The government of Japan and India should remove restrictions on and substantially increase incentives for the production of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion.

#### Indian-Japan joint project solves

Ravindran, 2k

[M., National Institute of Ocean Technology Director at the IIT Campus, Chennai, India, “The Indian 1 MW Floating OTEC Plant ¡V An Overview,” Summer 2000, IOA Newsletter, <http://www.clubdesargonautes.org/otec/vol/vol11-2-1.htm> //uwyo-baj]

In 1993, National Institute of Ocean Technology (NIOT) was formed by the Department of Ocean Development (DOD), Government of India to pursue the research activities on ocean energy as part of their various mission-based activities. Under this mission a major thrust was given for the technology development for OTEC. Early 1997, DOD, Government of India proposed to establish a 1 MW gross OTEC plant in India, which will be the first ever MW range plant established anywhere in the world. NIOT had been exploring the participation of national and international expertise for a joint research and development. Saga University in Japan, headed by Prof. Uehara, has been doing excellent and practically oriented R & D on OTEC for more than twenty five years and this team also showed keen interest in closely working with NIOT on OTEC technology development. Considering this, an MOU was signed in 1997 between NIOT and Saga University, Japan for a joint development of OTEC in India. NIOT conducted detailed surveys at the proposed OTEC site near Tuticorin, South India. Based on the temperature and bathymetric profiles, the optimization of the closed loop systems was done with the help of Saga University in 1998[1].

#### CP Solves for cheap baseload electricity- creates Hydrogen Economy

Joseph **Huang and** Stephen **Oney**, July **2003**. Senior Scientist for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Professor of Ocean &. Resources Engineering, University of Hawaii and PhD., executive vice present of OCEES. “Revisit Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion System,” http://www.springerlink.com/content/n864l3217156h045/fulltext.pdf.

Perhaps the largest contribution to human society and the global environment that OTEC will have is as the supplier of hydrogen for the impending hydrogen economy. The huge energy reservoir in the tropical ocean available via the OTEC process will require a transportable form of that energy to allow access by the energy demand centers in the temperate zone. The most attractive and versatile transportable energy form is hydrogen. There are natural synergies between OTEC and hydrogen production, especially liquid hydrogen (LH2), which other renewables such as wind and solar do not possess. These include: • Full and efficient utilization can be made of the investment in production capacity because OTEC is available 24 hours per day and 365 days per year. This is in contrast to most renewable energy systems such as wind, waves, tide, direct solar and photovoltaics. Also, OTEC systems cannot exhaust the resource at the location where they are installed – in contrast to oil, natural gas, geothermal or even hydroelectric (the reservoir eventually silts up); • The efficient production of hydrogen by electrolysis requires very pure water for the KOH solution. A small part of the OTEC process can be used to produce this pure water from the surface seawater, resulting in high efficiency electrolysis; • Liquefying hydrogen by the Claude process requires an efficient heat sink to minimize process energy. The Claude process, which cools compressed hydrogen gas with liquid nitrogen prior to expansion through a Joules-Thompson valve to complete the liquefaction process, requires a significant heat sink to maintain liquid nitrogen temperatures (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Technology 1989). The cold seawater that is used in the OTEC process could provide this efficient heat sink; • Liquid hydrogen is most efficiently transported by ocean tanker. The off-shore OTEC hydrogen plant is already located on the transport medium and therefore would result in the lowest cost for transport to market. From a global perspective, ocean transport distances of OTEC derived LH2 are much shorter than our present system of oil transport from the Middle East around Africa to North America or Europe or from the Middle East around India and the Malay Peninsula to Japan. The successful development of a global hydrogen economy will undoubtedly have to involve the largest renewable energy resource in the world – the tropical ocean. OTEC technology is the best way to tap into this virtually limitless thermal reservoir to produce hydrogen to support the impending hydrogen economy. Offshore OTEC plants, utilizing techniques already developed for accessing deep water oil fields, can be adapted to produce and liquefy hydrogen and ensure a sustainable supply of hydrogen from an environmentally benign, renewable resource for future generations.

# 4th Off

#### Nuclear industry fuels the power of the state and militarism enables social repression and control through the establishment of hierarchal social relationships and technology

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

The nuclear industry then has been largely state-developed, owned and promoted. We can't explain the phenomenon of its development, in the face of apparently major problems, risks and disadvantages, without seeing the state as having a crucial and largely independent role, independent that is of its more conventionally attributed role of protecting long-term capitalist interests.¶ Nuclear technology is not obviously in the interests of capital, although it does have numerous features which make it attractive for profit-making e.g. it is capital- intensive, large-scale, centralised and suitable for monopolisation. So of course are many other possible energy sources. But capital has required constant coaxing and reassurance to continue to participate, and the industry would apparently have become defunct some time ago if those mythical ft market forces had been allowed to prevail. Thus there have been no new orders for reactors in the U.S. since 1977, and the industry is in a financial mess even with the highly favourable conditions provided by the state. [2]¶ The industry does however seem to be highly suited to increasing the power of the state itself, both through its military connection, and through its contribution to overall technological, social and bureaucratic centralisation.¶ This seems to present a fairly clear case then where the state has operated with some relative autonomy in promoting a technology which appears to be in its own interests rather than primarily that of capital, and to be the chief promoter and beneficiary of the industry which capitalism has to be coaxed to support.¶ So far the data I have presented is consistent both with a sophisticated Marxist theory which allows some relative autonomy [3] to institutions such as the state, and with more traditional anarchist theories which see the state as the central organ of social repression and the production of hierarchical social relationships and associated technologies (this last a modern addition). There are however other factors which have to be taken into account to understand the kind of social control being exercised here, and which show that the state reduction model - the reduction of all significant factors to the state (or to some combination of state and capital) is too simple and has other defects as well. These factors show the need to press on beyond purely state or other reductive models and to develop a more pluralistic model of the operation of power which sees power as " a productive network which runs through the entire social body much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression". [4]

#### This technological control through nuclear power makes nuclear apocalypse inevitable through technological development—the tools that the state uses to monopolize centralized control and power lead to destruction of life

Hubbard, 1997

[Bryan, MA Thesis at Arizona state University, Nuclear criticism after the cold war: a rhetorical analysis of two contemporary atomic campaigns, 8-1-1997, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA327948] /Wyo-MB

Brummett (1989) notes the entelechial drive toward perfection at work in the rhetoric of nuclear weapons strategy. Hirschbein (1989) also saw the eventual progress of nuclear science enabling an "ersatz immortality -- immortalization through making a lasting monumental impact on history" (p. 167). This impulse to power is not new. Humanity has always feared death, seized the greatest power available to avoid death and then created rationalizations to romanticize death. Like other continuities flowing into the nuclear age, the drive toward perfection accelerates with nuclear knowledge and its accompanying industrial capacity. The drive toward perfection informs the other two continuities present in the nuclear age -- the desire to cut and control and a shared fascination with the apocalypse.¶ Since humanity became a problem-solving organism, it has strived to cut and control its environment in hopes of improving its strategic situation. Harris (1991) claimed the drive to control the environment involves an attempt to master energy. He¶ traced the search for energy through ancient times noting that the control of energy enabled the control not only of the environment but of its inhabiting organisms. As people became more organized and specialized, the control of energy became centralized. The modem experience of nuclear energy enables an acceleration of this process placing virtually unlimited power (energy) in the hands of an unprecedented few (Mumford, 1980). The tendency Harris observed is one continuity flowing through our current nuclear experiences. J. Burke and Omstein (1995) call this continuity the drive to cut and control.¶ This desire to cut and control nature makes human beings human and links our creativity and destructive capacities, our tool-using nature, and our problem-solving inclinations (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995). In The Chalice and The Blade: Our History, Our Future, Eisler (1988) sees the modem nuclear predicament as the logical perfection of ancient traditions which claim authority and legitimacy through the "power of the lethal Blade" (p. 184). She sees the current path of society set along a grim trajectory and says, "[a] dominator future is therefore, sooner or later, almost certainly also a future of global nuclear war -- and the end of all of humanity's problems and aspirations" (Eisler, p. 184). This trajectory for her originates thousands of years prior to the discovery of the atom. The cult of the blade originated in the "Initial Kurganization" of Old Europe from 4000-3500 B.C.E. according to Eisler (p. 250). The impulse to cut and control (J. Burke & Omstein, 1995) guides the development of humanity from its earliest tool-making days. The potential destructive power parallels the productive capacity of humanity's tools. This trajectory accelerates into the twentieth century creating a situation where,¶ according to Eisler, would-be totalitarians and their "faith in the power of the lethal Blade as the instrument of deliverance" (p. 184) become one source of today's nuclearism.

#### The alternative is to refuse nuclear power production in favor of the 1NC criticism.

#### And the alt solves—need analysis of power relationships embedded in nuclear knowledge and structures—key to resist centralized development of knowledge and power (green highlighting)

Plumwood, 1984

[Val, Presenting to the social control conference @ Sydney, “The state and the expansion of nuclear technology.” Online, http://blogs.exeter.ac.uk/radicalideas/files/2010/11/Plumwood-1984-The-state-and-the-explanation-of-nuclear-technology-1.PDF] /Wyo-MB

What is clear from recent events in Australia is the importance of moving beyond a narrow, 'political' approach to the nuclear issue to one which is based on an analysis of the power structures embedded in it. This is important for the survival of the anti-nuclear movement as an important social force in Australia. The anti-nuclear movement in Australia has had great strength and by some criteria, great success. But the recent treatment of the issue at the hands of politicians illustrates vividly the ultimate bankruptcy of elite-oriented strategies for change based on appeals to decision-makers and working within a state and electoral framework. An inability to focus on alternative strategies will probably cause the death or serious weakening of the movement in the coming period of political confrontation, yet its demise as a widespread activist issue would be a serious loss. An alternative approach, stressing long-term strategies and institutional analysis, has great promise because the multiplicity of factors, critiques and sites of resistance to nuclear power gives the issue great potential. And such a social movement also has the ability to bring about or reinforce social awareness of the undemocratic character of social life and of the need for other sorts of fundamental changes in social relations, provided of course that the means adopted, for example, for working in groups, are themselves appropriate to these multiple goals and sufficiently challenging to day-to-day hierarchical social relationships and power structures e.g. sexist and racist ones. [9]¶ In this strategy then the critique of the role of the state is critical, but it must be combined with a critique of the wider power structure involved. What implications does this analysis have for anarchism itself? Does anarchism emerge as just another form of activism and critique, and anarchists as anti-state activists along with feminists as anti-patriarchy activists for example? This may seem quite threatening to many anarchists, since it threatens the claim to a more central or 'purer' position.¶ Such a view however ignores the relation between the different critiques - it assumes that they just coexist peacefully side-by-side as separate pieces of an overall puzzle, needing only to be assembled in their separate purity to providing a critique, not only of general power structures, but of the means and strategies adopted by other social movements. This concern with means and the stress on appropriate ways of pursuing other political goals, has been traditionally important in anarchist thought.¶ If anarchism is conceived, to a large extent at least, as involving another way of doing something else, of pursuing other social and political goals and effecting social changes in appropriate ways, rather than just as a utopian and unrealizable goal, disconnected from strategies and from other movements for social change, then there is an important relationship between anarchism and other social movements for change. Links with other activist groups become crucial, as does attention to the means by which particular resistances to particular forms of power are conducted. Stress on purity of anarchist doctrine, on 'keeping the hands clean' by not mixing it with less idealistic or utopian social movements must then be seen as sterile and self-defeating, and as removing this fertile area for achieving change. The real challenge to contemporary anarchism, conceived of as a general resistance to hierarchical and centralising structures, would then be in the struggle within movements for social change for appropriate non-hierarchical processes and to achieve alternative social relations, as well as for the adoption of non-centralising means for achieving particular social goals.¶ Anarchism in this picture has a crucial role to play for other social movements in maintaining the means/ends critique, and in promoting non-centralising and non state-strengthening strategies for other activist movements. Other social movements such as the anti-nuclear movement then provide a crucial 'field' for anarchism, which, to the extent that it is a general critique of power and of processes for achieving change, may still have some claim to a central (if not centralising or reductive) role.

# Space

### 1NC- Adv F/L

#### 1st, Competition over space is bad: The paranoia over space militarization has started a cycle of foreign reaction in the status quo–all of their impacts are both exaggerated and inevitable

USA TODAY 6-13-05

Is the sanctity of the heavens about to be violated by the United States making a unilateral introduction of aggressive weapons that could spark a destabilizing arms race? Is the White House about to unleash an unprecedented expansion of regions to fight over in the future? You'd be forgiven for thinking so, based on news reports in recent weeks and on complaints from foreign countries such as Russia and China. According to major U.S. newspapers, a wide range of high-tech armaments may soon be approved and funded, with deployment in space only a matter of time. At that point, reluctant foreign nations will feel compelled to "respond in kind," unleashing an expensive and dangerous new arms race. But a sober reality check can put the issue into better perspective. If anything is likely to spark a "new arms race," this time in outer space, it's unlikely to be the usual suspects. Gung-ho space-superiority mantras have been coming from U.S. Air Force leaders for decades, but without funding, it has mostly been just bold talk. Space hardware with weapons-like applications has also been around, on Earth and in space, for decades — but using it to break things in orbit never made much military sense, then or now or in the foreseeable future. Nothing here has changed. No, the impetus for a future foreign "reaction" doesn't need a genuine U.S. "action" — it only needs the near-hysterical ranting from American newspapers, from lobby groups posing as "information centers" but having long-familiar agendas, and from foreign nations eager to score cheap propaganda points. By whipping up anxieties with little rational justification, these self-serving fear mongers may actually lead to the creation of something well worth fearing: the arming of a new battleground, out in space.

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

Bell 05

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

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

#### Space Travel Impossible: Humans Cannot Biologically Function For Extended Periods Without Gravity, Heart Atrophy, Muscle Degeneration, Decreased Immunities, And Significant Bone Density Loss.

Theunis, 10

(Why space is the impossible frontier,16 November 2010 by PiersmaTheunis. Piersma is professor of animal ecology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and senior research scientist at the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research in Den Burg. This article draws on his new book [The Flexible Phenotype: A body-centred integration of ecology, physiology, and behaviour](http://www.us.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/LifeSciences/EvolutionaryBiology/?view=usa&ci=9780199597246) (with Jan A. van Gils, Oxford University Press) <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827860.100-why-space-is-the-impossible-frontier.html//> UWOKB)

**Hawking, Obama and other proponents of long-term space travel are making a grave error. Humans cannot leave Earth for the several years that it takes to travel to Mars and back, for the simple reason that our biology is intimately connected to Earth. To function properly, we need gravity**. Without it, the environment is less demanding on the human body in several ways, and this shows upon the return to Earth. **Remember the sight of weakened astronauts emerging after the Apollo missions? That is as nothing compared with what would happen to astronauts returning from Mars. One of the first things to be affected is the heart, which shrinks by as much as a quarter after just one week in orbit** ([The New England Journal of Medicine, vol 358, p 1370](http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMra072139)). **Heart atrophy leads to decreases in blood pressure and the amount of blood pushed out by the heart**. In this way heart atrophy leads to reduced exercise capacity. Astronauts returning to Earth after several months in the International Space Station experience dizziness and blackouts because blood does not reach their brains in sufficient quantities. Six weeks in bed leads to about as much atrophy of the heart as one week in space, suggesting that the atrophy is caused by both weightlessness and the concomitant reduction in exercise. Other muscle tissue suffers too. The effects of weightlessness on the muscles of the limbs are easy to verify experimentally. **Because they bear the body's weight, the "anti-gravity" muscles of the thighs and calves degenerate** significantly when they are made redundant during space flight. Despite the best attempts to give replacement exercise to crew members on the International Space Station, after six months they had still lost 13 per cent of their calf muscle volume and 32 per cent of the maximum power that their leg muscles could deliver ([Journal of Applied Physiology, vol 106, p 1159](http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.91578.2008)). **Various metabolic changes** also occur, including a decreased capacity for fat oxidation, which can lead to the build-up of fat in atrophied muscle. **Space travellers also suffer deterioration of immune function both during and after their missions** ([Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine, vol 79, p 835](http://dx.doi.org/10.3357/ASEM.2276.2008)). Arguably the most fearsome effect on bodies is bone loss ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1569](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(80)02208-8)). Although the hardness and strength of bone, and the relative ease with which it fossilises, give it an appearance of permanence, bone is actually a living and remarkably flexible tissue. In the late 19th century, the German anatomist Julius Wolff discovered that bones adjust to the loads that they are placed under. **A decrease in load leads to the loss of bone material**, while an increase leads to thicker bone. It is no surprise, then, that in the microgravity of space bones demineralise, especially those which normally bear the greatest load. Cosmonauts who spent half a year in space lost up to a quarter of the material in their shin bones, despite intensive exercise ([The Lancet, vol 355, p 1607](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02217-0)). Although experiments on chicken embryos on the International Space Station have established that bone formation does continue in microgravity, formation rates are overtaken by bone loss. What is of greatest concern here is that, unlike muscle loss which levels off with time, **bone loss seems to continue at a steady rate of 1 to 2 per cent for every month of weightlessness**. During a three-year mission to Mars, space travellers could lose around 50 per cent of their bone material, which would make it extremely difficult to return to Earth and its gravitational forces. **Bone loss during space travel certainly brings home the maxim "use it or lose it".**

#### Colonization Won’t Save Us From Extinction And We Don’t Need To Get Off The Rock For 5 Billion Years.

Williams 10

(Lynda Williams teaches physics at Santa Rosa Junior College in California. Irrational Dreams of Space Colonization, Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, January 1, 2010//UWYOKB)

According to scientific theory, the destruction of Earth is a certainty. **About five billion years from now, when our sun exhausts its nuclear fuel, it will expand in size and envelope the inner planets, including Earth, and burn them into oblivion. So yes, we are doomed, but we have five billion years, plus or minus a few hundred million, to plan our extraterrestrial escape**. **The need to colonize the moon or Mars to guarantee our survival is not pressing. There are also real risks due to collisions with asteroids and comets, although none are of immediate threat and do not necessitate extraterrestrial colonization.** There are many Earth-based technological strategies that can be developed in time to mediate such astronomical threats, such as gravitational tugboats that drag the objects out of range. The solar system could also potentially be exposed to galactic sources of highenergy **gamma ray bursts that could fry all life on Earth; any moon or Mars base would face a similar fate.** Thus, **human-based colonies on the moon or Mars would not protect us from any of these astronomical threats in the near future.**

#### Every scenario they have for earth being destroyed applies as much to any other location in space- Asteroids can hit other planets or the moon so there is never a try or die scenario with space because long-term extinction is probably inevitable

#### Black holes would wipe out colonies

David Lamb, The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, 2001 p. 167-8

David Brin (1 990) offers a range of explanations of the Great Silence. He notes out that the 250-million-year orbit around the galaxy poses major survival problems for various solar systems. When they pass the spiral arms where new stars are formed in superexplosions they are likely to be destroyed. But a very advanced civilization (for example, a Kardaschev—Dyson Type II or III, see apter 7) may simply leave this dangerous place taking their solar system far away. Consequently the very advanced civilizations would be further away and less likely to make contact; only the less advanced would remain and they might not have evolved the ability to communicate over long distances. Brin also notes that there may be many unforeseen disasters in the galaxy, such as huge black holes, which could destroy potentially colonizing civilizations. There may be holocausts caused by the effects of colonization such that the colonizers leave nothing behind them. But on a more friendly note, Brin suggests that it is likely that the most habitable planets — not too hot and not too cold — with ample water and oxygen, wifi be far less dry than ours. Hence land creatures would - barely develop. In this respect we are unique. But intelligent life, such as dolphins

and whales, will develop in the water, without our technology derived from the use of hand and fire, and hence an intelligence with no likelihood of reaching the stars.

# Prolif

#### Nations won’t seek weapons and prolif will be slow

Waltz 03

[Kenneth N., Emeritus Prof. of IR at Berkeley, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, WW Norton, pg. 42-43]

Some have feared that weakening opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons will lead numerous states to obtain them because it may seem that "everyone is doing it." 48 Why should we think that if we relax, numerous states will begin to make nuclear weapons? Both the United States and the Soviet Union were relaxed in the past, and those effects did not fol­low. The Soviet Union initially supported China's nuclear pro­gram. **The United States helped both Britain and France to produce nuclear weapons**. By 1968 the CIA had informed President Johnson of the existence of Israeli nuclear weapons, and in July of 1970, Richard Helms, director of the CIA, gave this information to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These and later disclosures were not followed by censure of Israel or by reductions of economic assistance. 49 And in September of 1980, the executive branch, against the will of the House of Representatives but with the approval of the Senate, continued to do nuclear business with India despite its explo­sion of a nuclear device and despite its unwillingness to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. **Many more countries can make nuclear weapons than do**. One can believe that **American opposition to nuclear arm­ing stays the deluge only by overlooking the complications of international life**. Any state has to examine many conditions before deciding whether or not to develop nuclear weapons. Our opposition is only one factor and is not likely to be the decisive one. **Many states feel fairly secure living with their neighbors**. Why should they want nuclear weapons? Some countries, feeling threatened, have found security through their own strenuous efforts and through arrangements made with others. South Korea is an outstanding example. Many officials believe that South Korea would lose more in terms of American support if it acquired nuclear weapons than it would gain by having them. 50 Further, on occasion we might slow the spread of nuclear weapons by not opposing the nuclear weapons programs of some countries. When we opposed Pakistan's nuclear program, we were saying that we disapprove of countries developing nuclear weapons no mat­ter what their neighbors do. **The gradual spread of nuclear weapons has not opened the nuclear floodgates. Nations attend to their security in the ways they think best. The fact that so many more countries can make nuclear weapons than do says more about the hesi­tation of countries to enter the nuclear military business than about the effectiveness of American nonproliferation policy**. We should suit our policy to individual cases, sometimes bringing pressure against a country moving toward nuclear weapons capability and sometimes quietly acquiescing. No one policy is right in all cases. We should ask what the inter­ests of other countries require before putting pressure on them. Some countries are likely to suffer more in cost and pain if they remain conventional states than if they become nuclear ones. **The measured spread of nuclear weapons does not run against our interests and can increase the security of some states at a price they can afford to pay.**

**No Risk Of Nuclear Terror – Technical And Logistical Hurdles Like Access To Heu Are Impossible To Overcome**

**Mueller 08**

John Woody Mueller Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center Professor of Political Science Department of Political Science, Ohio State University. THE ATOMIC TERRORIST: ASSESSING THE LIKELIHOOD Prepared for presentation at the Program on International Security Policy, University of Chicago, January 15, 2008 ]

It is essential to note, however, that **making a bomb is** an **extraordinarily difficult task**. Thus, a set of **counterterrorism and nuclear experts interviewed** in 2004 by Dafna Linzer for the Washington Post **pointed to the "enormous technical and logistical obstacles confronting would-be nuclear terrorists**, and to the fact that **neither al-Qaeda nor any other group has come close to demonstrating the means to overcome them." Allison nonetheless opines that a dedicated terrorist group, al-Qaeda in particular, could get around all the problems in time and eventually steal, produce, or procure a "crude" bomb or device**, one that he however acknowledges would be "large, cumbersome, unsafe, unreliable, unpredictable, and inefficient" (2004, 97; see also Bunn and Wier 2006, 139; Pluta and Zimmerman 2006, 61). In his recent book, Atomic Bazaar: The Rise of the Nuclear Poor, William Langewiesche spends a great deal of time and effort assessing the process by means of which a terrorist group could come up with a bomb. Unlike Allison, he concludes that it "remains very, very unlikely. It's a possibility, but unlikely." Also: **The best information is that no one has gotten anywhere near this.** I mean, **if you look carefully and practically at this process,** you see **that it is an enormous undertaking full of risks for the would-be terrorists.** And so far **there is no public case**, at least known, **of any appreciable amount of weapons-grade HEU** [highly enriched uranium] **disappearing**. And **that's the first step. If you don't have that, you don't have anything.**

**A terror attacks is unlikely and the response by Nations is just guessing.**

**Ayson ’10**

Robert Ayson, Centre for Strategic Studies, Victoria University of Wellington. “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects”. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7 July 2010 , pages 571 – 593. InformaWorld

It is just possible that a terrorist nuclear attack could catalyze an inter-state nuclear war. The likelihood of a terrorist group gaining access to nuclear weapons is lower than some fear, and terrorists might not use a nuclear weapon as soon as they had acquired one. But if a terrorist group was to explode a nuclear device in a country that was itself armed with nuclear weapons, and especially if that country was in a conflict-prone relationship with another nuclear-armed state, the broader consequences of even a single terrorist nuclear detonation could be much more serious than some assume. To consider what might follow the terrorist use of a nuclear weapon upon an industrialized country, and especially on a country that is itself armed with nuclear weapons, is to engage a whole cosmos of uncertainties and assumptions. Moreover, in order to acquire a nuclear weapon in the first place, the terrorist group in question would need to surmount considerable hurdles. Having done so, the successful delivery and detonation of the nuclear device is no automatic process. And even once past this second set of obstacles, there remains a battery of questions, likelihoods, and interactions regarding what might happen once the world's first dramatic act of nuclear terrorism has occurred. It is all too easy, as Mueller has explained, for the discussion of catastrophic terrorism to descend into exaggeration and alarmism.1 But the strategic consequences of nuclear terrorism deserve attention for at least two reasons. First, no matter how improbable, the terrorist use of a nuclear weapon could have even wider and more harmful implications than some might suppose. The detonation of a single weapon by a terrorist group could certainly be locally catastrophic in and of itself. But it is also important to consider whether that initial explosion might just spark a general nuclear exchange between states with much larger arsenals than the terrorists could ever hope to acquire and use. Either by accident or design is it possible that a terrorist nuclear detonation could ultimately result in a catastrophe of truly intercontinental proportions? Second, even though it is unclear whether these much graver developments have any real likelihood of occurring, the analytical consideration of this possibility presents an intellectual challenge that tests strategic imaginations, and that indicates that, at least in theory, even terrorists cannot escape the logic of the nuclear age. Before it considers the ways in which a terrorist nuclear detonation might just lead to such a wider strategic conflagration involving the arsenals of two or more of the world's nuclear weapons states, this article addresses the significant obstacles standing in the way of the possession, deployment, and detonation of a nuclear weapon by a terrorist group. After considering the possible motivations behind these actions, it then canvasses the range of responses that an attacked country might adopt following the initial nuclear explosion on its territory. These options span a spectrum from relative inaction to the substantial use of force and brings the article to the heart of the argument. Recalling early Cold War concern about the possibility of minor nuclear powers setting off a major exchange between the superpowers, the remainder of this preliminary study considers the possibility that a terrorist group might set off a wider nuclear exchange either inadvertently or by design.

**No impact- exaggerated**

**Mueller and Stewart 10**

(John, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, Mark, writer for Foreign Affairs, “Hardly Existential: Thinking Rationally about Terrorism”, April 2, 2010, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66186/john-mueller-and-mark-g-stewart/hardly-existential?page=show>)

As can be seen, **annual terrorism fatality risks**, particularly for areas outside of war zones, **are less than one in one million and therefore generally lie within the range regulators deem safe or acceptable, requiring no further regulations, particularly those likely to be expensive**. They are similar to the risks of using home appliances (200 deaths per year in the United States) or of commercial aviation (103 deaths per year). **Compared with dying at the hands of a terrorist, Americans are twice as likely to perish in a natural disaster and nearly a thousand times more likely to be killed in some type of accident. The same general conclusion holds when the full damage inflicted by terrorists -- not only the loss of life but direct and indirect economic costs -- is aggregated.** As a hazard, terrorism, at least outside of war zones, does not inflict enough damage to justify substantially increasing expenditures to deal with it.

#### 1st, Plan doesn’t solve:

#### Thorium requires Uranium to start the chain reaction- Proliferation is still a risk

Boyd 09

[Arjun Makhijani and Michele Boyd, Fact Sheet Produced by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and Physicians for Social Responsibility, “Thorium Fuel: No Panacea for Nuclear Power”,

<http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/thorium2009factsheet.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

Thorium is not actually a “fuel” because it is not fissile and therefore cannot be used to start or sustain a nuclear chain reaction. A fissile material, such as uranium-235 (U-235) or plutonium-239 (which is made in reactors from uranium-238), is required to kick-start the reaction. The enriched uranium fuel or plutonium fuel also maintains the chain reaction until enough of the thorium target material has been converted into fissile uranium-233 (U233) to take over much or most of the job. An advantage of thorium is that it absorbs slow neutrons relatively efficiently (compared to uranium-238) to produce fissile uranium-233. The use of enriched uranium or plutonium in thorium fuel has proliferation implications. Although U-235 is found in nature, it is only 0.7 percent of natural uranium, so the proportion of U-235 must be industrially increased to make “enriched uranium” for use in reactors. Highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium are nuclear weapons materials. In addition, U-233 is as effective as plutonium-239 for making nuclear bombs. In most proposed thorium fuel cycles, reprocessing is required to separate out the U-233 for use in fresh fuel. This means that, like uranium fuel with reprocessing, bomb-making material is separated out, making it vulnerable to theft or diversion. Some proposed thorium fuel cycles even require 20% enriched uranium in order to get the chain reaction started in existing reactors using thorium fuel. It takes 90% enrichment to make weapons-usable uranium, but very little additional work is needed to move from 20% enrichment to 90% enrichment. Most of the separative work is needed to go from natural uranium, which has 0.7% uranium-235, to 20% U-235. It has been claimed that thorium fuel cycles with reprocessing would be much less of a proliferation risk because the thorium can be mixed with uranium-238. In this case, fissile uranium-233 is also mixed with non-fissile uranium-238. The claim is that if the uranium238 content is high enough, the mixture cannot be used to make bombs without a complex uranium enrichment plant. This is misleading. More uranium-238 does dilute the uranium-233, but it also results in the production of more plutonium-239 as the reactor operates. So the proliferation problem remains – either bomb-usable uranium-233 or bomb-useable plutonium is created and can be separated out by reprocessing. Further, while an enrichment plant is needed to separate U-233 from U-238, it would take less separative work to do so than enriching natural uranium. This is because U-233 is five atomic weight units lighter than U-238, compared to only three for U-235. It is true that such enrichment would not be a straightforward matter because the U-233 is contaminated with U-232, which is highly radioactive and has very radioactive radionuclides in its decay chain. The radiation-dose-related problems associated with separating U-233 from U-238 and then handling the U-233 would be considerable and more complex than enriching natural uranium for the purpose of bomb making. But in principle, the separation can be done, especially if worker safety is not a primary concern; the resulting U-233 can be used to make bombs. There is just no way to avoid proliferation problems associated with thorium fuel cycles that involve reprocessing. Thorium fuel cycles without reprocessing would offer the same temptation to reprocess as today’s once-through uranium fuel cycles.

#### creates a Uranium 233 source which can yield bombs

Makhijani 12

[Arjun, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, “Is Thorium A Magic Bullet For Our Energy Problems?”, Science Friday, NPR, 5.4, p. pq //wyo-tjc]

ARJUN MAKHIJANI: I don't think so. I think the problems of nuclear power, fundamentally, would remain. The safety problems would be different. I mean, Mr. Martin and proponents of thorium are right in the sense that the liquid fuel reactor has a number of safety advantages, but it also has a number of disadvantages. For instance, this breeder reactor lost out with the sodium-cooled breeder, in the incident that Mr. Martin mentioned, because the liquid - the molten sodium reactor, the sodium-cooled reactor has a much better breeding ratio. It produces a lot more excess fuel that you can then take to the next reactor. In this reactor, because thorium is not a fissile material, you actually need either plutonium or enriched uranium to start it. In fact, this reactor that operated in Oak Ridge for a few years, it actually started up in 1964, it never used thorium to breed uranium-233. Some uranium-233 was put into the reactor at one point, but it had been made in another reactor. It hadn't been made in that reactor. It operated with enriched uranium, some plutonium and some uranium-233, but not made in that reactor. So what are the problems? The problem is that with this particular reactor, most people will want a reprocessing, that is separating the fissile material on-site. so you have a continuous flow of molten salt out of the reactor. You take out the protactinium-233, which is a precursor of uranium, and then you put the uranium back in the reactor, and then you keep it going. But if you look at the Princeton University paper on thorium reactors from a few years ago, you'll see that this onsite reprocessing allows you to separate protactinium altogether. Now, the U.S. wouldn't do it, but if you were a county without nuclear materials and had a reprocessing plant right there, you'd separate the protactinium-233, you'd get pure uranium-233, which is easier to make bombs with than plutonium. I can read you the quote from the Princeton University paper, but I won't bother.

#### Produces weapons-usable fissile material

Green, 2009

[Jim, Friends of the Earth Campaigner, “Nuclear weapons and 'fourth generation' reactors.” 5-9-2009, Online, http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/41606] /Wyo-MB

The use of thorium, instead of plutonium, as a nuclear fuel doesn't solve the weapons proliferation problem. Irradiation of thorium (indirectly) produces uranium-233, a fissile material that can be used in nuclear weapons.¶ The US has successfully tested weapons using uranium-233 (and France may have too). India's thorium program must have a nuclear weapons component — as evidenced by India's refusal to allow IAEA safeguards to apply to its thorium program.¶ Thorium-fuelled reactors could also be used to irradiate uranium to produce weapons grade plutonium.¶ Some proponents of nuclear fusion power falsely claim that it would pose no risk of contributing to weapons proliferation.¶ In fact, there are several risks. These include the use of tritium, a radioactive form of hydrogen, as a fusion power fuel. This raises the risk of its diversion for use in boosted nuclear weapons, or, more importantly, the use of fusion reactors to irradiate uranium to produce plutonium or to irradiate thorium-232 to produce uranium-233.¶ Fusion power has yet to generate a single Watt of useful electricity but it has already contributed to proliferation problems.¶ According to Khidhir Hamza, a senior nuclear scientist involved in Iraq's weapons program in the 1980s: "Iraq took full advantage of the IAEA's recommendation in the mid 1980s to start a plasma physics program for 'peaceful' fusion research.¶ "We thought that buying a plasma focus device — would provide an excellent cover for buying and learning about fast electronics technology, which could be used to trigger atomic bombs.

#### 2nd, No impact to prolif:

#### No chain reactions. Prolif domino effects never materialize.

Alagappa ‘8 (Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow – East-West Center, in “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, Ed. Muthiah Alagappa , p. 521-522)

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India's and Pakistan's nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran's quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country's security concerns about the United States and Tehran's regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S. Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country's decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. **Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive;** often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993, 1996). **In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos**. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. **Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation**. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

#### Second Strike Capability Is Easy To Attain, Stops Nuclear Escalation

Waltz 03

[Kenneth N., Emeritus Prof. of IR at Berkeley, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, WW Norton, pg. 24-25]

Much of the literature on deterrence emphasizes the problem of achieving the credibility on which deterrence depends and the danger of relying on a deterrent of uncertain credibility. One early solution of the problem was Thomas Schelling's notion of "the threat that leaves something to chance." 23 **No state can know for sure that another state will refrain from retaliating even when retaliation would be irra­tional. No state can bet heavily on another state's common sense**. Bernard Brodie put the thought more directly, while avoiding the slippery notion of rationality. Rather than ask what it may be rational or irrational for governments to do, the question he repeatedly asked was this: How do govern­ments behave in the presence of awesome dangers? His answer was, very carefully. To ask why a country should carry out its deterrent threat if deterrence fails is to ask the wrong question. The question suggests that an aggressor may attack believing that the attacked country may not retaliate. This invokes the con­ventional logic that analysts find so hard to forsake. In a con­ventional world, a country can sensibly attack if it believes that success is possible. In a nuclear world, a would-be attacker is deterred if it believes that the attacked may retali­ate. **Uncertainty of response, not certainty, is required for deterrence because, if retaliation occurs, one risks losing so much. In a nuclear world, we should look less at the retalia­tor's conceivable inhibitions and more at the challenger's obvious risks.** One may nevertheless wonder whether retaliatory threats remain credible if the strategic forces of the attacker are superior to those of the attacked. Will an unsuccessful defender in a conventional war have the courage to unleash its deterrent force, using nuclear weapons first against a coun­try having superior strategic forces? Once more this asks the wrong question. The would-be attacker will ask itself, not whose forces are numerically superior, but whether a grossly provocative act might bring nuclear warheads down on itself. When vital interests are at stake, all of the parties involved are strongly constrained to be moderate because one's immoder­ate behavior makes the nuclear threats of others credible. **With deterrent forces, the question is not whether one country has more than another but whether it has the capability of inflict­ing "unacceptable damage" on another, with "unacceptable" sensibly defined. Given second-strike capabilities, it is** not the balance of forces but **the possibility that they may be used that counts.** The balance or imbalance of strategic forces affects neither the calculation of danger nor the question of whose will is the stronger. Second-strike forces have to be seen in absolute terms

# Biomass

#### Alt causes to Indian poverty and it will recover in 2013 anyway-lack of good governance means investment tanks and transition doesn’t occur

VOA Dec. 28th

[VOA, Dec. 18th, 2012, India’s Economy Looks to Rebound in 2013, <http://www.voanews.com/content/indias-economy-looks-to-rebound-in-2013/1573681.html>, uwyo//amp]

NEW DELHI — India’s economy has experienced its worst slowdown in nearly a decade this year. But there are signs that the country, which is still among the world’s fastest growing economies, may soon begin to recover from the slump. Month after month in 2012, virtually every sector of the Indian economy - agriculture, mining, manufacturing and services - slowed. At the end of the year, economic growth stood at 5.3 percent. It was a huge disappointment for a country whose economy had been racing ahead at eight percent plus for the last eight years. Like many other countries, India was affected by the global slowdown as exports were hit. But several domestic factors also pulled down the economy. Many economists blamed the government, which faces allegations of graft in many spheres, for policy inaction. Chief economist at ratings agency, CRISIL in Mumbai, D.K. Joshi, says the downturn was sharper than warranted by global factors. “It is widely recognized now, to clear projects it is taking time because of governance issues. And when it takes time to clear projects, the investment pipeline gets choked," says Joshi. "As a result of that investment slowed down quite significantly. Then we also had high inflation regime, and high inflation means the Central bank cannot cut interest rates to perk up the economy.” The government admits that investment is critical to revive the economy. Faced with plummeting growth, it has taken some steps to liberalize the economy and make it easier for foreign businesses to pump money into sectors such as retail, aviation and insurance. The long-awaited reforms were the biggest initiated in nearly ten years. Authorities also promised to speed up clearances for large infrastructure projects. The government also announced spending cuts as it grappled with high deficits. It slashed subsidies on fuel despite political opposition. This is expected to ward off the threat of a credit rating downgrade. Economist N. Bhanumurthy with the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy in New Delhi, says these steps are meant to reassure investors and could help the economy stage a gradual recovery. “Frankly right now the most important issue is confidence among investors, both domestic and foreign. All these measures are expected to provide some kind of confidence-booting measures for revival in the economy." he said. "Our own projections for the next year, 2013-14, is 7.1 percent.” Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has said the government’s first priority is to reverse the slowdown. But he says that a return to eight percent growth is an ambitious goal. Despite the slowdown, India remains high on the radar of foreign investors.

#### Preventing extinction is the highest ethical priority – we should take action to prevent the Other from dying FIRST, only THEN can we consider questions of value to life

Paul Wapner, associate professor and director of the Global Environmental Policy Program at American University, Winter 2003, Dissent, online: http://www.dissentmagazine.org/menutest/archives/2003/wi03/wapner.htm

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions-except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and non-existence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean-François Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### No Extinction from disease

Posner 05

[Richard Posner Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. “Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them.” http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract]

Yet the **fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort**, at least if the focus is on extinction events. **There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race**. There is a biological reason. **Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus**, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. **Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past** (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. **The reason is improvements in medical science.** But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

#### There is always value to life, it is subjective—can’t determine for others

Schwartz 2004

[“A Value to Life: Who Decides and How?” www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf]

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine’s choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient’s interests. The quality of life criterion asserts that there is a difference between the type of life and the fact of life. This is the primary difference between it and the sanctity criterion discussed on page 115. Among quality of life considerations rest three assertions: 1. there is relative value to life 2. the value of a life is determined subjectively 3. not all lives are of equal value. Relative value The first assertion, that life is of relative value, could be taken in two ways. In one sense, it could mean that the value of a given life can be placed on a scale and measured against other lives. The scale could be a social scale, for example, where the contributions or potential for contribution of individuals are measured against those of fellow citizens. Critics of quality of life criteria frequently name this as a potential slippery slope where lives would be deemed worthy of saving, or even not saving, based on the relative social value of the individual concerned. So, for example, a mother of four children who is a practising doctor could be regarded of greater value to the community than an unmarried accountant. The concern is that the potential for discrimination is too high. Because of the possibility of prejudice and injustice, supporters of the quality of life criterion reject this interpersonal construction in favour of a second, more personalized, option. According to this interpretation, the notion of relative value is relevant not between individuals but within the context of one person’s life and is measured against that person’s needs and aspirations. So Katherine would base her decision on a comparison between her life before and after her illness. The value placed on the quality of a life would be determined by the individual depending on whether he or she believes the current state to be relatively preferable to previous or future states and whether he or she can foresee controlling the circumstances that make it that way. Thus, the life of an athlete who aspires to participate in the Olympics can be changed in relative value by an accident that leaves that person a quadriplegic. The athlete might decide that the relative value of her life is diminished after the accident, because she perceives her desires and aspirations to be reduced or beyond her capacity to control. However, if she receives treatment and counselling her aspirations could change and, with the adjustment, she could learn to value her life as a quadriplegic as much or more than her previous life. This illustrates how it is possible for a person to adjust the values by which they appraise their lives. For Katherine Lewis, the decision went the opposite way and she decided that a life of incapacity and constant pain was of relatively low value to her. It is not surprising that the most vociferous protesters against permitting people in Katherine’s position to be assisted in terminating their lives are people who themselves are disabled. Organizations run by, and that represent, persons with disabilities make two assertions in this light. First, they claim that accepting that Katherine Lewis has a right to die based on her determination that her life is of relatively little value is demeaning to all disabled people, and implies that any life with a severe disability is not worth Write a list of three things that make living. Their second assertion is that with proper help, over time Katherine would be able to transform her personal outlook and find satisfaction in her life that would increase its relative value for her. The first assertion can be addressed by clarifying that the case of Katherine Lewis must not be taken as a general rule. Deontologists, who are interested in knowing general principles and duties that can be applied across all cases would not be very satisfied with this; they would prefer to be able to look to duties that would apply in all cases. Here, a case-based, context-sensitive approach is better suited. Contextualizing would permit freedom to act within a particular context, without the implication that the decision must hold in general. So, in this case, Katherine might decide that her life is relatively valueless. In another case, for example that of actor Christopher Reeve, the decision to seek other ways of valuing this major life change led to him perceiving his life as highly valuable, even if different in value from before the accident that made him a paraplegic. This invokes the second assertion, that Katherine could change her view over time. Although we recognize this is possible in some cases, it is not clear how it applies to Katherine. Here we have a case in which a rational and competent person has had time to consider her options and has chosen to end her life of suffering beyond what she believes she can endure. Ten months is a long time and it will have given her plenty of opportunity to consult with family and professionals about the possibilities open to her in the future. Given all this, it is reasonable to assume that Katherine has made a well-reasoned decision. It might not be a decision that everyone can agree with but if her reasoning process can be called into question then at what point can we say that a decision is sound? She meets all the criteria for competence and she is aware of the consequences of her decision. It would be very difficult to determine what arguments could truly justify interfering with her choice. The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### Nuclear leadership fails-Failed Nuclear Negotiations With Iran, North Korea And Pakistan

Reuters, 8-31

[Reuters, 8/31/12, “After early successes, Obama struggles to implement disarmament vision”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/31/us-usa-nuclear-arms-idUSBRE87U06B20120831>, \\wyo-bb]

Obama made significant progress on other nuclear fronts. He won adoption of a plan to strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and stepped up funding and efforts to secure nuclear materials worldwide. But there were major setbacks as well. Diplomacy and covert action have failed so far to stop Iran's suspected quest for the bomb, and denuclearization talks with North Korea are in a deep freeze. Nuclear-armed Pakistan withdrew its backing for talks on a Fissile Materials Cutoff Treaty, effectively blocking negotiations to halt production worldwide of fissile material for nuclear arms.

#### 2nd, the plan can’t solve- Protesters halt licensing while Competitors build away- Toshiba, Koreans, and Russians

Tucker 10

[William Tucker, The American Spectator Correspondent, “Nuclear Renaissance blossoms--without the USA: the world is going nuclear while we're going nowhere”, (Oct. 2010): p18., Academic OneFile. Web. 23 Aug. 2012, Academic OneFile. Web. 23 Aug. 2012., \\wyo-bb]

Yet the blame does not lie solely with the NRC. To a loud and vocal portion of the population, nuclear technology is still the devil's work, while only a few mandates and government subsidies stand between us and a world powered by wind and sunshine. In mid-July Jaczko braved a trip to Brattleboro, Vermont, where he broke bread with nearly 100 anti-nuclear crusaders trying to shut down Vermont Yankee, the 660-megawatt reactor that supplies one-third of the Green Mountain State's electricity. The crowd was the usual collection of pony-tailed men in business suits, eager young lawyers from the Nader-ite Public Interest Research Group, and well-heeled, gray-haired women who can't imagine why anyone would ever fool with nuclear power. Their verdict was unanimous: "Shut it down this afternoon!" Jaczko, of course, was accused of giving the nuclear industry a free pass and "not listening to the people." Faced with these pressures, the NRC responds by regulating the industry into the ground. Only one new reactor--the Vogtle Plant in Georgia--has received permission to begin site preparation for construction. Last July the NRC informed the utility, Southern Electric, that the dirt it was using to grade the site was inadequate. Southern was forced to go further abroad and spend more money on better dirt. Two weeks later the NRC shut down the project entirely when it discovered that a subcontractor had only asked prospective employees about drug and alcohol in interviews but failed to secure statements in writing. Work halted for three weeks. It is easy to see where this is going. If the NRC ever issues a construction license, the builder will be second-guessed on every rivet until the project is years behind schedule and $5 billion over budget. That will prove, once again, that nuclear is "too expensive to be built in this country." Meanwhile, China and Japan are building their reactors in less than four years for $5 billion. To the swift goes the race. SIX MONTHS AGO, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu electrified the industry by suggesting in a Wall Street Journal editorial that the U.S. might find a niche in building small modular reactors--something about the size of a gazebo--that can be buried in the ground and power a town of 20,000 while running for 20 years without refueling. Both Babcock & Wilcox and a California company named Hyperion have designs. Moving in this direction could break the logjam at the NRC and offer utilities bite-sized projects that would not require them to risk their entire net worth. Yet Hyperion already enquired about a license application at the NRC in 2006 and was told to go away--the Commission didn't have time for such small potatoes. (License applicants must pay the entire cost of the process, which means an investment of tens of millions.) Meanwhile, the dream that the U.S. might regain some technological lead is already fading. Toshiba has a mini-reactor it has been trying for years to sell to Galena, Alaska, an isolated village entirely dependent on diesel imports. The Russians are outfitting small reactors on barges and floating them into Siberian coastal villages. Then three months after Chu's op-ed, the Koreans announced they would also enter the field with their own mini-reactor. The idea that American companies, lumbering along under supervision of the NRC, can compete in this vigorous international market is already evaporating. So the world is going nuclear without our help.

#### Timeframe is laughable- it still requires a decade of testing and data, then another decade for writing regulations—this assumes pouring money into it

Makhijani 12

[Arjun, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, “Is Thorium A Magic Bullet For Our Energy Problems?”, Science Friday, NPR, 5.4, p. pq //wyo-tjc]

MAKHIJANI: I have a favorite molten salt reactor. My reactor is free. It's in the sky, 93 million miles away. You can store its energy in molten salt. It is being done today. You can generate electricity for 24 hours a day. The - so the impermanency problem has been solved. I don't know why - I'm still trying to understand why photovoltaics are still so expensive in this country. But you know Germany - I was at a seminar yesterday at the Heinrich Boll Foundation about the Germany decision to get out of nuclear. They're going to have a completely renewable system maybe by the time thorium reactors become commercial. This isn't going to happen tomorrow, even if you pour money into it. It would take 10 years for the NRC to understand and write regulations for this thing. And it would take 10 years before that to build the reactors, do the experiments and produce the data so you can regulate this thing, because all of our regulation is based on light water reactors. Six years ago, I might have agreed with Mr. Martin that maybe, you know, impermanency is a big problem. Somebody said you haven't looked. You really should do a study. So I did an honest, unbiased look, not thinking we could do renewable energy. And I found out that my hunch was wrong: We can do 100 percent renewable energy, and the Germans are actually aiming for it. You know, they have an export surplus with China, and we have a huge export deficit. Maybe they know something we don't know.

#### Can’t solve the economy—difficulties in short term; long timeframe

UK Dept of Energy and Climate Change 12

[United Kingdom. Department of Energy and Climate Change. *Comparison of thorium and uranium fuel cycles*. London: , Mar 2012. Web. <http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/meeting-energy-demand/nuclear/6300-comparison-fuel-cycles.pdf>. //Wyo-BF]

While economic benefits are theoretically achievable by using thorium fuels in existing LWRs, in current market conditions the position is marginal and insufficient to justify major investment by utilities: In a once-through LWR thorium cycle, thorium will displace only a fraction of the uranium fuel, the latter being necessary to provide the neutrons to convert the fertile Th-232 to fissile U-233. Moreover, the uranium fuel remaining will need to have a higher U-235 enrichment to compensate for neutron captures in Th-232, so that any savings in uranium ore and enrichment costs are likely to be marginal. On the other hand, the thorium fuel will require new fuel production facilities, with a substantial investment. Any marginal reductions in uranium ore and enrichment costs are unlikely to justify the necessary investment. In a reprocessing LWR cycle, in which the U-233 is recycled, the uranium ore and enrichment savings are likely to be improved still further and could even be eliminated altogether in the long term if a breeding cycle could be established. However, to reach this position will require major investment in thorium reprocessing and fuel fabrication plants, with significant technical and investment risk which appears not to be merited by current or reasonably foreseeable market conditions. It cannot be ruled out that the thorium fuel cycle may become competitive in LWRs in a future market environment of restricted uranium ore availability and thus very high uranium prices. This is not considered very likely for the foreseeable future, given that economically recoverable uranium reserves are thought to be very price dependent and therefore if uranium prices were to increase, then more uranium would be available to the market. It is therefore concluded that adopting the thorium fuel cycle in LWRs would only offer limited benefits. In the longer term, with strong pressure on uranium prices, Generation IV (Gen IV) systems operating with closed fuel cycles might then become competitive and that these systems would then set the competitive standard for the thorium fuel cycle. This sets the timescale on which thorium might become competitive. This is dictated by the development timescale for Gen IV systems, 20 to 30 years.

#### Still Produces a Ton of Waste- Waste problematic for Centuries, Still Highly Radio Toxic Decay

Tickell 12

[Oliver Tickell, British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative, “Thorium: Not Green, Not Viable and Not Likely,” Nuclear Pledge, June, <http://www.nuclearpledge.com/reports/thorium_briefing_2012.pdf>, \\wyo-bb]

3.6 Nuclear waste Claim: LFTRs produce far less nuclear waste than conventional solid fuel reactors. Response: LFTRs are theoretically capable of a high fuel burn-up rate, but while this may indeed reduce the volume of waste, the waste is more radioactive due to the higher volume of radioactive fission products. The continuous fuel reprocessing that is characteristic of LFTRs will also produce hazardous chemical and radioactive waste streams, and releases to the environment will be unavoidable. Claim: Liquid fluoride thorium reactors generate no high-level waste material. Response: This claim, although made in the report from the House of Lords, has no basis in fact. High-level waste is an unavoidable product of nuclear fission. Spent fuel from any LFTR will be intensely radioactive and constitute high level waste. The reactor itself, at the end of its lifetime, will constitute high level waste. Claim: the waste from LFTRs contains very few long-lived isotopes, in particular transuranic actinides such as plutonium.7 Response: the thorium fuel cycle does indeed produce very low volumes of plutonium and other long-lived actinides so long as only thorium and 233U are used as fuel. However, the waste contains many radioactive fission products and will remain dangerous for many hundreds of years. A particular hazard is the production of 232U, with its highly radio-toxic decay chain.

# 2NC

# CP

### AT: Restriction solvency deficit

#### DOD is able to claim exemptions from the restrictions, and it also creates a viable demonstration that helps to bypass their solvency deficit[green]

CSPO 10, Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes at ASU, “four policy principles for energy innovation & climate change: a synthesis”, June, <http://www.catf.us/resources/publications/files/Synthesis.pdf>

One major obstacle is to rapid commercialization and development are prolonged multi-year licensing times with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Currently, the NRC will not consider a reactor for licensing unless there is a power utility already prepared to purchase the device. Recent Senate legislation introduced by Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) has pushed for DOE support in bringing down reactor costs and in helping to license and certify two reactor designs with the NRC. Some additional opportunities to facilitate the NRC licensing process for innovative small modular reactors would be to fund NRC to conduct participatory research to get ahead of potential license applications (this might require ~$100million/year) and potentially revise the current requirement that licensing fees cover nearly all NRC licensing review costs. One option for accelerating SMR development and commercialization, would be for DOD to establish SMR procurement specifications (to include cost) and agree to purchase a sufficient amount of SMR’s to underwrite private sector SMR development. Of note here may be that DARPA recently (3/30/10) issued a “Request for Information (RFI) on Deployable Reactor Technologies for Generating Power and Logistic Fuels”2 that specifies may features that would be highly desirable in an advanced commercial SMR. While other specifications including coproduction of mobility fuel are different than those of a commercial SMR power reactor, it is likely that a core reactor design meeting the DARPA inquiry specifications would be adaptable to commercial applications. While nuclear reactors purchased and used by DOD are potentially exempt from many NRC licensing requirements3, any reactor design resulting from a DOD procurement contract would need to proceed through NRC licensing before it could be commercially offered. Successful use of procured SMR’s for DOD purposes could provide the knowledge and operational experience needed to aid NRC licensing and it might be possible for the SMR contractor to begin licensing at some point in the SMR development process4. Potential purchase of small modular nuclear reactors would be a powerful but proven way in which government procurement of new energy technologies could encourage innovation. Public procurement of other renewable energy technologies could be similarly important.

### 2NC – AT: Links To Politics

#### DOD spending is insulated from politics

Appelbaum 12

[Binyamin Appelbaum 12, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R%26D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8-12,http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say, \\wyo-bb]

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said the Defense Department had been more successful than other federal agencies because it is the main user of the innovations that it finances. The Pentagon, which spends billions each year on weapons, equipment and technology, has an unusually direct stake in the outcome of its research and development projects. "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes." Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda in controversial areas. No matter which party is in power, the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy technology, for example, in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

#### DOD is key – solves, overcomes restrictions and doesn’t link to politics

Madia 12

[William Madia, Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, Spring, "Small ModularReactors:APotential Game-changingTechnology",energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small\_Modular\_Reactors\_by\_William\_Madia,\\wyo-bb]

To determine if SMRs hold the potential for changing the game in carbon-free power generation, it is imperative that we test the design, engineering, licensing, and economic assumptions with some sort of public-private development and demonstration program. Instead of having government simply invest in research and development to “buy down” the risks associated with SMRs, I propose a more novel approach. Since the federal government is a major power consumer, it should commit to being the “first mover” of SMRs. This means purchasing the first few hundred MWs of SMR generation capacity and dedicating it to federal use. The advantages of this approach are straightforward. The government would both reduce licensing and economic risks to the point where utilities might invest in subsequent units, thus jumpstarting the SMR industry. It would then also be the recipient of additional carbon-free energy generation capacity. This seems like a very sensible role for government to play without getting into the heavy politics of nuclear waste, corporate welfare, or carbon taxes. If we want to deploy power generation technologies that can realize near-term impact on carbon emissions safely, reliably, economically, at scale, and at total costs that are manageable on the balance sheets of most utilities, we must consider SMRs as a key component of our national energy strategy.

#### DOD energy spending isn’t perceived by the public, even though other government spending is

Gail Reitenbach 12, Managing Editor, POWER Magazine, Senior Editor at The McGraw-Hill Companies, 1/1/12, “The U.S. Military Gets Smart Grid,” <http://www.powermag.com/print/smart_grid/The-U-S-Military-Gets-Smart-Grid_4228.html>

The military has an almost perfect set of conditions for developing a variety of advanced, "smart" technologies centered on electricity generation, delivery, and use.¶ Necessity. The DOD is one of the largest energy consumers worldwide and the single largest energy consumer in the U.S. At a White House Energy Security Forum in April 2011, Deputy Defense Secretary William J. Lynn III noted that the DOD accounts for 80% of U.S. federal energy use (and somewhere between 1% and 2% of nationwide consumption), consumes more energy than is used by two-thirds of all the nations on Earth, and has annual energy bills in the tens of billions of dollars ($15 billion in 2010). As in the civilian world, the number of electrically powered devices keeps increasing, so demand tends to rise as well. Consequently, ensuring a reliable supply of energy for both transportation and power can be challenging. ¶ Surety of supply poses challenges for both stationary and FOB installations. According to Lynn, more than 70% of convoys in Afghanistan are used to transport fuel or water and are easy targets for insurgents' roadside bombs. More than 3,000 U.S. troops and contractors had been killed or wounded protecting them as of April 2011. ¶ The desire to keep its people safe—by minimizing the amount of fuel that U.S. forces need to move around in combat zones to fuel electricity generators and vehicles—is a powerful motivating factor for many of the military's smart grid, energy efficiency, and renewable energy initiatives. ¶ Sharon E. Burke, assistant secretary of defense for operational energy plans and programs, told the audience at the Military Smart Grids and Microgrids Conference in October 2011: "When you consider that we move about 50 million gallons of fuel every month right now in Afghanistan, much of which is for power generation, you begin to understand the huge financial cost of this fuel." Burke noted that the fuel powers more than 15,000 generators in Afghanistan alone. She added that better combat power generation has benefits that include less need for fuel, reduced noise and heat signatures, less maintenance, and a lighter force. ¶ Protecting defense-related people, projects, and property at home is also a concern. Remember that DOD facilities are, for the most part, connected to the national grid, making them vulnerable to massive outages like those experienced in 2003 in the Northeast and in 2011 in the Southwest. ¶ Money. Though some Americans may balk at the Department of Energy (DOE) issuing grants and loan guarantees to advance utility smart grid or renewable projects, they are much less aware of the money spent through the Pentagon on similar projects for the military. ¶ For example, Dorothy Robyn, DOD deputy undersecretary for installations and environment, told Defense News on Oct. 31, 2011: "I've been delegated the authority to sign off on renewable projects that go out beyond the 10-year authority that most federal agencies have. We're the only federal agency that has the authority to go out to 30 years. What that does is allow us to do projects that are bigger and have a longer payback period." Robyn also noted that her department can take advantage of third-party financing for renewable and energy efficiency projects.

# Biomass

Xtnd

VOA 12- Lack of good governance means investment gets bogged down in bureaucracy in India, taking investment- means aff doesn’t solve the internal link to their advantage because they can’t fiat past India’s governance structure-

And several alt causes to growth slow down that causes poverty- global downturn, bad governance, etc.

No disease impact – never died from a plague that’s posner

#### Consequentialism is key to ethical decision making, because it ensures beings are treated as equal—any other approach to ethics is arbitrary because it considers one’s preferences as more important than others

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles.

#### Preventing death is the first ethical priority – it’s the only impact you can’t recover from.

Zygmunt Bauman, University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, 1995, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.
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#### Prolif will be slow- empirics prove that India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Iran’s nuclear ambitions haven’t had a cascading effect on their regions- prolif moves at a glacial pace- that’s Algappa 8

#### Possibility of devastating nuclear response means new nuclear states won’t escalate war to the nuclear realm- that’s Waltz 3

#### New nuclear states won’t escalate

Waltz 03

[Kenneth N., Emeritus Prof. of IR at Berkeley, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, WW Norton, pg. 27-29]

**An opponent who attacks what is unambiguously mine risks suffering great distress if I have second-strike forces**. This statement has important implications for both the deter­rer and the deterred. **Where territorial claims are shadowy and disputed, deterrent writs do not run.** As Steven J. Rosen has said, "It is difficult to imagine Israel committing national suicide to hold on to Abu Rudeis or Hebron or Mount Hermon." 27 Establishing the credibility of a deterrent force requires moderation of territorial claims on the part of the would-be deterrer. For modest states, weapons whose very existence works strongly against their use are just what is wanted. **In a nuclear world, conservative would-be attackers will be prudent, but will would-be attackers be conservative?** A new Hitler is not unimaginable. Would the presence of nuclear weapons have moderated Hitler's behavior? Hitler did not start World War II in order to destroy the Third Reich. Indeed, he was dismayed by British and French declarations of war on Poland's behalf. After all, the western democracies had not come to the aid of a geographically defensible and militarily strong Czechoslovakia. Why then should they have declared war on behalf of an indefensible Poland and against a Germany made stronger by the incorporation of Czechoslo­vakia's armor? From the occupation of the Rhineland in 1936 to the invasion of Poland in 1939, Hitler's calculations were realistically made. In those years, Hitler would have been deterred from acting in ways that immediately threatened massive death and widespread destruction in Germany. And, even if Hitler had not been deterred, would his generals have obeyed his commands? **In a nuclear world, to act in blatantly offensive ways is madness**. Under the circumstances, how many generals would obey the commands of a madman? One man alone does not make war. To believe that nuclear deterrence would have worked against Germany in 1939 is easy. It is also easy to believe that in 1945, given the ability to do so, Hitler and some few around him would have fired nuclear warheads at the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union as their armies advanced, whatever the consequences for Germany. Two considerations work against this possibility: the first applies in any world; the second in a nuclear world. **First, when defeat is seen to be inevitable, a ruler's authority may vanish**. Early in 1945, Hitler apparently ordered the initiation of gas warfare, but his generals did not respond. 28 **Second, no country will press a nuclear nation to the point of decisive defeat.** In the despera­tion of defeat, desperate measures may be taken, and the last thing anyone wants to do is to make a nuclear nation desper­ate. The unconditional surrender of a nuclear nation cannot be demanded. Nuclear weapons affect the deterrer as well as the deterred.

#### Prolif will be slow even in the new era.

Tepperman ‘9 (Jonathon, former Deputy Managing Ed. Foreig Affairs and Assistant Managing Ed. Newsweek, Newsweek, “Why Obama should Learn to Love the Bomb”, 44:154, 9-7, L/N)

The risk of an arms race--with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one--is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; **that's spread at glacial pace**." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors--Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say--might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

# Space

Space col not possible

Mars isn’t habitable- Bell 05 says that lack of enough air, huge temperature swings and possibility of artificial habitats thawing portions of mars and ruining the habitat

Biological effects- Theunis 10 ays astronauts on space stations experience depreciated immune system capabilities, muscle use an dbone loss, degrading biological processes- means artificial gravity can’t solve and the longer we’re in space the worse off we are

### Microgravity Take-out

#### Microgravity means that humans won’t survive in space even if they can get off the rock

Giancarlo Genta, Technical University of Turin and Michael Rycroft, International Space University, Space, The Final Frontier? 2003 p. 115-6

Even if microgravity is a very interesting condition for many scientific experiments, it could be detrimental for all living organisms. Our human anatomy has evolved on the surface of the Earth in an environment with a well-determined value of gravitational acceleration. Any decrease (or, even more, any increase) of gravitational acceleration will affect the operation of many Vital organs. Before Laika, the first liVing being to withstand micrograVity conditions, survived for a fairly long time on the Sputnik 2 satellite, some biologists held that life was utterly impossible without a gravitational field. Now we know that humans (and animals) can survive for a very long time in conditions of weightlessness, but their health is affected. Sdme effects, like space sickness, a combination of nausea, sweating, vomiting and loss of appetite, occur in the first few days of a space mis- sion. Other symptoms develop more gradually, but have more lasting consequences. There is a general redistribution of all bodily fluids, car- diovascular changes, loss of bone material, and a height increase. The human body is grossly overdesigned for conditions of weightlessness and, in an effort to compensate, reduces the superfluous parts — the bones, the muscles, the heart, and so on. These changes are of little consequence in orbit, but problematical for withstanding the stresses of re-entry and on returning to Earth. Very long periods in space, as experienced by Russian cosmonauts aboard the Mu space station, show that such damage may be limited with regular physical exercise. After more than one year in orbit, re-adaptation to normal gravity conditions on Earth was fairly easy, if a proper exercise regime had been followed in space.
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#### Turns space- Labor crisis in aerospace now – temporary workers key to industry competitiveness and innovation

**AIAA 10** [American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, "Recruiting, retaining, and developing a world-class aerospace workforce: An AIAA Information Paper, presented at the AIAA's 13th Annual AIAA Congressional Visits Day in March 2010, pdf, <http://www.doleta.gov/brg/indprof/aerospace_report.pdf>]

Without a strong aerospace workforce, the United States will lose the resulting economic and national security benefits. Incentives are needed for industry to invest in domestic aerospace workforce development, and for U.S. students to choose an engineering career. Barriers to employing talented foreign nationals must also be removed. Aerospace represents about $200 billion (or 1.5%) of the domestic economy and in 1997 provided a $56 billion positive trade balance. The aerospace workforce is the foundation of the industry’s success, yet unique workforce demographics present challenges. Figure 11 shows the age distribution of the aerospace business workforce compared to the total U.S. workforce. Up to half of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within five years. Aerospace workforce composition does not match national demographic averages. Compared to the total US workforce, the aerospace industry and NASA have a disproportionately large percentage of workers aged 4055, and a disproportionately small percentage of workers younger than 40. Student loans, research dollars to support universities, and service scholarships can provide incentives for younger workers to consider aerospace and join the industry. If talented young engineers are not recruited, retained, and developed to replace the workforce generation that is near retirement, then the U.S. stands to lose the valuable economic and critical national security benefits of the domestic aerospace industry. As shown in Figure 22, large percentages of engineers are working outside the science and engineering professions. Engineering students burdened with college loans are seeking greener pastures. As shown in Figure 33, aerospace engineering salaries are low compared to other industries. If the U.S. is to retain its edge in this industry, salaries need to rise and incentives given for entering the industry. Further, since 1980, the number of nonacademic science and engineering jobs has grown at more than four times the rate of the U.S. labor force as a whole2. With a growing number of science and engineering jobs anticipated, the supply of visas set aside under law for “highly qualified foreign workers,” – 65,000 a year4 – is not enough. A decline in student, exchange, and temporary high-skilled worker visas issued since 2001 interrupted a long-term trend of growth. The number of student visas and of temporary high-skilled worker visas issued have both declined by more than 25% since FY 2001. These declines were due both to fewer applications and to an increase in the proportion of visa applications rejected2.To add to the supply pressures of science and engineering workers in our economy, there is increased recruitment of high-skilled labor, including scientists and engineers, by many national governments and private firms. For example, in 1999, 241,000 individuals entered Japan with temporary high-skill work visas, a 75 percent increase over 19925. Research and development [R&D] expenditures keep the aerospace industry strong and help maintain US leadership in this sector. As shown in Figure 46, the R&D tax credit is working to increase corporate spending on this important activity. In the early 1990s, after implementation of the R&D tax credit legislation, private expenditures on R&D rose2. Yet even with this incentive, U.S. industry research and development funding is lagging. In 2001, US industry spent more on tort litigation than on research and development4. Perhaps as a result, American companies are lagging in patents. In 2005, only four American companies ranked among the top 10 corporate recipients of patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office4. And to further add to this distressing R&D dollars situation, federal research funding is lagging as well. The amount invested annually by the US federal government in research in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering combined is less than what Americans spend on potato chips7,8. RECOMMENDATIONS To remain globally competitive, the U.S. must adopt policies to increase our talent base in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), must educate, engage, and retain STEM professionals using means consistent with generational changes in technologies and markets, and must provide incentives for investment in research and development that helps to attract applicable talent. The AIAA recommends policies in three areas to achieve these goals: incentives for college students to study engineering, and corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, and immigration for STEM professionals. In the area of incentives for college students to study engineering, forgivable loan programs should be implemented for students who study engineering and enter the domestic technical workforce. Service scholarships should be created to pay college for students who desire to and will serve in aerospace-related U.S. government agencies after graduation. In addition, investments must be made in aerospace research infrastructure and increasing R&D funding to universities, since good research opportunities attract talented students into graduate STEM studies. R&D dollars provide a fourfold return by supporting graduate students, generating knowledge, creating innovation opportunities for small businesses around universities, and building the next generation of talented engineers. In the area of corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, targeted tax credits or incentives should be instituted for domestic aerospace workforce development expenses. An IR&D-like program for aerospace workforce development should be established by allowing a small percentage of government contract funding to aerospace companies to go into a development fund to be used on effective programs to expand domestic workforce capabilities. In addition, the R&D tax credit should be made permanent, providing stability to corporate fiscal policies, and thereby fostering a critical technology and engineering research environment that attracts the best and brightest into the technology and engineering fields. Lastly, in the area of immigration, barriers should be removed so that the US may retain talented foreign nationals in STEM professions critical to the aerospace industry.

#### Immigration reform is key to fighting cultural systemic violence

Bañuelas, 10

[Arturo, “The lies are killing us: The need for immigration reform,” US Catholic, October 2010, [www.uscatholic.org/culture/social-justice/2010/10/lies-are-killing-us-need-immigration-reform](http://www.uscatholic.org/culture/social-justice/2010/10/lies-are-killing-us-need-immigration-reform) //uwyo-baj]

Immigrants like Marisol show us that immigration reform is more than simply a matter of human rights for undocumented immigrants. It is a matter of survival for the poorest. No child of God should ever have to leave her family at 5 years of age to be able to eat and survive in our world. Like the majority of people who cross the border, these are not terrorists or drug smugglers but our brothers and sisters. The growing anti-immigrant sentiment in our country since 9/11 did not happen because people suddenly wanted to become cruel and heartless. It began because people started believing a lie about who we Latinos are, both documented and undocumented. This is why immigration is a defining issue that is about us—all of us Latinos—and about how we will shape the future of our church and our country. There is a saying in Spanish, "La mentira nos trae la muerte." Lies bring death. The lie is that immigrants, and by association all of us Latinos, are disposable as human beings and not worthy of human dignity and respect. And this lie is killing us. An immigrant recently told me, "I've been sacrificing myself for my family, but in this country I am worth nothing." Latinos and immigrants encounter racism, resentment, and extreme hostilities against them, and they masquerade as patriotism and now also as national security. By now we are familiar with the countless problems immigrants endure as a result of this lie: an increase in border deaths to more than 400 a year; raids, arrests, and deportations separating families; a backlog in family reunification and visa requests; militarization of the border; sexual exploitation of women immigrants traveling north; abuses in detention centers. Arizona has recently made national headlines for passing harsh anti-immigrant laws, but today more than 20 states have introduced even harsher laws than Arizona. The solutions these laws propose perpetuate lies, persecute innocent people, expose all of us Latinos to racial profiling, and cause death and suffering to the poor. Those who say that they are not against immigrants yet support such oppressive laws are practicing backdoor racism at its worst. Sure, every nation has a right to protect its borders against impending threats, but immigrants working to feed their children are not a threat to anyone. Their presence is not a threat, it is a human right; and we support their right to a better life. Many today scapegoat the poor for self-serving political gain, for economic greed, and security fears. Their lies blind people from seeing Christ in others and keep them from hearing the gospel call to hospitality of the stranger among us. These lies are being used to justify injustice and foster racism that causes pervasive exploitation of immigrants, who are demonized as illegal, as alien, as suspicious human beings. Since the majority of the more than 90 nationalities that daily cross our borders are from the Americas, it is our Latinidad itself that is being attacked. We know that the root causes of immigration include extreme poverty, unemployment, political and military corruption, and government instability in the countries of origin. However, we Latinos and Latinas throughout the Americas also know that the United States shares in the responsibility for these conditions that drive immigrants north across our borders. It is not a secret that once the estimated 12 to 20 million currently undocumented immigrants become citizens, our country will be different. This process has already begun, but wait until we get to vote, buy homes, graduate from universities, and become elected officials. Es mentira, it is a lie that immigrants will not learn English. In our parish we have some 100 people learning English to become citizens, and similar programs exist all over. Es mentira that all immigrants are here illegally. The truth is that the majority are here on some type of visa. Es mentira that stronger enforcement along the U.S.-Mexico border will stop immigrants from crossing the border. It is jobs that bring immigrants to the United States. Es mentira that immigrants are draining our health care and educational systems. The fact is that immigrants contribute about $90 billion in taxes, much more than the $5 billion they use in services. Despite these lies I feel optimistic because this is our time, this is Latino time. We are coming of age, and we want to help fashion a new nation: one that is more just, equal, and free for all citizens, especially the poorest. But we will need to do this the Latino way, grounded in a new vision we inherited from our indigenous ancestors, who said, "Tu eres mi otro yo," you are my other self. This is a profound spiritual vision of life, an economic program for justice, a cultural solution for peace, and an authentic reform for human dignity. Tu eres mi otro yo is the Latino way. We are all linked as one. We stand together, or we fall together. We are each other, and we need to help each other. Our ancestors teach us: If I despise you, I despise myself. And if I promote the good in you, I promote the goodness in me and everyone else. Our fathers, mothers, and abuelos have always taught what Christ teaches us: that we were made good and for good. When we see life from this decidedly Latino worldview, we discover that there are more good people in the world than bad, that the world is in truth moving toward this oneness. This is the Latino good news. I believe that our greatest meaning in life comes from our solidarity with others, especially the struggling poorest among us. As long as they do not eat, have health care, get a good education, live in decent housing, get treated with respect and dignity, then we all remain incomplete in ourselves and as a nation. In a time of such propaganda, lies, drastic poverty, violence, racism, and war, in this time when human life seems so dirt cheap, we must proclaim that each person matters, that they matter enormously to us because tu eres mi otro yo. As a Latino from the border I have reason to feel optimistic about life and our future because in us we carry this deep Latino desire to live out our God-given oneness; at the end of all our human struggles, we will see that it is our oneness that will win over lies, divisions, hate, and racism. In the end the glory will go to those who know how to embrace tu eres mi otro yo. In the end victory comes in our togetherness. I look at our Latino history in terms of the biblical story of the Exodus: Some have crossed the sea into the Promised Land of no more borders. Others are still in the water trying to make it to land. And some arrived late and are still wandering in the desert. Moses told them to be at the edge of the sea by 10 a.m., but, being Latino, they arrived at noon. They are still out there dreaming and wondering what it will be like when they get to the other side. Some of them are dying without water, acceptance, lack of health care, food, or shelter. But today we say, "Come, venganse," we are with you because our ministries represent solidarity in the struggle for human rights for all people. The divisive border wall exists also in our hearts. When the border fence went up, I was part of a march protesting it. I remember walking up to the ugly steel barrier. I put my fingers through the fence, and I felt deep anger. I wanted to tear it down with my bare hands. I kept remembering the Raramuri children in our parish missions in Mexico's northern Sierra Tarahumara, who do not have enough to eat, whose fathers and brothers search for ways to feed their families. Holding the fence I remembered their empty stomachs. I could hear Ester ask her mother, "Are we going to eat today?" Holding the fence in my hands, I said a prayer. I asked Jesus to forgive us. And I asked la Virgen de Guadalupe to protect her children. What the fence says is: "I don't want you to be my other self." Those of us who live on the border question whether the racial make-up of our families has anything to do with the fact that Canada and the Atlantic and Pacific coasts do not have disgusting walls, yet their combined border miles far exceed our 2,000-mile-long southwest border. This immoral wall along our border and in our nation's heart is causing moral damage to the nation's soul with long-term consequences far beyond the fears we have of terrorists. It says that we have stopped dreaming of the possibilities to help each other as human beings in the land of the free. It says that we have given in to smallness of our hearts because of the fear-filled lies that claim doom when we welcome the strangers in our midst. This ugly $242 billion wall is a wake-up call that our national leadership has failed to help us and that it is time for us to offer a better vision for national problems. We need to stop the further construction of this wall, tear it down, and make good use of the materials. What we need instead is just, comprehensive immigration reform, which will help America become a decent nation. This is an historic moment for us. We have never been this close to immigration reform, and we are not backing down because we are not afraid of those who oppose us. I have seen in the faces of Latinos all over the country that we are ready to show our resolve, our conviction, and our dedication to the immigrants and to reform. We want to do what it takes because we deeply believe that justice will triumph over hate, that love will conquer racism, and that common compassion will overcome the lies.

#### Will pass-Republican change of heart

Lilley Feb. 4th

[Sandra Lilley, writer for NBC Latino, Feb. 4h, 2013, Bipartisan House group hopes to unveil immigration reform plan by next week, <http://nbclatino.com/2013/02/04/bipartisan-house-group-hopes-to-unveil-immigration-reform-plan-by-next-week/>, uwyo//amp]

In fact, Gonzales says, out of all the issues the House debates this term, including gun control legislation and the debt ceiling, he thinks immigration legislation has the best chance of passing. ”The two parties are interested in reform for two different reasons. Democrats see it as a fairness issue, and for Republicans there is a political component, “says Gonzales. ”Overall, the rhetoric on the Republican side has shifted, and traditional Republican business groups are more open to find a way to reach an agreement,” he adds.

#### Will pass- bipartisan

#### Will pass- bipartisan

#### Gonzales Feb. 3rd

[Daniel Gonzales, The Arizona Republic writer, Feb. 3rd, 2013, Paths to immigration reform will be bumpy<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/02/03/immigration-reform-path-bumpy/1888233/>, uwyo//amp]

PHOENIX -- President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of eight senators have set the stage for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform this year. But passing a broad bill that addresses all aspects of immigration as Obama and the bipartisan group have proposed is fraught with obstacles, any one of which could derail the entire bill, as it did the last time Congress tried to tackle comprehensive immigration reform. The two plans, announced last week, put forth guidelines for beefing up border security, legalizing undocumented immigrants and cracking down on employers who hire illegal workers. Their vision also would streamline the nation's vast and complicated legal immigration system to better meet the labor needs of the economy and dissuade illegal immigration while trying to prevent families from being split apart.

#### Will pass- momentum and bipartisan support

Levey Feb. 3rd

[Noam Levey, Feb. 3rd, 2013, LA times writer, Reid predicts the Senate will pass immigration reform, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/03/news/la-immigration-reform-reid-predicts-senate-pass-20130203>, uwyo//amp]

WASHINGTON – Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said Sunday he is optimistic the Senate will pass immigration legislation, suggesting Republicans will have no choice but to join the push for a sweeping overhaul. “Things are looking really good,” the Nevada Democrat said in an interview on ABC News’ “This Week.” “Republicans can no longer stop this. They’ve tried it; it hasn’t worked.” A bipartisan group of senators – four Democrats and four Republicans – last week unveiled a blueprint for comprehensive legislation that would tighten border security and set up a path for illegal immigrants to get citizenship. And several leading GOP lawmakers have noted that the party, which lost heavily among Latino voters in the 2012 presidential election, must take action on the immigration issue.

#### First, imm>top of the docket

TNW 1/25

[The Next Web. “The Senate will move next week on comprehensive high-skill immigration reform,” 2013, <http://thenextweb.com/us/2013/01/25/the-senate-will-move-next-week-on-comprehensive-high-skill-immigration-reform/>]

Today The Hill obtained a copy of a forthcoming proposed law dubbed the ‘Immigration Innovation Act.’ Critically, it is backed by a bipartisan collection of Senators, giving it a clear shot at clearing the upper chamber of the United States Congress.¶ While likely h, the bill’s two key tenets would dramatically improve the high-skill immigration system of the United States. According to The Hill’s notes, the act would:¶ Completely end the cap on the total, yearly number of H-1B visas that American companies can apply for, providing that they are applying for a foreign graduate with a technical degree of an American university. TNW isn’t sure, but we’re assuming that degrees that fall under the “STEM” rubric are what will be required.¶ Improve the extant H-1B system by adding 40,000 slots each year. Also, the act would grant more H-1B visas based on market demand, provided that the new 115,000 visa ceiling was reached before the end of the year. This system would have a final cap of 300,000.¶ The bill does allow for spouses of H-1B visa holders to live and work inside of the United States. The House will likely have issues with the provision. Given that the House has been home to various immigration conspiracy theories, it would be out of character for it to keep its marbles this time around. This bill is a massive improvement on the laws tossed around during the last Congress.¶ The previous bill included fewer high-skilled visas, did not create the education exception, and perhaps most oddly ended the popular ‘green card lottery.’ That specific provision ended the proposed law’s chance of becoming law.¶ Here is the list of tipped co-sponsors for the Immigration Innovation Act: “Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.).”¶ If it can quickly pass the Senate, and receives a nod from the President, the House will be under immense pressure to pass it as well, but it could become weighed down with ponderous amendments that could be viewed as poison pills, roughly.¶ In his inaugural address, the President called for an improvement of the country’s high-skill immigration system. He may get it.

#### Obama pushing immigration NOW – should pass – avoiding political divisions key. Guns and Money fights now won’t thump it. Fighting for high-skilled workers, path to citizenship, and a guest worker program

PRESTON 1 – 12 – 13 NYT Staff [Julia Preston, Obama Will Seek Citizenship Path in One Fast Push, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/13/us/politics/obama-plans-to-push-congress-on-immigration-overhaul.html?\_r=0]

President Obama plans to push Congress to move quickly in the coming months on an ambitious overhaul of the immigration system that would include a path to citizenship for most of the 11 million illegal immigrants in the country, senior administration officials and lawmakers said last week.

Mr. Obama and Senate Democrats will propose the changes in one comprehensive bill, the officials said, resisting efforts by some Republicans to break the overhaul into smaller pieces — separately addressing young illegal immigrants, migrant farmworkers or highly skilled foreigners — which might be easier for reluctant members of their party to accept.

The president and Democrats will also oppose measures that do not allow immigrants who gain legal status to become American citizens one day, the officials said.

Even while Mr. Obama has been focused on fiscal negotiations and gun control, overhauling immigration remains a priority for him this year, White House officials said. Top officials there have been quietly working on a broad proposal. Mr. Obama and lawmakers from both parties believe that the early months of his second term offer the best prospects for passing substantial legislation on the issue.

Mr. Obama is expected to lay out his plan in the coming weeks, perhaps in his State of the Union address early next month, administration officials said. The White House will argue that its solution for illegal immigrants is not an amnesty, as many critics insist, because it would include fines, the payment of back taxes and other hurdles for illegal immigrants who would obtain legal status, the officials said.

The president’s plan would also impose nationwide verification of legal status for all newly hired workers; add visas to relieve backlogs and allow highly skilled immigrants to stay; and create some form of guest-worker program to bring in low-wage immigrants in the future.

A bipartisan group of senators has also been meeting to write a comprehensive bill, with the goal of introducing legislation as early as March and holding a vote in the Senate before August. As a sign of the keen interest in starting action on immigration, White House officials and Democratic leaders in the Senate have been negotiating over which of them will first introduce a bill, Senate aides said.

“This is so important now to both parties that neither the fiscal cliff nor guns will get in the way,” said Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, a Democrat who is a leader of the bipartisan discussions.

A similar attempt at bipartisan legislation early in Mr. Obama’s first term collapsed amid political divisions fueled by surging public wrath over illegal immigration in many states. But both supporters and opponents say conditions are significantly different now.

Memories of the results of the November election are still fresh here. Latinos, the nation’s fastest-growing electorate, turned out in record numbers and cast 71 percent of their ballots for Mr. Obama. Many Latinos said they were put off by Republicans’ harsh language and policies against illegal immigrants.

After the election, a host of Republicans, starting with Speaker John A. Boehner, said it was time for the party to find a more positive, practical approach to immigration. Many party leaders say electoral demographics are compelling them to move beyond policies based only on tough enforcement.

Supporters of comprehensive changes say that the elections were nothing less than a mandate in their favor, and that they are still optimistic that Mr. Obama is prepared to lead the fight.

“Republicans must demonstrate a reasoned approach to start to rebuild their relationship with Latino voters,” said Clarissa Martinez de Castro, the director of immigration policy at the National Council of La Raza, a Latino organization. “Democrats must demonstrate they can deliver on a promise.”

Since the election, Mr. Obama has repeatedly pledged to act on immigration this year. In his weekly radio address on Saturday, he again referred to the urgency of fixing the immigration system, saying it was one of the “difficult missions” the country must take on.

#### Avoiding controversy for next months is key

Charles Babington, AP Writer, “Obama Agenda Provides Long Work List To Tackle When He Returns”, 12/24/2012

WASHINGTON (AP) — It's hardly a secret that Barack Obama, like every president no doubt, muses about his ultimate legacy and spot in the presidential pantheon. He approaches his second term confronting tough and shifting challenges that will play big roles in shaping the rest of his presidency and his eventual place in history.¶ In the coming months, Obama will have to decide where to be ambitious, where to be cautious, and where to buy time.¶ He draws political strength from his surprisingly easy re-election in a bad economy. It's partly offset, however, by Republicans' continued control of the House, plus their filibuster powers in the Senate.

#### Fourth, The debate is irrelevant- PC impacts are not perceived until the vote when legislation crosses Obama’s desk

Drum 10

[Kevin, Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming off the back-burner”, <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>, March]

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### Second, Framing issue—capital gets it through—the plan drains his capital and destroys his agenda prioritization

Chris Cillizza, WaPo, 1/21/13, President Obama’s second term starts today. It ends sooner than you think., www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/01/21/president-obama-second-term-starts-today-it-ends-in-sooner-than-you-think/

At the moment, President Obama is at the height of his political influence. He is less than three months removed from a convincing reelection victory and freed from concerns about ever having to run for office again. He is coming off of two straight legislative wins — fiscal cliff and debt ceiling — and has a huge polling edge over his congressional Republican adversaries. That means that now is the time for Obama to move on his major legislative priorities — the first of which appears to be winning some sort of tightening of existing gun laws in the wake of the Newtown, Conn., tragedy. Obama also seems likely to push on immigration. And then there is the triple-headed economic monster: sequestration, a potential government shutdown and the debt ceiling. The president must choose carefully how hard he pushes on each of his priorities — and for how long. Much of his first term — and the political capital he brought into it — was spent on fights over the economic stimulus package and his health-care plan. While both of those legislative initiatives became law, it was at considerable political cost to Obama and his party — and at the expense of other priorities like energy, for example. No matter what pieces of the Obama agenda mentioned above make it through Congress as spring turns to summer in 2014, the attention of the political world will turn away from legislative fights and to the coming midterm campaign. (Prepare to hear a lot about the so-called “six-year itch” election.) In expectation of that election, Congress will avoid any sort of major legislative action from the summer on as both parties seek to avoid exposure as they make their case to voters in the fall. Once the midterms end, the 2016 presidential race, which is already showing signs of getting started, will burst out into the open with a few candidates likely declaring their intent to run by the close of 2014. With the race expected to be open on both sides — assuming Vice President Biden decides not to run — the level of interest in the contest to come will be substantial. (Human nature dictates that we love the next big thing more than the current big thing.) Add it all up and what you get is this: By the start of 2015, Obama’s power to drive his legislative agenda will be significantly less than it is today. What his second term meant (or didn’t) will have already be largely determined by then. The president has 18 months, then — give or take a few months — to build out his political legacy. Which means he needs to get moving as quickly as possible or run the risk of running out of political power before he can get done even most of what he hopes will round out his presidency in this second term.

#### Third, Obama has PC and it is the immigration tiebreaker- cements the deal

Manuel Feb. 1

[Andre Manuel, writer for The Politic, February 1st, 2013, Politics at Play in Push for Immigration Reform, <http://thepolitic.org/politics-at-play-in-push-for-immigration-reform/>, uwyo//amp]

Yet, there is reason to believe things will turn out differently this time. The Republican Party is still reeling from its defeat in the 2012 Presidential election. Its leaders are coming to terms with the nation’s changing demographics; for the Party to remain relevant, it can’t continue to receive 29 percent of the Latino vote, as it did in 2012. Thus even a Republican majority in the House of Representatives, which will be sure to oppose President Obama at nearly every step along the way during his second term, may get behind immigration reform, which is widely popular in the Latino community, to avoid future electoral defeats. The combination of President Obama’s political capital following the 2012 landslide, the GOP’s desire to reach out to the Hispanic community, and the current plan’s bipartisan support may propel it to a better fate than its 2005 counterpart. This Republican political maneuver may usher in greater opportunities for millions of undocumented workers. But only time will tell.

#### Contentious debate ensures plan is not perceived as a victory

Mann, Brookings Governance Studies senior fellow, 10

[Thomas, Brookings, November, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections”, <http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2010/11_midterm_elections_mann.aspx>, accessed 6-20-11]

The well-documented successes of the financial stabilisation and stimulus initiatives are invisible to a public reacting to the here and now, not to the counterfactual of how much worse it might have been. The painfully slow recovery from the global financial crisis and Great Recession have led most Americans to believe these programmes have failed and as a consequence they judge the President and Congress harshly. HIGHLY POLARISED That perception of failure has been magnified by the highly contentious process by which Obama’s initiatives have been adopted in Congress. America has in recent years developed a highly polarised party system, with striking ideological differences between the parties and unusual unity within each. But these parliamentary-like parties operate in a governmental system in which majorities are unable readily to put their programmes in place. Republicans adopted a strategy of consistent, unified, and aggressive opposition to every major component of the President’s agenda, eschewing negotiation, bargaining and compromise, even on matters of great national import. The Senate filibuster has been the indispensable weapon in killing, weakening, slowing, or discrediting all major legislation proposed by the Democratic majority.

#### Extinction

Kemp 10

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

# RND Seven

# 1NC

### 1st Off

#### [A.] Interpretation: production of natural gas and oil is distinct from exploration

Energy Information Agency, no date (Glossary, Energy Information Agency, http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm, acsd 5-12)

Preproduction costs: Costs of prospecting for, acquiring, exploring, and developing mineral reserves incurred prior to the point when production of commercially recoverable quantities of minerals commences.

#### [B.] Violation: affirmative removes restrictions on exploration of crude oil [C.] Reason to prefer:

#### Ground: Components of the supply chain outside of production are key to negative capacity to challenge the necessity of adding more supply. -Exploration ground kills exploration/study counterplans and case takeout arguments against production centered approaches on energy. -Exploration ground would allow affirmatives to not actually defend an increase of production if the area of interest doesn’t have the capacity for being commercially viable. -Production centered ground is sufficient because it has structural market effects that allow the affirmative to implicate the other sectors.

#### Limits: Components of the supply chain outside of production unlimits affirmative potential and predictable constraints for the negative -There are a ton of areas that could possibly be explored – it would be impossible to predict all of them. -Allowing preproduction opens the affirmative to directly promoting other upstream sections of the chain as well - includes transportation affs, refinery affs, and marketing affs.

#### [D.] Voting Issue: competitive equity and education.

### 2nd OFf

#### Obama pc key to immigration and will pass now- Hard line key to defeat Republicans

Spetalnick & Crowan Feb. 4th

[Matt Spetalnick and Richard Cowan, Reuters, February 4th, 2013, Obama, aides seek momentum on immigration reform this week, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/04/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130204>, uwyo//amp]

The flurry of activity, including new moves in Congress, comes amid disagreement between the Democratic president and Republicans over the question of citizenship for illegal immigrants, an obstacle that could make it hard to reach a final deal on sweeping legislation. Obama is expected to use his February 12 State of the Union speech to Congress to keep the heat on Republicans, who appear more willing to accept an immigration overhaul after they were chastened by Latino voters' rejection in the November election. But differences have emerged since Obama and a bipartisan Senate working "group of eight" rolled out their proposals last week aimed at the biggest U.S. immigration revamp in decades. Obama wants to give America's 11 million illegal immigrants a clear process to achieve citizenship, including payment of fines, criminal background checks and going to the "back of the line" behind legal applicants, and has vowed to introduce his own bill if Congress fails to act in a timely fashion. But top Republicans want to defer citizenship until the county's borders are deemed more secure - a linkage that Obama and most of his fellow Democrats would find hard to accept. Obama's aides are confident the president has enough leverage to avoid giving ground - not least because they believe that if the reform effort fails in Congress, voters are more likely to blame the Republicans and they would suffer in the 2014 midterm congressional elections.

#### Skilled worker access will determine the future of the biotech industry

**Dahms 3**, executive director of the California State University System Biotechnology Program (CSUPERB); chair of the Workforce Committee, Biotechnology Industry Organization; and a member of the ASBMB Education and Professional Development Committee, (A. Stephen, “ Foreign Scientists Seen Essential to U.S. Biotechnology,” in Pan-Organizational Summit on the U.S. Science and Engineering Workforce: Meeting Summary, National Academy of Sciences, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/picrender.fcgi?book=nap10727&blobtype=pdf>)

The scarcity of skilled technicians is seen by the biotechnology industry in the U.S. and Canada as one of its most serious challenges. The success of this industry is dependent on the quality of its workforce, and the skills and talents of highly trained people are recognized as one of the most vital and dynamic sources of competitive advantage. The U.S. biotechnology industry workforce has been growing 14 to 17 percent annually over the last six years and is now over 190,000 and conservatively estimated to reach 500,000 by 2012. Despite efforts by the industry to encourage U.S. institutions to increase the production of needed specialists, a continual shortfall in the needed expertise requires access to foreign workers. Foreign workers with unique skills that are scarce in the U.S. can get permission to stay in the U.S. for up to six years under the H1B classification, after which they can apply for permanent resident status. There are currently over 600,000 foreign workers in this category across all industries, and they are critical to the success and global competitiveness of this nation. Of these H-1B visa holders, 46 percent are from India and 10 percent are from China, followed in descending order by Canada, Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, U.K., Pakistan, and the Russian Federation. Our annual national surveys have demonstrated that between 6 and 10 percent of the biotechnology workforce have H-1B visas. The constant shortfall in specialized technical workers that has been experienced by the biotechnology industry over the past six years has been partially alleviated by access to talented individuals from other nations. However, the industry’s need is sufficient to justify a 25 percent increase in H-1Bs in 2004. Biotechnology industry H-1B visa holders are mainly in highly sought after areas such as analytical chemistry, instrumentation specialization, organic synthesis, product safety and surveillance, clinical research/biostatistics, bio/pharm quality, medicinal chemistry, product scale-up, bioinformatics and applied genomics, computer science, cheminformatics, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics. Forty percent of H-1B foreign workers are at the Ph.D. level, 35 percent M.S., 20 percent B.S., and 5 percent M.D. In comparison, the U.S. biotechnology industry technical workforce is estimated to be 19 percent Ph.D., 17 percent M.S., 50 percent B.S., and 14 percent combined voc-ed/ community college trained. These and other survey data by industry human resource groups clearly show that the H-1B worker skills match the most pressing employment needs of the biotechnology industry. The data demonstrate that maintaining a reasonably-sized H-1B cap is critical to the industry. Although the national annual H-1B visa cap was raised from 115,000 to 195,000 in the 106th Congress via S. 2045, the cap has already been exceeded. The increased cap remains in effect until 2003 and efforts are under way to ensure that it remains high. The Third Annual National Survey of H-1Bs in the biotechnology industry found that 80 percent are from U.S. universities, and 85 percent of those eventually get green cards. Companies now spend, on average, $10,200 in processing fees and legal expenses to obtain each green card, an estimated cost to the industry of more than $150 million over the past 5 years. In the wake of the 9/11 World Trade Center attacks, debate has been focused on more restrictions on foreign students, a development that would have a severe impact upon the competitiveness of the U.S. biotechnology industry. Clearly, the H-1B route provides a temporary solution to shortages in the national and domestic biotechnology labor pools, shortages mirroring the inadequate production of appropriately trained U.S. nationals by U.S. institutions of higher learning. The reality is that universities have inadequate resources for expanding the training pipeline, particularly in the specialized areas of the research phase of company product development. Efforts should be directed toward influencing greater congressional and federal agency attention to these important topics.

#### Solves bioterror

**Bailey, 1** [Ronald, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine and Reason.com, where he writes a weekly science and technology column. Bailey is the author of the book Liberation Biology: The Moral and Scientific Case for the Biotech Revolution (Prometheus, 2005), and his work was featured in The Best American Science and Nature Writing 2004. In 2006, Bailey was shortlisted by the editors of Nature Biotechnology as one of the personalities who have made the "most significant contributions" to biotechnology in the last 10 years. 11/7/1, “The Best Biodefense,” Reason, <http://reason.com/archives/2001/11/07/the-best-biodefense>]

But Cipro and other antibiotics are just a small part of the arsenal that could one day soon be deployed in defending America against biowarfare. Just consider what’s in the pipeline now that could be used to protect Americans against infectious diseases, including bioterrorism. A Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Research Association survey found 137 new medicines for infectious diseases in drug company research and development pipelines, including 19 antibiotics and 42 vaccines. With regard to anthrax, instead of having to rush a sample to a lab where it takes hours or even days to culture, biotech companies have created test strips using antibody technologies that can confirm the presence of anthrax in 15 minutes or less, allowing decontamination and treatment to begin immediately. Similar test strips are being developed for the detection of smallpox as well. The biotech company EluSys Therapeutics is working on an exciting technique which would "implement instant immunity." EluSys joins two monoclonal antibodies chemically together so that they act like biological double-sided tape. One antibody sticks to toxins, viruses, or bacteria while the other binds to human red blood cells. The red blood cells carry the pathogen or toxin to the liver for destruction and return unharmed to the normal blood circulation. In one test, the EluSys treatment reduced the viral load in monkeys one million-fold in less than an hour. The technology could be applied to a number of bioterrorist threats, such as dengue fever, Ebola and Marburg viruses, and plague. Of course, the EluSys treatment would not just be useful for responding to bioterrorist attacks, but also could treat almost any infection or poisoning. Further down the development road are technologies that could rapidly analyze a pathogen’s DNA, and then guide the rapid synthesis of drugs like the ones being developed by EluSys that can bind, or disable, segments of DNA crucial to an infectious organism's survival. Again, this technology would be a great boon for treating infectious diseases and might be a permanent deterrent to future bioterrorist attacks. Seizing Bayer’s patent now wouldn’t just cost that company and its stockholders a little bit of money (Bayer sold $1 billion in Cipro last year), but would reverberate throughout the pharmaceutical research and development industry. If governments begin to seize patents on the pretext of addressing alleged public health emergencies, the investment in research that would bring about new and effective treatments could dry up. Investors and pharmaceutical executives couldn’t justify putting $30 billion annually into already risky and uncertain research if they couldn’t be sure of earning enough profits to pay back their costs. Consider what happened during the Clinton health care fiasco, which threatened to impose price controls on prescription drugs in the early 1990s: Growth in research spending dropped off dramatically from 10 percent annually to about 2 percent per year. A far more sensible and farsighted way to protect the American public from health threats, including bioterrorism, is to encourage further pharmaceutical research by respecting drug patents. In the final analysis, America’s best biodefense is a vital and profitable pharmaceutical and biotechnology industry.

#### Extinction

Steinbrenner, 97

John Steinbrenner, Senior Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22-1997, Lexis

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

### 3rd Off

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should establish that the penalty for violating restrictions on the production of crude oil on federal lands may include entry into a Supplemental Environmental Project. Implementation of the Supplemental Environmental Projects should follow the 1991 Policy on the Use of Supplemental Environmental Projects in EPA Settlements, and any conflicting federal laws and regulations should be modified to provide a narrow exemption for the above penalty.

#### Penalties determine regulatory compliance—restrictions are irrelevant if penalties are marginal

Center for Progressive Regulation 08

[Center for Progressive Regulation, 2008, Environmental Enforcement, progressiveregulation.org/perspectives/environEnforce.html]

Effective enforcement is key to ensuring that the ambitious goals of our environmental statutes are realized. Enforcement refers to the set of actions that the government can take to promote compliance with environmental law. . Currently, rates of noncompliance with environmental laws remain disturbingly high; experts believe that as many as twenty to forty percent of firms regulated by federal environmental statutes regularly violate the law. Tens of millions of citizens live in areas out of compliance with the health based standards of the Clean Air Act, and close to half of the water bodies in the country fail to meet water quality standards set by the Clean Water Act. In communities burdened by multiple sources of pollution, noncompliance has particularly serious health consequences for affected residents. As in virtually every other area of government regulation, environmental enforcement traditionally has been based on the theory of deterrence. This theory assumes that persons and businesses act rationally to maximize profits, and will comply with the law where the costs of noncompliance outweigh the benefits of noncompliance. The job of enforcement agencies is to make both penalties and the probability of detection high enough that it becomes irrational– unprofitable-- for regulated firms to violate the law.¶ EPA’s enforcement policies traditionally have reflected these principles. EPA has emphasized the importance of regular inspections and monitoring activity to detect noncompliance, and has responded to violations with swift and appropriate sanctions. EPA’s policies also mandate that the agency recover the economic benefit firms realize through noncompliance, since if a firm is able to profit from illegal activity, it has little incentive to comply in the first place.

#### The CP’s SEP penalty is just that—it causes the same industry response as the aff, without lifting the restriction

Dana 98

[David Dana, Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law, 1998, ARTICLE: THE UNCERTAIN MERITS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT REFORM: THE CASE OF SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, 1998 Wis. L. Rev. 1181, Lexis]

The previous analysis illustrates that the inclusion of SEPs in an enforcement regime may lead to negotiated settlements that cost violators substantially less than the standard monetary penalty. The particular implications of this insight for a deterrence analysis depend on whether the standard monetary penalty represents "an optimal penalty" or instead a sub- or super-optimal penalty. As a preliminary matter, a brief discussion of the concept of optimal penalty (PEN<opt>) thus may be in order. Economists typically regard the goal of an enforcement regime as the achievement of "optimal deterrence." The phrase optimal deterrence, of course, implies that absolute or complete deterrence of regulatory violations should not be the goal of an enforcement regime. Rather, the regime should act to prevent violations which will generate social costs in excess of social benefits. Conversely, of course, the regime should not discourage violations that produce net social benefits. In settings involving perfect detection and prosecution of regulatory violations by government agencies, a penalty equalling the social harm of a violation will produce optimal deterrence. Where detection and prosecution are imperfect, a penalty equalling the harm of a violation will result in underdeterrence because potential violators will discount the nominal penalty to take account of the probability that they will evade detection and/or prosecution. To achieve optimal deterrence, therefore, [\*1206] nominal penalties must equal the social harm divided by the probability of detection and prosecution. The standard monetary penalty for any particular regulatory violation - the penalty that would be imposed in the absence of any SEP settlement options - logically can have only one of three relations to the optimal penalty: The standard monetary penalty can be less than the optimal penalty, equal to the optimal penalty, or greater than the optimal penalty. In all three of these cases, the introduction of SEP settlement options into an enforcement regime is troublesome from an optimal deterrence perspective. Each case will be taken in turn. 1. pen[in'mon.std'] < pen<opt> Where the standard monetary penalty is less than the optimal penalty, regulators' exclusive reliance on monetary penalties will produce underdeterrence. n77 That is, some violations will occur even though the social costs of the violations exceed the social benefits. The introduction of SEPs into such regimes will only make matters worse: SEPs will lower regulated entities' expected penalties for regulatory violations n78 and [\*1207] hence produce more underdeterrence and more socially costly violations. For example, imagine that the harm from a particular regulatory violation has a dollar equivalent value of $ 400, and the perceived probability of detection is 0.1. The optimal penalty thus would be $ 400/0.1 or $ 4000. Assume, however, that the standard monetary penalty is only $ 3000 and regulated entities' expected penalty for violating the regulation is thus only $ 300. Profit-maximizing regulated entities will take the risk of violating the regulation if they expect to gain more than $ 300 by doing so. Now assume that a regulatory agency adds SEP settlements to the enforcement regime. The regulated entity in question now believes that there is a fifty percent probability that it could successfully negotiate a SEP in the event government regulators detect its regulatory noncompliance. n79 Assume also that the regulated entity estimates that the SEP discount or savings off the standard monetary penalty would be thirty-three percent, so that the expected cost of a SEP would be $ 2000. The total expected penalty thus would be 0.1[(0.5)($ 3000) + (0.5)(0.66)($ 3000)], or approximately $ 250. This reduction in the expected penalty from $ 300 to $ 250 could translate into real differences in regulated entities' behavior. Under the pre-SEP regime, regulated entities at least would avoid socially undesirable violations offering them less than $ 300 in savings. The addition of SEPs to the regime eliminates deterrence for violations offering between $ 250 and $ 300 in savings. 2. pen[in'mon.std'] = pen<opt> Where the standard monetary penalty equals the optimal penalty, the enforcement regime will achieve optimal deterrence. Regulated entities will be deterred from committing all of the potential violations that result in greater social loss than social gain, but they will not be deterred from [\*1208] committing any potential violations that are, on net, socially beneficial. The introduction of SEPs into the penalty regime will lower expected penalties and thus produce a shift from this state of optimal deterrence to one of underdeterrence.

#### Adopting the ’91 guidelines are key

Kristl 07

[Kenneth T. Kristl 7, Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Widener University School of Law, “MAKING A GOOD IDEA EVEN BETTER: RETHINKING THE LIMITS ON SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS,” Vermont Law Review, Vol. 31, 2007, <http://lawreview.vermontlaw.edu/files/2012/02/kristl.pdf>]

If in fact the mitigation percentage is ultimately meaningless, why have it in the SEP Policy at all? Perhaps because it allows EPA to create the illusion that it is being “tough” on violators, consistent with the Policy’s strong assertions about the importance of “substantial monetary penalties” and deterring non-compliance. 254 One must question, however, whether the illusion is worth the price if that price is to discourage defendants from seeking to propose SEPs because of the perceived “discount” their SEP dollars will receive. The fact that almost 90% of defendants have chosen not to do SEPs strongly suggests that this discouragement of SEP participation is not merely theoretical. If EPA is really serious about encouraging more SEPs, it needs to explore why nearly 90% of defendants are turning away from what EPA says it wants to encourage. The better solution is to get rid of the 80% cap on the mitigation percentage and re-adopt the 100% ceiling in the 1991 SEP Policy. Such a cap would allow EPA to treat mediocre projects less favorably but would incentivize and reward defendants who develop proposals that deliver solid environmental benefits. More importantly, it would remove the “second class” stigma that SEPs inevitably get when SEP dollars are “discounted.” Such a change is much more likely to increase SEP participation rates, and thereby allow more environmental benefits from SEPs. CONCLUSION Having defendants agree to undertake Supplemental Environmental Projects holds great promise for providing environmental benefits beyond those arising from mere compliance with the law or governmental programs. If EPA is seriously committed to its stated goal of increasing the use of SEPs above the historically low participation levels, it needs to examine critically the restraints its own policies impose on such projects. The insistence on nexus and a mitigation percentage ceiling found in EPA’s approach toward SEPs both lack legal or economic justification and work to shackle SEPs in ways that forfeit potential benefits. Careful reexamination of nexus and the mitigation percentage ceiling justify removal of these concepts from EPA’s policies. Such a change is simple to implement and would unshackle SEPs, likely increase their use in environmental enforcement cases, and make the good idea of SEPs even better by increasing the environmental benefits that enforcement activity can bring.

#### SEPs key to solve waste management—solves endocrine disrupters

Adams and Israel 8

[Kate Adams, General Counsel of Honeywell International, a NYSE traded Fortune 100 multi-industrial company, and Brian Israel, Former Honors Trial Attorney in the Environmental Enforcement Section of the U.S. Department of Justice, 2008, Symposium: Breaking the Logjam: Environmental Reform for the New Congress and Administration: Panel VII: Managing Waste: Waste in the 21st Century: A Framework for Wiser Management, 17 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 703, Lexis]

The broader use of SEPs would be an important step toward wiser waste management practices. SEPs can, and should, be designed to achieve a reduction of waste generation and more sustainable waste handling practices, including with respect to recycling, energy use, air emissions, and water discharges. While a civil penalty paid to the U.S. Treasury will have no direct impact on the environment, a well-designed SEP would result in tangible and observable benefits. Moreover, SEPs encourage companies to adopt measures that go beyond compliance with existing regulations and therefore SEPs are drivers toward innovation and creativity. Here is a recent real-world example of the promise of SEPs and the problem with our current regime. In response to an alleged civil violation of an environmental statute, a company agreed not only to correct the underlying problem but also to pay a penalty in the amount of the economic benefit from the violation, which was modest. In addition, the company proposed a novel SEP to EPA that would have been in lieu of the remainder of the civil penalty. The SEP would have required the company to undertake a rigorous experiment to test a new technology for on-site regeneration of carbon, which is commonly used at Superfund sites to cleanup certain types of contamination. If successful, the technology could have significant environmental benefits since the current practice is to ship spent carbon offsite for treatment, and the associated environmental costs (including carbon dioxide emissions) with off-site regeneration are huge. Moreover, the promising technology was based upon an EPA patent! Notwithstanding the collective promise of this new approach, the technology to date has not been further developed because the incentive to do so for a single site is not present. In sum, this should have been a perfect SEP - it would further develop a technology that would potentially massively reduce the indirect environmental costs of site cleanups. The company would enjoy no financial benefit since the cost of the [\*722] pilot study was the same as the penalty. Finally, the proposed SEP clearly met all of the existing guidelines for SEPs. Nonetheless, EPA rejected the proposal. EPA's rationale was that SEPs are receiving increased scrutiny from EPA headquarters and there was no appetite for fighting an uphill bureaucratic battle. In order to fully achieve the sustainability promise of SEPs, then, a legislative fix is required. Here's one possible legislative solution: modify the civil penalty regime for environmental statutes so that civil penalties can be entirely paid through SEPs, except to the extent that the violation is deemed willful and to the extent necessary to recoup any economic benefit from the violation. If the violation resulted from willful conduct, then the violator would not be able to offset the penalty though a SEP. A SEP policy such as this is an overall positive. Regulators would be able to see real environmental results from their enforcement efforts. Companies would have the same incentive to comply with the law since the monetary consequences of noncompliance would still exceed the economic benefit of the violation. Moreover, in cases where the violation resulted from willful conduct, there would be no opportunity for a SEP offset. And, most importantly, a more robust SEP policy would lead to creative, sustainable projects that would not otherwise be required by the environmental laws. Conclusion This article provides a few illustrations of a management framework that considers not only direct environmental impacts and cost effectiveness when making waste management decisions, but also indirect environmental impacts. We call this third criteria sustainability. Sustainability looks broadly at the spatial and temporal impacts associated with our products, our waste handling procedures, and our cleanup sites. We believe that this three-pronged approach could dramatically improve waste management decisions as outlined in the examples above. Of course, this framework is broadly applicable and should also apply to numerous other aspects of resource and waste management. n53 Finally, we submit that there is something significant we do not yet know about current environmental behavior and norms that will one day prove harmful. A few possibilities include nanoparticles, endocrine disrupters, or even some of the alternative energy sources currently being explored. Given our increasing ability to measure impacts and our expanding notion of up-stream and down-stream sustainability, it is a near-certainty that some activities currently presumed to be safe and effective will one day be viewed as inappropriate. Whatever the phenomenon, the lesson to be learned is that we are imperfect and evolving and will always have unpredictable impacts on our environment. Ultimately, we must be mindful of this lesson and be proactive about evaluating and reducing our footprint in the world. This is a burden that most often will fall on those engaged in production and other tangible physical activities. However, this forward looking perspective is also a critical component of a wiser waste management policy.

#### Extinction

SCMP, South China Morning Post, 1999, Countdown to extinction, Lexis

It sounds like second-rate science fiction, dredged from the wilder shores of radical feminist fantasy. Through a combination of environmental pollutants and genetic wrong-turns, the male of the species slowly turns into a group of useless mutants and evolutionary misfits: sterile, stunted and doomed to extinction. While this may read like the stuff of bad Saturday matinees, a growing band of scientists believe such a scenario is not only possible, but already in its early stages. From the beginning of this decade, a flurry of reports from around the world have pointed to a drastic decline in men's sperm counts. Some studies indicate a drop of more than 50 per cent during the past 50 years, accompanied by a surge in male genital deformities, such as undescended testicles and hypospadias, in which the urethra appears on the bottom or side of the penis.

### 4th Off

#### The United States federal government should maintain production restrictions on the production of crude oil on federal lands except for production restrictions on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

#### Drilling in the artic would kill the ecosystems in the water and escalate out of control due to a lack of infrastructure and harsh climate

Lacey 12

(Stephen Lacey, reporter/blogger for Climate Progress, where he writes on clean energy policy, technologies, and finance. “Podcast: The Consequences Of Offshore Oil Drilling In Arctic Waters” July 17, 12. http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/07/17/532791/podcast-the-consequences-of-drilling-for-oil-in-arctic-waters//wyoccd)

But a growing group of disaster-response officials, political leaders, environmental groups, and scientists are all raising concerns about the environmental impact of this new drilling activity. With virtually no infrastructure in place to clean up an oil spill, the consequences of a well blow-out could be disastrous. The long-term consequences could be equally bad. As Arctic sea ice continues its death spiral, fossil fuel companies seeing new opportunities under the waters are swooping in — increasing the extraction of carbon-based fuels that are contributing to global warming. In this podcast, linked above, we’ll speak with Michael Conathan, director of oceans policy at the Center for American Progress, who has been watching the activity in the Arctic closely. He’ll discuss a new report, Putting a Freeze on Arctic Ocean Drilling, and talk about the various environmental and infrastructure challenges in the region. You can follow our podcast RSS feed here. A transcript of the conversation is below: Michael Conathan: Now as climate change has taken its toll up there and the sea ice has receded, we’re really starting to see that the Northwest Passage is likely to become a reality in the coming years. So what that’s doing is increasing activity, sort of, across the board, industrial activity in the Arctic. Everything from the long sought after shipping route to ice retreating and exposing areas of the intercontinental shelf that are thought to contain massive oil and gas reserves. There are also issues of fisheries opening up. There is basically an untapped fishery resource in the Arctic and the world has to decide how they are going to manage that. Are they going to manage it like all other international fisheries or, because it is this untapped resource is there the ability to do something different up there in that regard. Cruise Lines are starting to look at the Arctic as potential destinations. So really there is a big of a gold rush going on in the Arctic right now. Stephen Lacey: What has Shell proposed as it moves into the Arctic to do exploratory drilling? This is a new phenomenon, they are not quite sure what they’re going to find. There are estimates of massive amounts of reserves but they’re not quite sure. This is anybody’s guess… MC: They’re not sure but Shell has spent several years and over $4 billion trying to get access to these resources in the Arctic, so obviously they believe strongly that there is a significant resource there for them to tap into. Where we are right now is that over the past year or so the Obama Administration has been moving towards issuing permits for Shell to drill 5 exploratory wells. In the Beaufort Sea and the Chuckchi Sea which are bodies of water of the north slope of Alaska. These are wells that are basically test wells. Shell believes, based on seismic testing, based on geology, that there are significant deposits and resources up there for them to tap into. This is sort of the “lets prove it” mechanism. SL: The real scary thing here is not just that we are focusing our resources on more oil and gas, that could accelerate the problem of climate change, but that locally there is no infrastructure in place to deal with an oil spill, if it did take place. Talk about what you’ve found out about when evaluating infrastructure needs and ecosystem constraints. MC: Yeah there are a couple of issues in that regard. I think, paramount, what we found in our report is the remarkable lack of infrastructure on the north slope of Alaska. This really is the last frontier. It’s incredibly distant. Its 1,000 miles away by air from the closest coast guard station. There is one highway that goes from Anchorage, Alaska, through Fairbanks to the North Slope. There is no rail access. There are no major airports up there. There is just these tiny little communities up there on the North Slope that are not connected by road. Everything is connected by small plane air traffic. The communities themselves, they have no hotels. There is one hotel on the North Slope of Alaska, in Barrow. There is an incredible lack of infrastructure in this region. When you compare that to the Gulf of Mexico, where most of our current drilling operation takes place, and where the Deepwater Horizon incident occurred, where we had tens of thousands of people who could rush to that area and have places to sleep and wash and eat and take care of the basic needs of, effectively and army of responders. There is nothing like that on the North Slope of Alaska. If there is an accident on the North Slope of Alaska, the infrastructure to deal with it simply does not exist. You can’t get resources there, you can’t get people there, you can’t put them up when they are there. From an environmental perspective, there is an incredible lack of information about what happens to oil when it’s in icy, Arctic water. § Marked 14:25 § It’s a very different situation from when it’s in the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico. The weather conditions, the drilling season will occur from July 1st to either the end of September in the Chukchi Sea or the end of October in the Beaufort Sea. And as you get towards then end of those drilling seasons, that’s when the ice starts to roll back in. And if a spill happens towards the end of that drilling season, now you are dealing with a situation where you have to clean up, you have to respond as the temperatures are getting colder, the light is disappearing, the ocean is literally icing over.

#### ANWR actions will be modeled world wide- Global species loss

STAR TRIBUNE 02

[March 19, 2002, p. Lexis (MHBLUE1255)]

As the Wilderness Society argues, 95 percent of Alaska's North Slope is open for oil and gas exploration. The remaining 5 percent, in ANWR, is a fragile and pristine place that hosts millions of migratory birds and sustains a large caribou herd that is essential to native tribes living in the area. It makes no sense to spoil all of that in the name of national security when the Congress won't even dare boost mileage standards. The hypocrisy is appalling. U.S. behavior matters in this world; when it acts badly, others are encouraged to imitate that bad behavior. After all, most nations are much poorer than the United States, so if U.S. officials can't afford to protect a special place like ANWR, how on earth can nations like Kazakhstan, Brazil and Vietnam be expected to protect their own special places?

#### Extinction

Diner 1994

[David, Major in US Army, Winter, “THE ARMY AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT: WHO'S ENDANGERING WHOM?” Lexis]

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." [79](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=2c2079b6a9753fd72b599ac94393715a&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=5d418220b8f79eb99eb7ad7f7b46acfc#n79) By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, [80](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=2c2079b6a9753fd72b599ac94393715a&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=5d418220b8f79eb99eb7ad7f7b46acfc#n80) mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

### 5th Off

#### First the links, Production focus to problems fails—the only solutions it engenders are more production,

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 our selves, 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.

# Case

### Heg

#### New great powers are rising and will soon be on par with the us—prefer our evidence because it cites the two most important indicators of a power shift

Layne 12

[Chris, Professor of IR and Political Science at Texas A&M, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana”, p. online //wyo-tjc]

American decline is part of a broader trend in international politics: the shift of economic power away from the Euro-Atlantic core to rising great and regional powers (what economists sometimes refer to as the ‘‘emerging market’’ nations). Among the former are China, India, and Russia. The latter category includes Indonesia, Turkey, South Korea, Brazil, and South Africa. In a May 2011 report, the World Bank predicted that six countries—China, India, Brazil, Russia, Indonesia, and South Korea—will account for one-half of the world’s economic growth between 2011 and 2025 (Politi 2011; Rich 2011). In some respects, of course, this emergence of new great powers is less about rise than restoration. As Figure 1 indicates, in 1700 China and India were the world’s two largest economies. From their perspective—especially Beijing’s—they are merely regaining what they view as their natural, or rightful, place in the hierarchy of great powers. The ascent of new great powers is the strongest evidence of unipolarity’s end. The two most important indicators of whether new great powers are rising are relative growth rates and shares of world GDP (Gilpin 1981; Kennedy 1987). The evidence that the international system is rapidly becoming multipolar—and that, consequently, America’s relative power is declining—is now impossible to deny, and China is Exhibit A for the shift in the world’s center of economic and geopolitical gravity. China illustrates how, since the Cold War’s end, potential great powers have been positioning themselves to challenge the United States.

#### Multipolarity will arrive in two decades as other powers catch up to the US—transition to offshore balancing now is key to avoid unending cycles of warfare\*\*

Layne 9

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, Review of International Studies, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, 2009, p. asp]

Some primacists believe that the US is immune to being counter-balanced because, as the only great power in a ‘unipolar’ system, it is so much more powerful than its nearest possible competitors.4 Yet, recent studies by the CIA offer compelling evidence that by 2020 the era of America’s unipolar ascendancy will be drawing to a close as new poles of power in the international system approach the US share of world power.5 And, of course, growing apprehensions about the military, as well as economic, implications of China’s rapid ascent are – at the very least – an implicit acknowledgment that the days of unchallenged US dominance in world affairs are numbered. Offshore balancers believe the US must adjust to incipient multipolarity because they understand that – unless the US is prepared to fight an unending series of preventive wars – new great powers inevitably will emerge in the next decade or two.

#### We outweigh- only a risk of a global nuclear war in a world of US primacy

Layne in 6

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to Present, Cornell University Press (Ithica), p. 176 //wyo-tjc]

If we assume, just for the sake of argument, that the magnet effect was a factor leading to U.S. involvement in Eurasian wars before 1945, nuclear weapons have changed the geopolitical equation since then. There are many imponderables about nuclear strategy. Nuclear weapons today probably would deter war between nuclear-armed great powers in Eurasia. On the other hand, because of the stability-instability paradox (the standoff at the strategic nuclear level makes it more thinkable for nuclear-armed great powers to fight limited, conventional wars against one another), nuclear deterrence might allow great powers to begin wars in the hope that they would be fought with conventional weapons only. However, in a conventional conflict between nuclear-armed great powers, the risk of escalation would be omnipresent. Precisely because of these unknowns, American grand strategy should maximize U.S. autonomy, because the last thing the United States should want is to be caught in the cross fire of a nuclear war fought by Eurasian great powers. If the United States adopts an offshore balancing grand strategy, it simply is not the case that the United States would he sucked into a war between Eurasian great powers. A nuclear conflict in Eurasia cannot leap the Atlantic or Pacific oceans and engulf the United States unless the United States is embroiled from the outset because of its forward military presence in Eurasia. In a nuclear world, it would be irrational to risk being involved in such a conflict for economic reasons (and, probably, for any reason).

#### Conflict with China is inevitable unless we accept retrenchment—no amount of accommodation or good relations can avoid a hegemonic clash

Layne 12

[Chris, Professor of IR and Political Science at Texas A&M, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana”, p. online //wyo-tjc]

Revealingly, Ikenberry makes clear this expectation when he says that the deal the United States should propose to China is for Washington ‘‘to accommodate a rising China by offering it status and position within the regional order in return for Beijing’s acceptance and accommodation of Washington’s core interests, which include remaining a dominant security provider within East Asia’’ (Ikenberry 2011:356). It is easy to see why the United States would want to cut such a deal but it is hard to see what’s in it for China. American hegemony is waning and China is ascending, and there is zero reason for China to accept this bargain because it aims to be the hegemon in its own region. The unfolding Sino- American rivalry in East Asia can be seen as an example of Dodge City syndrome (in American Western movies, one gunslinger says to the other: ‘‘This town ain’t big enough for both of us’’) or as a geopolitical example of Newtonian physics (two hegemons cannot occupy the same region at the same time). From either perspective, the dangers should be obvious: unless the United States is willing to accept China’s ascendancy in East (and Southeast) Asia, Washington and Beijing are on a collision course.

#### NORTH KOREAN WAR CAN ONLY BE AVERTED BY SWITCHING TO ROBUST DETERRENT STRATEGY, WITHDRAWING TROOPS AND ENCOURAGING JAPANESE/SOUTH KOREAN PROLIFERATION

Galen Carpenter in 4

[Ted, CATO Analyst, “Living With the Unthinkable”, National Interest, Winter 2003/2004, p. asp]

INSTEAD OF placing faith in the efficacy of negotiations with a country that has violated every agreement it has ever signed on the nuclear issue or considering the dangerous option of pre-emptive war, the United States needs a strategy to deal with the prospect of North Korea's emergence as a nuclear power. Washington should pursue a two-pronged strategy, since there are two serious problems that must be addressed. One problem is the possibility that Pyongyang might be aiming to become a regional nuclear power with a significant arsenal that could pose a threat to its neighbors and, ultimately, to the American homeland. The latter is not an immediate danger, but a North Korean capability to do so over the longer-term is a problem Washington must anticipate. Countering the threat of a "bolt out of the blue" attack on the United States is relatively straightforward. America retains the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenal in the world, as well as a decisive edge in all conventional military capabilities. The North Korean regime surely knows (although it might behoove the administration to make the point explicitly) that any attack on American soil would mean the obliteration of the regime. The United States successfully deterred a succession of aggressive and odious Soviet leaders from using nuclear weapons, and it did the same thing with a nuclear-armed China under Mao Zedong. It is therefore highly probable that Kim Jong-il's North Korea, which would possess a much smaller nuclear arsenal than either the Soviet Union and China, can be deterred as well. As an insurance policy to protect the American population in the highly unlikely event that deterrence fails, and for other reasons besides, Washington should continue developing a shield against ballistic missiles. To counter North Korea's possible threat to East Asia, Washington should convey the message that Pyongyang would be making a serious miscalculation by assuming it will possess a nuclear monopoly in northeast Asia. North Korea's rulers are counting on the United States to prevent Japan and South Korea from even considering the option of going nuclear. American officials should inform Pyongyang that, if the North insists on joining the global nuclear weapons club, Washington will urge Tokyo and Seoul to re-evaluate their earlier decisions to decline to acquire strategic nuclear deterrents. Even the possibility that South Korea and Japan might do so would come as an extremely unpleasant wakeup call to North Korea. The United States does not need to press Tokyo and Seoul to go nuclear. It is sufficient if Washington informs those governments that the United States would not object to them developing nuclear weapons. That by itself would be a major change in U.S. policy. In addition, Washington needs to let Seoul and Tokyo know that the United States intends to withdraw its forces from South Korea and Japan. In an environment with a nuclear-armed North Korea, those forward-deployed forces are not military assets; they are nuclear hostages.

#### Competition over oil breeds cooperation- turns the advantage

Herberg 11

(Mikkal Herberg, Research Director, Energy Security Program The National Bureau of Asian Research. “China’s Energy Rise and the Future of U.S.-China Energy Relations” June 21, 2011. http://newamerica.net/publications/policy/china\_s\_energy\_rise\_and\_the\_future\_of\_us\_china\_energy\_relations//wyoccd)

In this context the future energy relationship between Washington and Beijing seems more likely to reflect a continuing mix of cooperation and efforts to seek common ground coexisting with arenas of competition, distrust, and tension. Our energy relations seem destined to parallel the path of broader Sino-American relations. The most constructive arena of U.S.-China energy relations has been cooperation on jointly developing cleaner energy sources, new renewable energy technologies, and new ways to improve energy efficiency. But even in the area of clean energy technology, there is a mix of cooperation and hard-nosed competition. The push toward renewable and cleaner energy technologies fits well with the inclinations and institutions of leadership in both Washington and Beijing and responds to their common challenges of heavy dependence on carbon, coal, and oil-intensive energy sources. For Beijing’s leadership, renewables and electric vehicle development promise to create new, incremental supplies to respond to their growing fears over their basic ability to provide enough energy to meet booming energy demand while also reducing air pollution from China’s heavily coal-based economy. Improved efficiency will be critical to slowing the need to mobilize enormous, ever increasing supplies of energy to fuel economic growth. Moreover, improved efficiency and renewable energy give Beijing a pathway to reducing the carbon intensity of their economy that makes it possible for Beijing to show it is responsive to global pressure to do something about China’s rising carbon emissions. Finally, Beijing sees renewable and clean energy technologies as major future potential export and growth drivers for China’s economy. The Obama administration is driven by many of the same concerns. It also sees electric vehicle technology as a way to reduce long-term oil import dependence and strengthen energy security, as does Beijing. So collaboration and joint development has been seen as a potential “win-win” scenario for both. This collaboration began under the Republican Bush Administration in 2008 with the United States-China Ten Year Framework for Cooperation on Energy and Environment that emerged from that administration’s Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) and has expanded under the Obama administration and the new Strategic and Economic Dialogue (SAED). Recent U.S.-China summit meetings have resulted in the creation of a broad range of cooperative initiatives to develop and spread new energy technology. The most significant has been the creation of the United States-China Clean Energy Research Center (CERC) jointly funded at $150 million and with headquarters in both countries. Other initiatives cover building efficiency, carbon capture and storage, new vehicle technologies, collaboration on developing shale natural gas deposits, and a wide range of other “green” initiatives. However, this constructive aspect of our energy relationship has more recently taken on an increasingly competitive atmosphere that pitches Chinese and U.S. clean energy interests in much more competitive terms. There has been widespread concern expressed in Congress and elsewhere that China is “winning the race” to develop clean technologies and that much of the trade advantage and manufacturing growth from these technologies is ending up in China. China has aggressively targeted gaining a strategic trade advantage in these technologies and the higher value employment they create through a series of questionable trade and industrial practices. The scale of China’s clean energy subsidies and protection of their domestic industry has been a growing source of bilateral tension with the U.S. as well as Europe. At the sharpest point of these concerns, after complaints from the United Steelworkers Union that China was unfairly subsidizing its wind and solar equipment producers, the Obama administration filed a WTO case against China in December 2010. So even where bilateral cooperation on energy is blessed at the highest level, efforts to sustain that collaboration will be needed in an increasingly competitive global trade environment.

#### Competition over oil doesn’t escalate

Dafinoiu 11

(David Dafinoiu is an administrator at the Security News Center, and has written articles for other news sources, emphasizing in security. “US-China conflict: worldwide competition for oil?” 7-28-2011. http://securityandintelligence.wordpress.com/2011/07/28/us-china-conflict-worldwide-competition-for-oil//wyoccd)

However, US Admiral Michael Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, has announced that America will continue to run reconnaissance missions near China’s coastline despite the objections. But Conn Hallinan, of Foreign Policy in Focus says that this conflict is part of the worldwide competition for energy resources between the number one and the number two energy users in the world. “I think their [Chinese] anger is justified,” Conn Hallinan told RT. “The danger here is that people make mistakes – and when mistakes get made between nuclear powers, that is something we all need to worry about.” Mainly China is worried that the US could “put its thumb” on their energy resources. The South China Sea contains rich oil and gas reserves and some of the world’s most geo-strategically vital naval routes. “This is part of a worldwide competition. Right now the US is the number one user of energy in the world and China is number two. 80 per cent of Chinese energy supplies move by sea. They either move through the Straits of Hormuz, which is controlled by the American Fifth Fleet, or they move through the Straits of Malacca, which is controlled by the American Seventh Fleet,” Hallinan said. “They are concerned with keeping their sea lanes open. That is why they are so pushy about the South China Sea,” he concluded. Hallinan suggests, though, that the conflict is not going to go much further than this.

#### Threat of global warming forces cooperation-squo solves the advantage

Gardner and Rascoe 11

(Timothy Gardner and Ayesha Rascoe, verified journalist for Reuters. “Clean energy seen as "bright spot" for U.S.-China relations”. January 19, 2011. http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/01/19/us-usa-china-energy-idUSTRE70H5WB20110119//wyoccd)

(Reuters) - Cooperation on clean energy could be a high point in U.S.-China relations leading to benefits for both countries, government and business officials said ahead of a summit between Chinese President Hu Jintao and President Barack Obama. Disputes between the world's two largest economies and energy consumers over China's wind power subsidies and its slowdown in exports of rare earths minerals, used in everything from wind turbines to cell phones, have dominated headlines in recent months. The countries are also having wider arguments. The United States says China's currency, the yuan, is undervalued and Washington is pushing Beijing for help in persuading North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons. But with rising concerns about oil prices, now above $90 a barrel, energy security, and global warming, officials said the world's biggest developed country and the biggest developing country have much to learn from each other. Progress can be made on sharing technologies on efficiency, cleaner coal, and development of renewables like wind and solar power, they said. As China tries to transform its economy from the manufacturing of cheap goods into one developing and distributing sophisticated technologies, such as clean energy, spats over intellectual property rights have already troubled trade relations between the two countries. But pressure on both countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reel in fossil fuel demand may push them to overcome these differences. DEALS Still, China's Minister of Science and Technology Wan Gang said at a forum on U.S-China clean energy cooperation hosted by the Brookings Institution that common interests between the two countries make clean energy an issue ripe for nurturing close ties. "I'm sure that this is one of the best points of convergence and cooperation between our two countries, and will be one of the bright spots in our future cooperation," Wan said on Tuesday. During the forum, officials from both governments unveiled plans to continue joint research and development in clean energy -- electric vehicles, clean coal and energy-efficient buildings -- through the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center. First announced in 2009, the centers will be supported by at least $150 million from private and public interests over five years. In addition, several deals were signed between U.S. and Chinese companies. General Electric Co and China Huadian Corp signed a joint agreement for gas turbines in China that will generate $350 million in U.S. exports. GE also signed a deal with Shenhua, one of the world's biggest coal firms, on coal gasification. The Energy Department said that the deal could lead to $100 million in U.S. exports. In addition, Alcoa and the China Power Investment Corporation signed an agreement to collaborate on a range of aluminum and clean energy projects representing $7.5 billion in potential investment both within China and abroad. U.S. utilities Duke Energy, and American Electric Power also signed deals involving cleaner-burning coal. HURDLES But officials said several hurdles have to be cleared to prevent competition between the two powers from hurting clean energy efforts. Jon Huntsman, the U.S. ambassador to China, said both countries need to continue their cooperative effort to protect intellectual property rights in China. "This a critical issue in the high technology sector including clean energy, and it generates a lot of concern in both U.S. and Chinese companies," he said. Justin Yifu Lin, a chief economist at the World Bank, said more research and development needs to be done on alternative energies like wind and solar to get them off government subsidies. Until then bickering about subsidies strain relations, as the wind power case shows. In addition, delicate balances will have to be struck between American companies that have new technologies they haven't fully developed and Chinese ones that want to bring them to their huge market. "In many commercial negotiations the Chinese play a very hard game of trying to trade market access for technology and American companies are always faced with the question of how much of their crown jewels they are willing to part with," Robert Kapp, a China advisor to the Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis law firm, told reporters in a teleconference hosted by the World Resources Institute ahead of the Obama-Hu summit. In many cases American companies have decided a certain amount of technology transfer is in their interest.

### Econ

#### Economy is resilient and decline doesn’t cause war

Zakaria 9

Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability: Why terrorism and economic turmoil won't keep the world down for long” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.print.html>)

One year ago, **the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system**, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, **was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization**—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—**were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled**. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." **Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries**. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, **how much has the world really changed**? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. **Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.** A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' “says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" **This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage**. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many**. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think.** The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### Economic collapse does not cause war—their historical arguments are wrong

FERGUSON, Professor of History at Harvard , OCTOBER 6

(Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

**Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed**. What may be **the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out.** Nazi **Germany started the war** in Europe only **after its economy had recovered.** **Not all the countries** affected by the Great Depression **were taken over by fascist regimes**, **nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression**. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole**. **Some wars came after periods of growth**, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Third, No impact- trade deficit has been declining since 2006

Global Resource News No date

[Global Resource News, The publisher and editor of the site is Robert Thomason, a journalist formerly with the Washington Post. While at the Post, Thomason was the principal researcher for foreign news. He also wrote on many topics for the Post, such as the initial popularity of the Web, business, recessions, technology and energy management., No Date, US Oil Trade Deficit Drops But Still Large Outflow, <http://globalresourcesnews.com/GRNLead-oildeficit201205>, uwyo//amp]

Despite a month-to-month increase, the US trade deficit in oil has been dropping since 2006. Nonetheless, the $11.2 billion deficit in March represents a major outflow of dollars to foreign producers. (The US imported $16.5 billion worth of oil and exported $5.3 billion.) Overall, the US trade deficit grew to more than $51 billion in March, according to the Dept. of Commerce. As the chart to the right shows, there has been a medium-term decline in the oil deficit since 2006, when it was in the $20 billion to $16 billion per month range. The oil deficit peaked that year at $553 billion, as measured in 2005 dollars. It began to shrink in early 2008, but with the banking crisis of September that year it temporarily increased to the $16 billion range again. Starting in Jan. 2009 it began its present, gradual decline.

#### First, Results in net loss of jobs- and oil companies just want more vacant leases to call assets

Johnson 2010

[Brad Johnson, think progress writer, March 31, 2010, Drilling Is Not The Solution To Create Jobs And Reduce Reliance On Foreign Oil, <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2010/03/31/174618/obama-drilling-tough/>, uwyo//amp]

This expansion in offshore drilling leases, the Energy Information Administration has found, will have no effect on gas prices or dependence on foreign oil. Nor will it increase jobs, as oil companies aren’t really interested in new drilling — they are already sitting on existing leases instead of drilling them, in order to inflate their bottom lines by claiming the value of leased oil reserves as an asset. Furthermore, a Center for American Progress study has found that money that goes into the oil sector instead of the clean energy economy means a net loss of 14 jobs per million dollars.

#### Second, Trade deficit isn’t that large- most of the profit goes to American companies

Utley 2011

[Jon Basil Utley is Associate Publisher of The American Conservative, a Robert A. Taft Fellow for International and Constitutional Studies at the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and a Fellow with the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, , March 03, 2011, Trade Deficits Are Made in America,http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/trade-deficits-made-in-america/, uwyo//amp]

2.) Trade statistics are very misleading. Much manufacturing in China is done for American companies, which gain most of the profits. For example, the Apple iPhone adds $2 billion to the trade deficit with China, although it is entirely designed and owned by Americans and is made of parts imported from Europe and other Asian nations. China’s actual input is $6.50 out of the $178 wholesale cost, according to a Wall Street Journal analysis, “Not Really Made in China.” It explains that the actual trade deficit with China is about half of what the statistics show. The same consideration applies to many other imports—sneakers, for example. A pair of Nike shoes may cost $3 to produce, which goes to China. The rest of the retail price is accounted for by advertising, shipping, design, raw materials, and profits, most of which revert to Americans. China’s imports of raw materials are bought from Latin America, but their value shows as part of our trade deficit with China. Latin Americans, meanwhile, use their surpluses to buy planes and software from the United States.

#### Fourth, Doesn’t make the US independent- available oil is insufficient

Hargreaves 2010

[Steve Hargreaves, Senior Writer, 2010, The risks and rewards of offshore drilling,http://money.cnn.com/2010/05/04/news/economy/oil\_drilling/index.htm, uwyo//amp]

It won't make the United States energy independent: We simply use too much oil. The Energy Information Administration estimates the country could eventually produce another 1.3 million barrels of oil a day if all areas off the East and West coasts, The Gulf of Mexico, and Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife refuge were opened for drilling. The American Petroleum Institute says it could be as high as 2 million barrels a day. Oil spill may threaten offshore drilling plans But the country burns through some 20 million barrels of oil a day - two thirds of which is imported. "It's not about freeing us from foreign sources," said Melanie Kenderdine, executive director at Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Energy Initiative. "It's just not that much oil.

#### Manufacturing job losses are due to digital shift in America’s workforce

Utley 2011

[Jon Basil Utley is Associate Publisher of The American Conservative, a Robert A. Taft Fellow for International and Constitutional Studies at the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and a Fellow with the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, , March 03, 2011, Trade Deficits Are Made in America,http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/trade-deficits-made-in-america/, uwyo//amp]

3.) Large numbers of manufacturing jobs have been lost because of increases in productivity from the computer and communications revolution, not from foreign competition. Add to this the factor of labor-union work rules and spurious law suits that so damage American industry.

#### Health care costs kill manufacturing

Utley 2011

[Jon Basil Utley is Associate Publisher of The American Conservative, a Robert A. Taft Fellow for International and Constitutional Studies at the Ludwig von Mises Institute, and a Fellow with the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, , March 03, 2011, Trade Deficits Are Made in America,http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/trade-deficits-made-in-america/, uwyo//amp]

5.) Healthcare costs are brutally destructive of lower-wage manufacturing. We pay double the proportion of our gross national product compared to Europeans and Canadians. Health-insurance costs bankrupted two of our auto manufacturers. A worker with a family who earns $30,000 per year can easily cost his employer over $8,000 for health insurance. The high cost of healthcare is our fault, not that of our Chinese competitors.

#### Boosting manufacturing won’t solve the economy- it isn’t more important than any other sector and the economy would still be plagued by out of control spending, high school dropout rates, and enormous entitlements

Becker 2012

[Gary Becker, Gary Becker is a professor at the University of Chicago and a Nobel Laureate, 04/24/3012, A Farewell to Factories, <http://english.caixin.com/2012-04-24/100383805_2.html>, uwyo//amp]

U.S. President Barack Obama, in his State of the Union address, advocated special tax breaks and support for the manufacturing sector. I do not see any more convincing case for subsidies to manufacturing than there was for the special treatment of agriculture during the long decline in farm employment. Most of the arguments made in support of privileges for manufacturing could be made for services and other sectors of the economy. For example, although certain manufacturing industries have had high rates of productivity advance, so too has mining, such as through the development of fracking techniques. The most important technological advance of the past several decades has been the computer and the Internet, for these gave birth to email, word processing, apps, online sales and social networks like Facebook and Twitter. Instead of singling out manufacturing for special privileges, the U.S. government should get behind certain general policies. High on the list would be raising the rate of growth of the American economy, for this will tend to create jobs in most sectors of the economy. More government support may be justified for basic research in science and other areas that would also benefit all sectors, not just manufacturing. Local and state governments, along perhaps with the federal government, could try to reduce the dismally high dropout rates from American high schools. Dropouts have trouble finding good jobs even in the best of times, and they suffer the most during recessions. Many other steps can be taken to help the American economy, especially by limiting the growth of entitlements and the federal budget. None of the steps to improve the economy involve favoring manufacturing employment and the manufacturing sector. The call by many for special treatment of manufacturing jobs is basically misguided.

#### Doesn’t solve conflict-asymmetry theory means states can use trading partners as sources of power to manipulate other countries and resources.

Kinne 12

(Brandon, University of Texas at Dallas, Journal of Politics, “Multilateral Trade and Militarized Conflict: Centrality, Openness, and Asymmetry in the Global Trade Network,” January 1, 2012, accessed via Academic Search Premiere//wyo-mm)

These arguments most directly implicate breadth, as a high number of trade partners should reduce a state’s reliance on any single partner. However, depth of ties also matters, especially if deep trade ties indicate established sales organizations for a state’s products or readily available sources of substitute goods. For example, when conﬂict led to a decline in Colombia-Venezuela trade in 2009, Colombia directed its efforts at trade substitution toward those countries with which it already enjoyed strong ties—the United States, the EU, China, and Canada. Deep trade ties may also increase a state’s autonomy if those ties are highly asymmetrical and, thus, potentially exploitable (Barbieri 1996, 31–32). As Hirschman argues with regard to asymmetrically dependent states, ‘‘The greater the percentage of exports and imports involved in a dominant market, the more difﬁcult it will be to provide substitute markets and sources of supply’’ (1980, 30). In short, asymmetry implies that powerful states ‘‘may be able to manipulate the relationship as a source of power’’ (Keohane and Nye 1973, 122). Finally, commercial proximity to nonpartners (closeness) may also increase autonomy, especially if it accords states strategically valuable positions in the global trade network. Concerns about strategic actors are a common theme in colloquial views of international economics—evidenced, for example, by popular criticism of China’s role in export of rare-earth metals or Japanese predominance in semiconductors. States that occupy highly central positions in the global trade network may hold monopoly power in value-added chains and thus exercise political inﬂuence even over nonpartners. This possibility is reinforced by evidence that trade in certain strategic resources in fact increases conﬂict (e.g., Goenner 2010; Polachek 1980; Sen 1984). Thus: H2: Trade integration increases a country’s probability of initiating militarized disputes Trade Integration and Network Centrality The complexity of multilateral trade integration presents an empirical challenge. I employ a network conception of integration, in which the global system of commerce is deﬁned as a network of interacting units. Most simply, a social network consists of a set of n actors (nodes) connected by a set of ties (edges). The network is formally represented as an n 3 n adjacency matrix, A, where matrix entries aij indicate a tie between node i and node j. Network ties may either be nondirected, such that aij 5 aji , or directed, such that aij ¼6 aji . Network ties may also be dichotomous, such that aij 5 1 if a tie exists and aij 5 0 otherwise, or they may be weighted, such that aij takes on some value indicating not merely the presence but also the strength of the i / j tie.

#### Third, Productivity gains spell the inevitable decline of manufacturing

Becker 2012

[Gary Becker, Gary Becker is a professor at the University of Chicago and a Nobel Laureate, 04/24/3012, A Farewell to Factories, <http://english.caixin.com/2012-04-24/100383805_2.html>, uwyo//amp]

Commentators have always lamented a sizable fall in jobs in any large sector of an economy. A prominent example is the huge decline in farm employment during the 20th century in all developed countries. In 1900, about 40 percent of American jobs were in agriculture. This fraction continued to drop during that century, despite a host of special subsidies and tax breaks to the farm sector. Only 2.5 percent of the American labor force has worked on farms during the past couple of decades. The enormous advances in farm productivity are a major reason behind the disappearance of farm jobs. With about 2 percent of the labor force currently on farms, the United States manages not only to provide the vast majority of food for 300 million Americans, but U.S. farmers have enough production left over to export large quantities to the rest of the world. Big productivity gains in manufacturing are also a major cause behind the decrease in manufacturing employment in the United States. Higher productivity lowered prices of manufactured goods relative to prices of services. Yet employment in manufacturing fell because the lower manufacturing prices did not stimulate a large enough increase in the demand for manufactured goods to offset the productivity increases of the manufacturing workforce. A second obvious force reducing jobs in American manufacturing has been the growth in China's economy and its exports of a large variety of cheap manufactured goods (which are a great boon to American and other consumers). Since China did not become a major player in world markets until after 1990, exports from China cannot explain the downward trend in manufacturing employment prior to that year, but Chinese exports were important in the declining trends in manufacturing during the past 20 years. Finally, the recession cut jobs in all sectors of the American economy, but especially in factories and construction.

#### Fourth, US manufacturing eclipses even China- no other country has the background economic profile needed, guarantees manufacturing strength

Keefe 2010

[John Keefe, CBS News reporter, January 2010, Manufacturing Surprise: The U.S. Still Leads In Making Things, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123_162-36742134/manufacturing-surprise58-the-us-still-leads-in-making-things/>, uwyo//amp]

But our manufacturing has the advantage of strong backup from the services sector: [T]he composition of manufacturing in the U.S. has a more economically appealing profile than it does in China. For example, China has a commanding lead in lower tech areas such as textiles, apparel, appliances, as well as certain commodities. By contrast the U.S. has a larger share in higher tech areas such as aircraft, special industrial machinery (machine tools, turbines, equipment for construction and mining), medical and scientific equipment, and of course media related industries (publishing and printing). ... The share of manufacturing value added that is claimed by electronics (including computers) is roughly the same in China as in the U.S. However the U.S. based tech industries consistently achieve higher productivity and wage levels than do their counterparts in China. Also the U.S. tech industries enjoy a stronger domestic base than is seen in China, despite the latter's robust macro economic growth rates, since the higher tech industries in China have traditionally been driven by trends in multinational investment, and other forces related to international trade. In addition the well developed services sectors in the U.S., in particular the dynamic areas of programming and software applications that are resident in the "information" sectors, play a strong role in the supporting the ongoing vitality and development of the electronics part of U.S. manufacturing § Marked 14:30 § (in addition to supporting other industries such as 'Publishing'). So the strength of U.S. in services sectors should continue to provide competitive support for the viability and fast growth rates of technology based manufacturing in the U.S. So U.S. manufacturing is still big -- maybe not bigger than everyone else by a mile, but it's important. And by the reasoning of IHS Global Insight, we're still pretty good at it. And if Chinese manufactured goods become more expensive due to a rising renminbi, maybe we can reclaim some of that market share.

# 2NC

# CP

#### Alaskan offshore drilling projects will destroy the economies and environments around them

Cernansky 10

(Rachel Cernansky is a writer and environmentalist. She received a Master's Degree in journalism from Columbia University“Offshore Drilling Bad for Environment, Energy Security, and Job Creation: Oceana” April 1, 2010. http://video.planetgreen.discovery.com/work-connect/oceana-offshore-drilling-economy.html//wyoccd)

If you haven't heard, President Obama announced plans this week to begin offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coasts of Alaska and Virginia. The move betrays his talk on the campaign trail, and it undoes a longstanding ban on offshore drilling. Ocean conservation group www.oceana.org">Oceana is calling him out on it, saying not only is it a threat to the environment and marine life, but it compromises efforts to improve energy security and may threaten job creation. Instead of drilling offshore, which Oceana campaign director Jacqueline Savitz called "a wholesale assault on the oceans," she said "the U.S. should focus its resources on expanding offshore wind and other renewable energy opportunities." These opportunities would go much farther to create jobs and address climate change, whereas offshore drilling will compete for resources with renewables—making all energy sources more expensive to bring to market. From a jobs, costs and climate standpoint, says Oceana, the most beneficial are renewables, such as offshore wind. Short-sighted plan A study by the Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts has shown that for every $1 million of U.S. investment in clean energy technology (including wind, solar, smart grid work and building retrofits to increase energy efficiency), three times more jobs are created than if the same amount were invested in oil and gas. Drilling projects will compromise the economic health of coastal communities, which rely on clean waters and intact ecosystems. Without proper understanding of how drilling will affect the ecosystem—or the ability to predict the future—these projects are also seen as risky and, for some of the leases in Alaskan waters, subject to challenge in the Court of Appeals because of a lack of sound science promising the environmental safety of drilling in these areas. Michael LeVine, Pacific Senior Counsel for Oceana, said, "Trial and error is the wrong way to find out whether it's safe to drill in the Arctic Ocean." Arctic offshore leases made during the Bush Administration were found by a federal court to be arbitrary and unsupported by adequate science. In 2009, the court ruled that the Interior Department had not properly evaluated the environmental sensitivity of offshore drilling. Obama's plan is no better, and to say the least, it's a disappointment to anyone concerned about the environment, energy security (or gas prices), or job creation.

#### Artic drilling would accelerate rapidly and would destroy ecosystems home to rare species

Beinecke 12

(Frances Beinecke, president of NRDC. NRDC, one of the United States' most influential environmental action groups, uses law, science and the support of 1.3 million members and online activists to advance comprehensive solutions to today's biggest environmental challenges. “Plan for Arctic Drilling a Bad Move When No Proven Way to Stop an Arctic Spill” June 27, 2012. http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/fbeinecke/plan\_for\_arctic\_drilling\_a\_bad.html//wyoccd)

We saw how little this industry can do to stop a gusher in the Gulf of Mexico, in warm, clear, calmer

waters and with access to a massive flotilla of commercial, industrial and Coast Guard vessels and the best offshore drilling technology in the world. Now envision a blowout in the Arctic Ocean, a remote and harsh region of high seas, gale-force winds and sub-freezing temperatures much of the year. These drilling sites are more than 1,000 miles from the nearest U.S. Coast Guard station. The waters see ice floes in the summer, and are packed solid with ice for eight or more months each year – and no one knows how to clean up an oil spill in ice. A spill in the Arctic would make the Gulf disaster look like child's play. Opening a new vein in our oil addiction, meanwhile, would make a mockery of science. We need to be developing carbon-free energy sources, not searching for ever more fossil fuel in ever more remote and pristine locations. The Arctic is ground zero for climate change. The region has heated up nearly twice as much as the rest of the planet. Its glaciers are receding, and as they melt, they contribute to global sea-level rise. Last week’s cover story in the Economist cautioned: “For those minded to ignore the risks, it is worth noting that even the more extreme predictions of Arctic warming have been outpaced by what has happened in reality.” Americans are already feeling the effects of climate change in the form of deadly heat waves, devastating floods and droughts, and illnesses brought on by polluted air. Opening the Arctic Ocean to drilling will only aggravate these grave consequences. We can keep our economy moving without oil from the Arctic Ocean. Fuel efficient cars, sustainable biofuels, public transit options, and other solutions can get us where we need to go without sacrificing the Arctic Ocean or climate stability. The Obama administration’s new clean car standards, for instance, will save drivers more than $80 billion a year at the pump within 20 years, while cutting our oil use by more than we imported from Saudi Arabia and Iraq in 2010. But the oil industry is using its extraordinary influence to persuade leaders we need more oil and we need to despoil our last wild ocean to get it. Oil companies are so eager to get into the Arctic that they don’t even want to wait until experts can establish what is safe or create plans for protecting the most sensitive parts of the region. Nor do they want to wait until America has acted on the lessons of the BP oil disaster. While the Obama administration has taken some steps, Congress has failed to pass one piece of legislation to make drilling safer since the Deepwater Horizon pumped approximately 170 million gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico. The only responsible course is to put the brakes on risky drilling in the Arctic Ocean, while we gather the facts we need to understand this fragile and vital region. Until and unless we have the knowledge, technology and ability to prevent all spills, or ensure that they are swiftly contained and cleaned up, any drilling in Arctic waters risks unthinkable disaster. The stakes are too high here to roll the dice and hope for the best. Arctic conditions are too harsh for safe operations, and we don’t know how to prevent a blowout or clean up an oil spill there. This is an extraordinary and miraculously wild place, a crucial nursery for whales, seal, polar bears, and birds, to name just a few. We must not trade this rich and diverse region for more oil company profits.

### ANWR=key ecosystem

#### ANWR is unique- Delicate, critical part of Artic Ecosystem

National Resource Defense Council 05

[National Resource defense council, “The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge” 3.10.05, <http://www.nrdc.org/land/wilderness/arcticrefuge/facts1.asp>, \\wyo-bb]

The Arctic Refuge coastal plain is the most critical part of the delicate ecosystems that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established to protect. It is too fragile -- and too valuable -- to be sacrificed for a relatively small amount of oil. We would not put a dam in the Grand Canyon, or cut down Sequoia trees for firewood, so why would we allow oil derricks in one of our last pristine wildernesses? Some places should be off-limits to oil drilling and industrial development, and the Arctic Refuge is one of them. We have a moral responsibility to save wild places such as the Arctic Refuge for future generations.

#### One of the last places to be untouched by industrialization

Meadows 11

[William H. Meadows, President of The Wilderness Society, “There Will Never Be a Time to Drill in ANWR”, November 3, 2011. http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-it-time-to-drill-in-the-arctic-refuge/there-will-never-be-a-time-to-drill-in-anwr, \\wyo-bb]

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is truly one of a kind. It is one of the few remaining intact ecosystems in the world--one of the last places on the planet that has not felt the heavy hand of industrialization. It is home to more than 100,000 caribou that make up the Porcupine caribou herd. These animals are the cultural lifeblood of the Gwich'in people and their primary food source. For the Gwich'in, the Arctic Refuge--specifically the coastal plain, where the caribou go to birth their calves--is the "sacred place where life begins." The coastal plain is also designated critical habitat for the threatened polar bear, and provides the most important land denning and nursery habitat in the United States for polar bears.

# Econ

#### Decline doesn’t cause war

Miller 00 (Morris, Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa, ‘2K (Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

# Heg

### Unsustainable: Multiple Factors

#### Hegemony not sustainable- hard and soft power and economic/political constraints will all undermine it

Layne 9

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, International Security, “The Waning of US Hegemony—Myth or Reality?”, 2009, p. asp]

According to the NIC, in addition to relative decline, the United States will confront other constraints on its international role. U.S. military supremacy will no longer be as dominant as it has been since the Cold War’s end (p. 93). The United States’ soft power may diminish as its liberal model of political and economic development is challenged by authoritarian/statist alternatives (pp. 3, 8–9, 13–14). At home, economic and political constraints may undermine U.S. hegemony.

.

### Unsustainable: Structural Characteristics

#### Hegemony is structurally unsustainable—history is categorically on our side

Layne 9

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, Review of International Studies, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, 2009, p. asp]

Although there are some nuanced differences among offshore balancing’s proponents, they fundamentally agree on the strategy’s basic premises. First, offshore balancers recognise that one of the few ironclad rules in international politics is that when one great power becomes too powerful – when it bids to achieve hegemony – it is defeated by the counter-balancing efforts of the other major powers in the international system. The history of the modern international state system (which dates back to about 1500) is littered with the wreckage of great powers that tried an failed to achieve geopolitical primacy: the Hapsburg Empire under Charles V, Spain under Philip II, France under Louis XIV and Napoleon, and Germany under Hitler (and, some would argue, under Kaiser Wilhelm II). Failure is the fate of hegemons. The reason is simple: the basic motivation of all major states is to survive, and when one among them threatens to gain preponderant power, the security of the others is threatened.

#### OFFSHORE BALANCING SOLVES FOR EAST ASIAN WARS—JAPAN, RUSSIA AND INDIA STABILIZE IT

Layne in ‘7

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science @ Texas A&M, American Empire: A Debate , P. 76 //wyo-tjc]

The key component of a new geopolitical approach by the United States would be the adoption of an offshore balancing strategy Under this approach, a regional East Asian power balance would become America's first line of defense against a rising China and would prevent Beijing from dominating East Asia. The other major powers in Asia-Japan, Russia, India-have a much more immediate interest in stopping a rising China in their midst than does the United States, and it is money in the bank that they will step up to the plate and balance against a powerful, expansionist state in their own neighborhood. It is hardly surprising (indeed, it parallels in many ways America's own emergence as a great power) that China-the largest and potentially most powerful state in Asia-is seeking a more assertive political, military, and economic role in the region, and even challenging America's present dominance in East Asia. This poses no direct threat to U.S. security, however, Doubtless, Japan, India, and Russia (and, perhaps, Korea) may be worried about the implications of China's rapid ascendance, because a powerful China potentially would be a direct threat to their security. This is precisely the point of offshore balancing: because China threatens its neighbors far more than it threatens the United States, these neighbors-not the United States-should bear the responsibility of balancing against Chinese power.

#### HEGEMONY AND EXTENDED DETERRENCE COMMITMENTS IN EAST ASIA WILL INEVITABLY FAIL, CHAIN-GANGING THE US INTO A NUCLEAR WAR. MUST WITHDRAW AND ALLOW RENUCLEARIZATION TO STRIKE A STABLE BALANCE AND PREVENT A LARGER WAR BETWEEN THE US AND ASIA\*\*

Layne in 96

[Christopher, “Less is More”, National Interest, Spring, p. 72-73 //wyo-tjc]

The conditions that contributed to successful extended nuclear deterrence in Cold War Europe do not exist in post-Cold War East Asia. Unlike the situation that prevailed in Europe between 1948 and 1990 -- which was fundamentally stable and static -- East Asia is a volatile region in which all the major players -- Japan, China, Korea, Russia, Vietnam -- are candidates to become involved in large-scale war. There is no clear and inviolable status quo. The lines of demarcation between spheres of influence are already blurred and may well become more so as Chinese and Japanese influence expand simultaneously, increasing the number and unpredictability of regional rivalries. The status of Taiwan, tension along the 38th Parallel in Korea, conflicting claims to ownership of the Spratly Islands, and the Sino-Japanese territorial dispute over the Senkaku Islands are only a few of the flash-points that could ignite a great power war in East Asia. Washington will clearly exercise far less control over the policies of East Asian powers than it exercised over America's European allies during the Cold War. Hence, the risk of being chain-ganged into a nuclear conflict are much higher for the United States in post-Cold War East Asia if it maintains or extends nuclear guarantees to any of the region's major states. Even more important, post-Cold War East Asia simply does not have the same degree of strategic importance to the United States as did Europe during the Cold War. Would the United States risk a nuclear confrontation to defend Taiwan, the Spratlys, or Senkaku? Knowing that they would not constitute the same kind of threat to U.S. interests that the Soviet Union did, future revisionist East Asian powers would probably be more willing to discount America's credibility and test its resolve. The presence of American forces in the region may indeed have the perverse effect of failing to preserve peace while simultaneously ensuring the United States would be drawn automatically into a future East Asian war. They could constitute the wrong sort of tripwire, tripping us rather than deterring them. Notwithstanding current conventional wisdom, the United States should encourage East Asian states -- including Japan -- to resolve their own security dilemmas, even if it means acquiring great power, including nuclear, military capabilities. Reconfiguring American security policies anywhere in the world in ways that, in effect, encourage nuclear proliferation is widely seen as irresponsible and risky. This is not necessarily the case. Nuclear proliferation and extended deterrence are generally believed to be flip sides of the same coin, in the sense that providing the latter is seen to discourage the former. Nearly all maximalists are simultaneously proliferation pessimists (believing that any proliferation will have negative security implications) and extended nuclear deterrence optimists (believing that extended nuclear deterrence "works"). But this formulation comes apart from both ends in East Asia: Potential nuclear powers in the region are unlikely to act irresponsibly and, as suggested above, the U.S. nuclear umbrella is of uncertain credibility in post-Cold War circumstances in which the Soviet Union no longer exists and strains in the U.S.-Japanese relationship are manifest. Even selective proliferation by stable, non-rogue states admittedly raises important political, strategic, organizational, and doctrinal issues. But so does relying on America's nuclear extended deterrence strategy in changed circumstances. The need at hand is to weigh the dangers imbedded in an extended deterrence strategy against those posed by the possibility of nuclear proliferation, and here the Japanese case provides the most important and sobering illustration. Clearly, most of the concerns about proliferation that maximalists hold are inapplicable to Japan. Japan is not a rogue state, but a highly stable political system with a firm pattern of civil-military relations in which civilian primacy is unchallenged. On the technical side, Japan has both the technology and the resources to build an invulnerable, second strike deterrent force, thus contributing to crisis stability by muting a potential adversary's incentives to pre-empt in crisis. No one seriously doubts that Japan could develop command-and-control systems at least as sophisticated as our own to ensure against accidents, unauthorized use, or terrorism. And while the dangers of japanese proliferation are more modest than commonly supposed, the risks to the United States of maintaining its nuclear umbrella are greater. In short, for the United States, some nuclear proliferation may be preferable to pledges of extended deterrence in circumstances in which credibility would be low compared to the dangers of catalytic war. Retracting the nuclear umbrella from Japan would, it is true, set off a chain of foreseeable -- and unforeseeable -- events. But if the guarantee is left in place and deterrence should fail, that, too, would lead to a chain of unforeseeable -- and all-too-foreseeable -- consequences. On balance then, the risks to East Asians might rise even as the dangers for the United States shrink. It is not a simple matter, but inasmuch as the preeminent goal of U.S. foreign policy is the security of the United States, the choice in such circumstances is clear.

#### HEGEMONY IN THE MIDDLE EAST SPARKS TERRORISM AND INSTABILITY, LINK TURNING EVERY POSSIBLE REASON FOR HAVING HEG THERE IN THE FIRST PLACE

Layne in 6

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to Present, Cornell University Press (Ithica), p. 123 //wyo-tjc]

Nondemocratic states know—and have known long before March 2003— that the United States is willing to use its hard power to impose its liberal institutions and values on them. This tends to create self-fulfilling prophecies, because it causes states that might not otherwise have done so to become “threats.” When the United States challenges the very legitimacy of existing nondemocratic regimes, the effect is to increase their sense of isolation and vulnerability. States and regimes are highly motivated to survive, so it’s no surprise that, in self-defense, others respond to U.S. offensive use of liberal ideology by adopting strategies that give then, a chance to do so, including asymmetric strategies such as acquiring weapons of mass destruction annl supporting terrorism. Another grand strategic consequence of U.S. democracy-promotion efforts is that these often generate instability abroad. Again, Iraq is a good example. Convinced that the Middle East already is so turbulent that nothing the United States does will make things worse, the Bush II administration professes indifference about the destabilizing potential of democratic transitions in the region.34 President George W. Bush declared that the United States will not accept the status quo in the Middle East and that “stability cannot be purchased at the expense of liberty.”35 Although it’s unlikely the United States can purchase real democracy in the Middle East at any price, it is likely that by attempting to do so Washington will end up buying a lot more turmoil in the region. Indeed, radical Islamic groups see the U.S. push to democratization as a path for seizing power.36 The odds are high that U.S. efforts to export democracy will backfire, because even if democracy should take root in the region, it is not likely to he liberal democracy. Illiberal democracies usually are unstable, and they often adopt ultranationalist and bellicose external policies.37 In a volatile region like the Middle East, it is anything but a sure bet that newly democratic regimes—which by definition would be sensitive to public opinion—would align themselves with the United States. Moreover, if new democracies should fail to satisfy the political and economic aspirations of their citizens—precisely the kind of failure to which new democracies are prone—they easily could become far more dangerous breeding grounds for terrorism than are the regimes now in power in the Middle East.

# 1NR

#### BIOTERRORISM RISKS STOCK MARKET COLLAPSE

**GARRETT IN ‘01**

(science & medical writer) ‘01

[Laurie, Foreign Affairs, January/February, LN]

**In a large urban center,** the true costs of a bioterrorist attack might be the consequences of panic, such as a stock market collapse in New York or a commodities market crash in Chicago. At a 1998 Senate hearing on bioterrorism, then Minnesota State Epidemiologist Michael Osterholm warned against underestimating the degree of panic such an event would provoke:  
[A] single case of meningitis in a local high school causes enough fear and panic to bring down a whole community. . . . Now imagine you're telling people, "This is going to unfold for eight weeks, and I can't tell you if you're going to die." And with every symptom . . . real or imagined, [people are] going to think, "I've got it! I'm going to die!"

#### BIOTERRORISM RISKS TRADE RESTRICTION BACKLASH

**FIDLER (Prof, Law, Indiana University.) ‘02**

[David P., “Public health and Internationa Law: Bioterrorism, Public health, and International Law.” 3 Chicago Journal of International Law 7, Spring//delo-uwyo]

This episode indicates that bioterrorism may affect international law on trade in goods. In the World Trade Organization ("WTO"), for example, member states have  [\*20]  the right to restrict trade in order to protect human, animal, and plant life or health. n39 The exercise of this right is subject, however, to scientific and trade-related disciplines. The scientific disciplines require sufficient scientific evidence and a scientific risk assessment supporting trade-restricting health measures. n40 Further, WTO member states must base trade-restricting health measures on applicable international standards, unless they have scientific evidence that such standards are inadequate. n41 The trade-related disciplines mean that trade-restricting health measures must be non-discriminatory and the least trade restrictive measures possible. n42  
These rules were not designed to deal with the potential adverse trade consequences of bioterrorism. The rules remain relevant in the bioterrorism context, however, because they seek to ensure that trade-restricting health measures protect health, are based on scientific opinion rather than fear, and minimize the impact of *bona fide* measures on flows of international trade. Although Russia has not joined the WTO, the United States addressed Russia's ban against livestock and meat imports from Florida as though the dispute would be handled under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures ("SPS Agreement"). The United States pointed out that Russia's ban exceeded applicable international standards set by the Office International des Epizooties ("OIE") for dealing with anthrax. n43 The SPS Agreement recognizes the OIE as the standard-setting international organization for animal health. n44 In other words, Russia's ban was not justified by the scientific standards internationally recognized as applicable in this context.  
This episode reinforces the importance of science and public health as a component of international legal analysis. Bioterrorism is a great producer of fear. International trade law on protecting human, animal, and plant life and health seeks to ensure that science and public health principles drive government decisions rather than fear or protectionism disguised as fear. The anthrax attacks underscore the importance of these disciplines in international trade law.

.

#### Plan forces political energy fights---saps capital --- also proves rollback

Geman 10

[Ben, The Hill, 4/1/10, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/90137-drilling-push-shakes-up-climate-fight->]

While most of the drilling proposal can be undertaken using executive power, expanded drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico would require congressional approval. That will surely play a role in the fight over energy and climate legislation that Democrats hope to bring to the floor. Republicans called Obama’s plan too narrow, as it closes off or delays leasing or sales in other areas. The energy consulting firm ClearView Energy Partners, in a research note Wednesday, said the limits of the White House plan give architects of the Senate energy and climate bill an opening to woo new support. “One obvious implication of today’s announcement: delaying and canceling OCS [Outer Continental Shelf] sales gives lawmakers the opportunity to ‘sweeten’ a climate bill by restoring or accelerating sales,” ClearView states. But the White House and the architects of Senate legislation — Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) — risk losing support among liberal Democrats and environmentalists as they seek expanded drilling. For instance, Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.) attacked the plan Wednesday. “Drilling off the Virginia coast would endanger many of New Jersey’s beaches and vibrant coastal economies, MARKED” Lautenberg said in a prepared statement. Environmental groups that are on board with efforts to craft a compromise climate change and energy bill — such as the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council — also slammed the proposal.

#### Top of the agenda and will pass-about to be unveiled- means he’ll overcome contentious issues

TNW 1/25

[The Next Web. “The Senate will move next week on comprehensive high-skill immigration reform,” 2013, <http://thenextweb.com/us/2013/01/25/the-senate-will-move-next-week-on-comprehensive-high-skill-immigration-reform/>]

Today The Hill obtained a copy of a forthcoming proposed law dubbed the ‘Immigration Innovation Act.’ Critically, it is backed by a bipartisan collection of Senators, giving it a clear shot at clearing the upper chamber of the United States Congress.¶ While likely h, the bill’s two key tenets would dramatically improve the high-skill immigration system of the United States. According to The Hill’s notes, the act would:¶ Completely end the cap on the total, yearly number of H-1B visas that American companies can apply for, providing that they are applying for a foreign graduate with a technical degree of an American university. TNW isn’t sure, but we’re assuming that degrees that fall under the “STEM” rubric are what will be required.¶ Improve the extant H-1B system by adding 40,000 slots each year. Also, the act would grant more H-1B visas based on market demand, provided that the new 115,000 visa ceiling was reached before the end of the year. This system would have a final cap of 300,000.¶ The bill does allow for spouses of H-1B visa holders to live and work inside of the United States. The House will likely have issues with the provision. Given that the House has been home to various immigration conspiracy theories, it would be out of character for it to keep its marbles this time around. This bill is a massive improvement on the laws tossed around during the last Congress.¶ The previous bill included fewer high-skilled visas, did not create the education exception, and perhaps most oddly ended the popular ‘green card lottery.’ That specific provision ended the proposed law’s chance of becoming law.¶ Here is the list of tipped co-sponsors for the Immigration Innovation Act: “Sens. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.).”¶ If it can quickly pass the Senate, and receives a nod from the President, the House will be under immense pressure to pass it as well, but it could become weighed down with ponderous amendments that could be viewed as poison pills, roughly.¶ In his inaugural address, the President called for an improvement of the country’s high-skill immigration system. He may get it.

#### Will pass- bipartisan

#### Will pass- momentum and bipartisan support

Levey Feb. 3rd

[Noam Levey, Feb. 3rd, 2013, LA times writer, Reid predicts the Senate will pass immigration reform, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/03/news/la-immigration-reform-reid-predicts-senate-pass-20130203>, uwyo//amp]

WASHINGTON – Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said Sunday he is optimistic the Senate will pass immigration legislation, suggesting Republicans will have no choice but to join the push for a sweeping overhaul. “Things are looking really good,” the Nevada Democrat said in an interview on ABC News’ “This Week.” “Republicans can no longer stop this. They’ve tried it; it hasn’t worked.” A bipartisan group of senators – four Democrats and four Republicans – last week unveiled a blueprint for comprehensive legislation that would tighten border security and set up a path for illegal immigrants to get citizenship. And several leading GOP lawmakers have noted that the party, which lost heavily among Latino voters in the 2012 presidential election, must take action on the immigration issue.

#### Will pass-Republican change of heart

Lilley Feb. 4th

[Sandra Lilley, writer for NBC Latino, Feb. 4h, 2013, Bipartisan House group hopes to unveil immigration reform plan by next week, <http://nbclatino.com/2013/02/04/bipartisan-house-group-hopes-to-unveil-immigration-reform-plan-by-next-week/>, uwyo//amp]

In fact, Gonzales says, out of all the issues the House debates this term, including gun control legislation and the debt ceiling, he thinks immigration legislation has the best chance of passing. ”The two parties are interested in reform for two different reasons. Democrats see it as a fairness issue, and for Republicans there is a political component, “says Gonzales. ”Overall, the rhetoric on the Republican side has shifted, and traditional Republican business groups are more open to find a way to reach an agreement,” he adds.

#### Immigration is Top Priority

Stanton 2/7

[John Stanton, Buzzfeed Staff, “Obama Throws Down The Gauntlet Over Defense Cuts”, http://www.buzzfeed.com/johnstanton/obama-throws-down-the-gauntlet-over-defense-cuts

February 7, 2013, \\wyo-bb]

On immigration reform, Obama noted that "I said this is going to be a top priority and an early priority … [and] I am heartened" by bipartisan talks in the House and Senate. "I recognize that politics aren't always easy … but what I also know is that part of our strength is our youth and dynamism and our history of attracting talent from all over the globe. Ive seen some of that talent in the young DREAMERS I've met," he said. He also urged Congress to address gun violence and to "do so recognizing that again there are regional diff here, and we should respect those … guns means something differ for somebody who grew up on a farm or rural community and someone who grew up in a city." "But we can't have a situation where 20 more of our children or 100 more of our children are shot in a senseless fashion," Obama added.

#### PC key to agenda- needs to quickly invest before he becomes a lame duck

Carson & Hennessey Feb. 4th

[Christi Parsons and Kathleen Hennessey, Washington Bureau, Feb. 4th, 2013, Obama takes second-term agenda to the campaign trail, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/04/nation/la-na-obama-20130204>, uwyo//amp]

During a second term, presidents often head off on a tour of the country after their State of the Union assessment, seizing the high mark of their political capital to press their agenda. The clock is ticking with less than two years, maybe only months, before lame-duck status sidelines the chief executive.

#### Obama’s capital is key – he’s got enough for immigration with the coming debt and gun fights. But will need to be a broker on immigration

FOLEY 1 – 15 – 13

[Elise Foley, reporter for the Huffington Post in Washington, D.C. She previously worked at The Washington Independent, Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform_n_2463388.html>]

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way. At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.

Now there's the question of how Obama gets there. While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal.

It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.

In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.

#### Framing issue—initial bargaining determines legislative success—capital now is key

Matthew N. Beckman, UC-Irvine Professor of Political Science, 2010, Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004, p. 53

To the cynic, meetings between White House officials and congressional leaders offer little more than pageantry - an opportunity to portray legislative work, not to do it. And, to be sure, sometimes these interbranch exchanges entail little more than pleasantries and pictures. However, many close observers of the presidential-congressional relationship have long cited prevoting bargaining across Pennsylvania Avenue as being substantively important. For example, discussing President Eisenhower's legislative record in 1953, CQ staffers issued a caveat they have often repeated in the years since: The President's leadership often was tested beyond the glare spot- lighting roll calls....Negotiations off the floor and action in commit- tee sometimes are as important as the recorded votes. (CQ Almanac 1953,77) Many a political scientist has agreed. Charles Jones (1994), for one, wrote, "However they are interpreted, roll call votes cannot be more than they are: one form of floor action on legislation .If analysts insist on scoring the president, concentrating on this stage of lawmaking can provide no more than a partial tally" (195)' And Jon Bond and Richard Fleisher (1990) note that even if they ultimately are reflected in roll-call votes, "many important decisions in Congress are made in places other than floor votes and recorded by means other than roll calls ... " (68). Still, while citing earlygame processes as being potentially important, no one has yet shown how (or when) they are, much less integrated the earlygame and endgame within a unified framework. This is what I aim to accomplish here. Specifically, let me now uncover how, in addition to the familiar endgame lobbying option, presidents may also seek to exert influence in the legislative earlygame by implementing a two-pronged approach: mobilizing leading allies and deterring leading opponents.

#### Specifically true for immigration—capital key to get legislation off the ground

Ted Hesson, 1/2/13, Analysis: 6 Things Obama Needs To Do for Immigration Reform, abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/things-president-obama-immigration-reform/story?id=18103115#.UOSvpG88CSo

On Sunday, President Barack Obama said that immigration reform is a "top priority" on his agenda and that he would introduce legislation in his first year. To find out what he needs to do to make reform a reality, we talked to Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director at America's Voice, a group that lobbies for immigration reform, and Muzaffar Chishti, the director of the New York office of the Migration Policy Institute, a think tank. Here's what we came up with. 1. Be a Leader During Obama's first term, bipartisan legislation never got off the ground. The president needs to do a better job leading the charge this time around, according to Chishti. "He has to make it clear that it's a high priority of his," he said. "He has to make it clear that he'll use his bully pulpit and his political muscle to make it happen, and he has to be open to using his veto power." His announcement this weekend is a step in that direction, but he needs to follow through.

#### PC key to agenda-bully pulpit pressures oppositional congresswomen and men

Carson & Hennessey Feb. 4th

[Christi Parsons and Kathleen Hennessey, Washington Bureau, Feb. 4th, 2013, Obama takes second-term agenda to the campaign trail, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/feb/04/nation/la-na-obama-20130204>, uwyo//amp]

"He's always been very comfortable in the campaign-mode part of this — the speeches making direct appeals to the American public where he wants to see the policy go," said GOP strategist Kevin Madden, a former advisor to Mitt Romney. "I think he's always been much more comfortable with the pageantry of politics than the practice of building legislative coalitions." It's unclear whether any president could build a coalition in such a sharply split Congress. But as Obama reads his first term, the best way to get anything done on Capitol Hill is to win over the crowds first. Fresh off his first inauguration, Obama spent his political capital diving into healthcare reform, a bruising effort that took more than a year. His efforts to negotiate a far-reaching budget deal with the House speaker yielded nothing. But when he took to the road, he was able to win an extension of the payroll tax break and lower interest rates on federal student loans. "They're making up for a major error of the first term, that he didn't use the bully pulpit as effectively to set the national debate," said Allan Lichtman, a presidential historian at American University. "He let a lot of the healthcare debate take place in Congress, so you had Congress setting the terms." "In the second term, if he's going to get anything done, he has to get the public behind him," Lichtman continued. "Congress operates on fear and greed. The only way you get Congress to work with him is if they believe he has a big public movement behind him."

#### Reducing environmental regulations triggers massive Congressional battles and requires PC expenditure

Kraft and Vig 10

[Michael Kraft is a Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs @ UWisconsin-Green Bay. Norman J. Vig is Winifred and Atherton Bean Professor of Science, Technology, and Society, Emeritus, at Carleton College. “Environmental Policy over Four Decades,” CQPress, <http://www.cqpress.com/docs/college/Ch1-kraft-vig.pdf>]

Despite these notable pledges and actions, rising criticism of environmental programs also was evident throughout the 1990s and the first decade of the twenty-first century both domestically and internationally. So too were a multiplicity of efforts to chart new policy directions. For instance, intense opposition to environmental and natural resource policies arose in the 104th Congress (1995–1997), when the Republican Party took control of both the House and Senate for the first time in forty years. Ultimately, much like the earlier effort in Ronald Reagan’s administration, the antiregulatory campaign on Capitol Hill failed to gain much public support. 2 Nonetheless, pitched battles over environmental and energy policy continued in every Congress through the 110th (2007–2009), and they were equally evident in the executive branch as the Bush White House sought to rewrite environmental rules and regulations to favor industry and to dramatically increase development of U.S. oil and natural gas supplies on public lands. 3 Yet growing dissatisfaction with the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of environmental policies was by no means confined to congressional conservatives and the Bush administration. It could be found among a broad array of interests, including the business community, environmental policy analysts, environmental justice groups, and state and local government officials. 4 Since 1992, governments at all levels have struggled to redesign environmental policy for the twenty-first century. Under Presidents Bill Clinton and GeorgeW. Bush, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) tried to “reinvent” environmental regulation through the use of collaborative decision making involving multiple stakeholders, public-private partnerships, market-based incentives, information disclosure, and enhanced flexibility in rulemaking and enforcement (see chapters 7, 9, and 10). 5 Particularly during the Clinton administration, new emphases within the EPA and other federal agencies and departments on ecosystem management and sustainable development sought to foster comprehensive, integrated, and long-term strategies for environmental protection and natural resource management (see chapter 8). 6 Many state and local governments have pursued similar goals, with adoption of a wide range of innovative policies that promise to address some of the most important criticisms directed at contemporary environmental policy (see chapters 2 and 11). The election of President Barack Obama in 2008 signaled the likelihood of even greater attention to innovative policy ideas in the years ahead as the nation demonstrated a new sense of urgency about climate change and a determination to address a range of environmental, energy, and resource challenges despite a poor economy. The precise way in which Congress, the states, and local governments will change environmental policies remains unclear. The partisan gridlock of the past decade may give way to greater consensus on the need to act. Yet policy change rarely comes easily in the U.S. political system. Its success will likely depend on several key conditions: public support for change, how the various policy actors stake out and defend their positions on the issues, the way the media cover these disputes, the relative influence of opposing interests, and the state of the economy. Political leadership, as always, will play a role, especially in reconciling deep divisions between the major political parties on environmental protection and natural resource issues. Political conflict over the environment is not going to vanish any time soon. Indeed, it will likely increase as the United States and other nations struggle to define how they will respond to the latest generation of environmental problems. In this chapter we examine the continuities and changes in environmental politics and policy since 1970 and discuss their implications for the early twenty-first century. We review the policymaking process in the United States, and we assess the performance of government institutions and political leadership. We give special attention to the major programs adopted in the 1970s, their achievements to date, and the need for policy redesign and priority setting for the years ahead. The chapters that follow address in greater detail many of the questions explored in this introduction. The Role of Government and Politics The high levels of political conflict over environmental protection efforts during recent years underscores the important role government plays in devising solutions to the nation’s and the world’s mounting environmental ills. Global climate change, population growth, the spread of toxic and hazardous chemicals, loss of biological diversity, and air and water pollution all require diverse actions by individuals and institutions at all levels of society and in both the public and private sectors. These actions range from scientific research and technological innovation to improved environmental education and significant changes in corporate and consumer behavior. As political scientists we believe government has an indispensable role to play in environmental protection and improvement. The chapters in this volume thus focus on environmental policies and the government institutions and political processes that affect them. Our goal is to illuminate that role and to suggest needed changes and strategies.

#### Expansion of offshore oil production/drilling is highly partisan-pushes Congress into a stalemate

Barlett & Silveleib 2011

[By Ted Barrett and Alan Silverleib, CNN,

May 18, 2011, Senate rejects GOP oil drilling plan, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/POLITICS/05/18/senate.oil.drilling/index.html>, uwyo//amp]

Washington (CNN) -- The Senate rejected a Republican measure Wednesday to expand offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. coastal waters, signaling a continued partisan stalemate over energy policy and, more specifically, how to respond to rising gas prices. The bill was defeated in a 42-57 vote. Sixty votes were required for passage. Five Republicans -- Alabama's Richard Shelby, Louisiana's David Vitter, Maine's Olympia Snowe, South Carolina's Jim DeMint, and Utah's Mike Lee -- voted against the bill. One Democrat, Montana's Max Baucus, didn't vote. On Tuesday, the Senate rejected a Democratic measure MARKED to strip major oil companies of about $20 billion in tax subsidies over the next 10 years and use the savings to pay down the federal deficit.

#### Oil expansion is highly controversial and distracts from other legislation

Snyder 2011

[Tanya Snyder, November 4, 2011, Coming Soon: Super-Partisan “Oil-For-Infrastructure” Transpo Bill, <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/11/04/coming-soon-super-partisan-oil-for-infrastructure-transpo-bill/>, uwyo//amp]

“In the coming weeks, House Republicans will formally introduce an energy & infrastructure jobs bill, and hope to move the legislation through the House before the end of the year,” House Speaker John Boehner announced yesterday. House Republicans say a bill to pay for infrastructure with oil exploitation is on its way. Photo: Heat USA Back in September, the Speaker let slip that the GOP would like to “link the next highway bill to an expansion of American-made energy production.” Turns out, two House Republicans have already put forth proposals to do just that. Both plans pay for infrastructure investment not with user fees like a gas tax, but with revenues from oil drilling. Yoking transportation funding to fossil fuel extraction presents a horrific feedback loop. Drill for oil to pay for infrastructure to drive more cars to burn more oil — it’s a recipe to entrench oil dependence in transportation policy in a whole new way. Very few details have emerged so far about Boehner’s plan. For example, it’s unclear whether House leadership plans to use one of those bills as a guide. Most likely, it will combine the House Transportation Committee’s multiyear transportation reauthorization proposal with some hybrid plan to expand domestic energy production. This new development is disheartening for anyone who genuinely wants to see a reauthorization pass anytime soon. Congress has been unable to pass one because of polarizing disagreements over funding and complete paralysis when it comes to taking the necessary step of increasing the gas tax. A plan to expand oil drilling, with the Deepwater Horizon disaster still fresh in Americans’ minds, is bound to be even more controversial. With no chance of passing the Senate or being signed by the president, a bill like this will only serve to distract attention from more realistic proposals to reauthorize the surface transportation program. Besides, the logistics will likely be so complex and the revenues will be far enough in the future that even putting politics aside, the proposal is untenable.