# 2AC Round 2

#### Big Oil distorts markets and creates political abuse

Juhasz 8 (Antonia – American oil and energy analyst, Investigative Journalism Fellow at the Investigative Reporting Program, “The Tyranny of Oil”, pgs 124-125)

FROM ITS VERY CONCEPTION TO the present day, the oil industry has been plagued with massive **anticompetitive, undemocratic socially, economically, and politically destructive practices**, the while, it has been coddled, subsidized, protected, and preserved by the U.S. government. We have come all but full circle from the Standard Oil of Rockefeller to the ExxonMobil of today. For decades the oil companies have been permitted to collude and wreak havoc on the governments and people of the world, only to return home and direct their collusive energies against the United States and its people. In 2007 the Wall Street Journal declared, "The federal government has nearly stepped out of the antitrust enforcement business, leaving companies to mate as they wish."132 The impacts of the merger waves are being felt in critical ways today. From Chevron's purchase of Getty, to BP's purchase of Amoco, to Exxon's massive merger with Mobil, antitrust experts warned over and over again that concentration in the oil industry would lead to an erosion of democracy, market manipulation, reduced supply, higher gas prices, and other forms of both market and political abuse. **They were right**.

#### The permutation is a linkage of struggles – without an affirmation of solidarity there’s no chance for change

Giroux 11 (Henry A. Giroux, Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, 9 October 2011, “An Interview With Henry Giroux: Youth Movement in a Culture of Hopelessness”, <http://www.truth-out.org/interview-henry-giroux-youth-movement-culture-hopelessness/1318092302>)

AJE: Police have used batons and pepper spray against some protesters in New York, and have arrested more than 800 of them. In your latest article, you **describe non-physical government repression** in the US - especially within the education system. Can you describe that, in the context of why people are angry enough to camp out for weeks on end in protest? HG: The theoretical framework for that is that one of the things you have to realise is that democracy doesn't work without the formative culture that makes possible the skills, the knowledge, the ideas, the modes of dialogue, the **modes of exchange, that can actually** provide the foundation for people to be critical and engaged social and individual agents. If you don't have that formative culture, democracy becomes empty. What you end up with is actually a culture that is so wedded, in this particular case, to a neoliberal logic, that people can only see themselves as individuals, they can only see themselves as competitive, they hate the social state, they have no understanding of solidarity; and what I have been arguing for at least 35 years is that you have to take seriously **that education is a fundamental part of politics**, and that we're not just talking about schools. We're talking about, as C Wright Mills said, **an entire cultural apparatus that now has an enormously educational function.** All you have to do is look at Fox News in the US, or look at the right wing takeover of talk radio, which is overwhelming. The fact is that these media don't entertain, they produce subjectivities, they produce identities, they produce desires, they create framing mechanisms for how people understand politics and their relationship to immigrants and to each other and to a larger global audience. It seems to me that until this question of pedagogy - of the articulation of knowledge through experience and how people relate to the world - until education is seen as a fundamental dimension of politics, we're in real trouble, because if you don't do that you can't understand social media as a profoundly important political educational tool. If you don't do that, you can't understand how people come to internalise understandings of themselves that are at odds with their own possibilities for freedom. That's why I believe the dominant media finds this movement so threatening. They're hysterical. What it suggests is not that young people are simply protesting. It suggests that they're not buying the crap that comes out of the dominant media, they're challenging it, and secondly, they're setting up their own circuits of knowledge and education. That's frightening to think that young people can actually create a culture in which questions of dialogue, dissent, critical engagement, global responsibility, can come into play - **that truly frightens**, in my estimation, financial and dominant elites.

#### Whiteness isn’t a monolithic root cause---they shut off productive debate over solutions – means the alt fails

Shelby 7 – Tommie Shelby, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity

Others might challenge the distinction between ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage, on the grounds that we are rarely, if ever, able to so neatly separate these factors, an epistemic situation that is only made worse by the fact that these causes interact in complex ways with behavioral factors. These distinctions, while perhaps straightforward in the abstract, are difficult to employ in practice. For example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the members of a poor black community to determine with any accuracy whether their impoverished condition is due primarily to institutional racism, the impact of past racial injustice, the increasing technological basis of the economy, shrinking state budgets, the vicissitudes of world trade, the ascendancy of conservative ideology, poorly funded schools, lack of personal initiative, a violent drug trade that deters business investment, some combination of these factors, or some other explanation altogether. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to determine when the formulation of putatively race-neutral policies has been motivated by racism or when such policies are unfairly applied by racially biased public officials.¶ There are very real empirical difficulties in determining the specific causal significance of the factors that create and perpetuate black disadvantage; nonetheless, it is clear that these factors exist and that justice will demand different practical remedies according to each factor's relative impact on blacks' life chances. We must acknowledge that our social world is complicated and not immediately transparent to common sense, and thus that systematic empirical inquiry, historical studies, and rigorous social analysis are required to reveal its systemic structure and sociocultural dynamics. There is, moreover, no mechanical or infallible procedure for determining which analyses are the soundest ones. In addition, given the inevitable bias that attends social inquiry, legislators and those they represent cannot simply defer to social-scientific experts. We must instead rely on open public debate—among politicians, scholars, policy makers, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens—with the aim of garnering rationally motivated and informed consensus. And even if our practical decision procedures rest on critical deliberative discourse and thus live up to our highest democratic ideals, some trial and error through actual practice is unavoidable.¶ These difficulties and complications notwithstanding, a general recognition of the distinctions among the ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage could help blacks refocus their political energies and self-help strategies. Attention to these distinctions might help expose the superficiality of theories that seek to reduce all the social obstacles that blacks face to contemporary forms of racism or white supremacy. A more penetrating, **subtle, and empirically grounded analysis is needed to comprehend the causes of racial inequality and black disadvantage**. Indeed, these distinctions highlight the necessity to probe deeper to find the causes of contemporary forms of racism, as some racial conflict may be a symptom of broader problems or recent social developments (such as immigration policy or reduced federal funding for higher education).

#### Negative state action in a positive direction proves that the state can be used to stop doing bad things

Barbrook 97 Dr. Richard Barbrook, Hypermedia Research Centre – U. of Westminster, 6-5-1997, “More Provocations,” Amsterdam.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-1-9706/msg00034.html

I thought that this position is clear from my remarks about the ultra-left posturing of the ‘zero-work’ demand. In Europe, we have real social problems of deprivation and poverty which, in part, can only be solved by state action. This does not make me a statist, but rather anti-anti-statist. By opposing such intervention because they are carried out by the state anarchists are tacitly lining up with the neo-liberals. Even worse, refusing even to vote for the left, they acquiese to rule by neo-liberal parties. I deeply admire direct action movements. I was a radio pirate and we provide server space for anti-roads and environmental movements. However, this doesn’t mean that I support political abstentionism or, even worse, the mystical nonsense produced by Hakim Bey. It is great for artists and others to adopt a marginality as a life style choice, but most of the people who are economically and socially marginalised were never given any choice. They are excluded from society as a result of deliberate policies of deregulation, privatisation and welfare cutbacks carried out by neo-liberal governments. During the ‘70s. I was a pro-situ punk rocker until Thatcher got elected. Then we learnt the hard way that voting did change things and lots of people suffered if state power was withdrawn from certain areas of our life, such as welfare and employment. Anarchism can be a fun artistic pose. However, human suffering is not.

#### Eliminating the state causes corporate fill-in – private groups will ramp up exploitation in far worse ways

Chomsky 98 (Noam, Professor of Linguistics – MIT, The Common Good: Noam Chomsky Interviewed by David Barsamian, p. 84-85)

So Argentina is “minimizing the state”–cutting down public expenditures, the way our government is doing, but much more extremely. Of course, when you minimize the state, you maximize something else –and it isn’t popular control. What gets maximized is private power, domestic and foreign. I met with a very lively anarchist movement in Buenos Aires, and with other anarchist groups as far away as northeast Brazil, where nobody even knew they existed. We had a lot of discussions about these matters. They recognize that they have to try to use the state--even though they regard it as totally illegitimate. The reason is perfectly obvious. When you eliminate the one institutional structure in which people can participate to some extent--namely the government--you're simply handing over power to unaccountable private tyrannies that are much worse. So you have to make use of the state, all the time recognizing that you ultimately want to eliminate it. Some of the rural workers in Brazil have an interesting slogan. They say their immediate task is "expanding the floor of the cage." They understand that they're trapped inside a cage, but realize that protecting it when it's under attack from even worse predators on the outside, and extending the limits of what the cage will allow, are both essential preliminaries to dismantling it. If they attack the cage directly when they're so vulnerable, they'll get murdered. That's something that anyone ought to be able to understand who can keep two ideas in their head at once, but some people here in the US tend to be so rigid and doctrinaire that they don’t understand the point. But unless the left here is willing to tolerate that level of complexity, we’re not going to be of any use to people who are suffering and need our help—or, for that matter, to ourselves.

#### Turns the alt and provides our aff new offense against the alt – economic vulnerability uniquely impacts Native Americans

Hanson 1 (Randel, Assistant Professor of Justice Studies – Arizona State University, American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 25)

The marketing of nuclear waste to American Indians as a means of economic development is the latest chapter in the story of radioactive colonization, just as the process by which hit is marketed arguably represents a new stage in US-Indian relations win which voluntarism is the hallmark of dispossession. Capitalism, whether industrial or post-industrial, is a shape-shifting force that continues to open up new opportunities for itself. The invitation to American Indians by the US government and corporations to step more centrally into the market relations of capitalism and more fully apply it in appraising the future of Indian lands and peoples is an example of that shape-shifting. At the end of the Cold War, according to the US government and corporations, tribal sovereignty may mean that Native Americans will face increasing onslaughts in the forms of “invitations” to take the toxic wastes of dominant society. Ironically, while this may allow Native Americans to retain their lands and increase their sovereignty over them, the very survivability of those lands may be jeopardized by the toxic threats, which confront them.

**Extinction**

**Boggs 97** (Carl, Professor of Political Science – National University, Theory & Society 26, December, p. 773-774)

The decline of the public sphere in late twentieth-century America poses a series of great dilemmas and challenges. Many ideological currents scrutinized here ^ localism, metaphysics, spontaneism, post- modernism, Deep Ecology – intersect with and reinforce each other. While these currents have deep origins in popular movements of the 1960s and 1970s, they remain very much alive in the 1990s. Despite their different outlooks and trajectories, they all share one thing in common: a depoliticized expression of struggles to combat and overcome alienation. The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved – perhaps even unrecognized – only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious diseases, technological displacement of workers) cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side- step these global realities will, more than ever, be **reduced to impotence**. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, **the fate of the world hangs in the balance**. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will **continue to decide** the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be **filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites** – an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way **the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise** – or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collective interests that had vanished from civil society.75

#### Turn – remediation focus – “giving the land back” cannot undo past harm to natives – only locks in a cycle of guilt and hostility

Espinoza and Harris 97 (Leslie, Associate Professor of Law – Boston College Law School and Angela P., Professor of Law – University of California, Berkeley School of Law, “Embracing the Tar-Baby - LatCrit Theory and the Sticky Mess of Race”, California Law Review, October, 85 Calif. L. Rev. 1585, Lexis)

Interracial justice in Yamamoto's sense may also require that we question the underlying assumption of the oppression sweepstakes: that the competition is for more and special goodies from the state, and that these will be distributed in accordance with a remedial paradigm in a zero-sum game. A narrow focus on securing a privileged place within the existing legal framework prevents us from challenging the framework itself; the oppression sweepstakes ignores the possibility that liberation is not a zero-sum game. [**191**](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1aeeea8422dc0173d223d66d258a7b36&docnum=5&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAb&_md5=70c114391a759ff4dc2bdba808330bf4&focBudTerms=native%20america%21%20or%20indian%20w/35%20land%20back&focBudSel=all#n191) And like an unremitting focus on past injury in therapeutic discourse, the remedial paradigm endorsed by the Supreme Court in anti-discrimination law and furthered by various reparations movements has its dangers. It is important to acknowledge past injury; yet true remediation is impossible, both politically and symbolically. No amount of money distributed to present-day African Americans can undo the loss of forty acres and a mule at the end of the [\*1644]  Civil War. Present-day Indian nations will never be given all of their land back, and even if they were, no land transfer could undo the genocide and the spirit-murder that Indian conquest wrought. The search for remediation as the way to undo the wounds of the past **threatens to lock whites and nonwhites into a never-ending tango of guilt, despair, and hostile denial.**
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## S

#### DOE initiatives have made licensing easier

**McMahon, 12** – environmental and green technology journalist, writer and editor, teaches journalism at the University of Chicago (Jeff, 5/23. “Small Modular Nuclear Reactors By 2022 -- But No Market For Them.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2012/05/23/small-modular-reactors-by-2022-but-no-market-for-them/)

The Department of [Energy](http://www.forbes.com/energy/) will spend $452 million—with a match from industry—over the next five years to guide two small modular reactor designs through the nuclear regulatory process by 2022. But cheap natural gas could freeze even small nuclear plants out of the energy market well beyond that date. DOE accepted bids through Monday for companies to participate in the Small Modular Reactor program. A number of reactor manufacturers submitted bids, including [NuScale Power](http://www.energyonline.com/Industry/News.aspx?NewsID=7575&NuScale_Power_LLC_Submits_Proposal_to_DOE_for_SMRs) and a collaboration that includes [Westinghouse and General Dynamic](http://www.sacbee.com/2012/05/21/4505348/westinghouse-burns-mcdonnell-and.html). “This would allow SMR technology to overcome the hurdle of NRC certification – the ‘gold standard’ of the international nuclear industry, and would help in the proper development of the NRC’s regulatory framework to deal with SMRs,” according to Paul Genoa, Senior Director of [Policy](http://www.forbes.com/policy/) Development at the [Nuclear Energy Institute](http://www.nei.org/).

#### More evidence

**Madia 12** (William Madia, Stanford Energy Journal, Dr. Madia serves as Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University. Previously, he was the Laboratory Director at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory from 2000-2004 and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory from 1994-1999., “SMALL MODULAR REACTORS: A POTENTIAL GAME-CHANGING TECHNOLOGY”, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small_Modular_Reactors_by_William_Madia>, Spring 2012)

**Nevertheless, since the most developed of the SMRs are mostly based on proven and licensed components and are configured at power levels that are passively safe**, **we should not expect many new significant licensing issues to be raised for this class of reactor.**

## NG

There’s NO defense here to our impacts

### A2: Nat Gas Blocks

#### Price spikes are inevitable and only nuclear can stabilize them – investors will switch to nuclear for the stability benefits – that’s Myers

#### Energy investors use future pricing – they THINK nat gas prices will rise

Adams 2-3 (Rod, Publisher – Atomic Insights, “Can Natural Gas Push Nuclear Out of Energy Market?” Energy Collective, 2013, <http://theenergycollective.com/rodadams/180601/natural-gas-push-nuclear-out-market>)

Making long term energy decisions based on today’s North American natural gas prices is a bit like swinging a hockey stick under the assumption that pucks don’t move, even when they are placed on slick ice. The Great One (Wayne Gretzky) would remind anyone guided by that false notion that skating to where the puck is **going to be in five years** is likely to be more rewarding than swinging your stick at the place where the puck was reported to be last month. Here is an important graph to keep in mind when asking if nuclear energy can compete with natural gas. It is also worth keeping this graph of prices for natural gas sold to electricity producers near the top of your decision support material. Everyone who is interested in energy decisions should either know or learn that it takes roughly 5 years from the time that a combined license is issued for a new nuclear plant until that plant enters commercial operation. The license application process requires an additional 42-48 months with a steady investment in both personnel and money in order to keep it moving on that schedule. It is therefore short-sighted to make any decisions about whether or not to pursue a nuclear power project based on today’s market prices. Take any point on the above graph, draw the local slope and see how close it comes to predicting the price of natural gas nine years later. Companies that are building nuclear plants today are benefitting from the low prices that their future competitors are offering and from our rather sluggish economy. The material and labor inputs to the construction process are cheaper in times of low energy prices, low inflation and and low interest costs. There is no doubt that companies that are operating smaller, individually located nuclear units and selling electricity in competitive wholesale markets are not big fans of low electricity prices enabled by low gas prices. Their stress, however, is not solely due to low fuel prices for their competitors. Electricity customers at the retail end of the business are not necessarily obtaining much benefit from temporarily low wholesale market prices. Some items that neither Rebecca nor Richard directly mentioned are just as important as low natural gas prices. For example, every nuclear power plant in the US that is maintaining an operating license must pay an annual fee to the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the regulatory services associated with that license. The fee is a flat rate that does not vary depending on the power output of the reactor, so a plant that generates 1,200 MWe pays exactly the same $4.7 million per year as a plant that only produces 600 MWe. Every nuclear power site in the US is required to provide the same, often excessive, level of security; sites with only one small reactor thus have higher costs per unit of marketable electricity. There is financial uncertainty associated with additional costs that are going to be imposed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in a cosmetic response action to Fukushima; even landlocked plants in Nebraska or Illinois may be forced to show that they can withstand natural disasters on the level of a 9.0 earthquake and a 45 foot high tsunami. The high cost of repairs at a nuclear plant are not driven only by the factors that Rebecca Smith mentioned in the below quote: Nuclear plants also spend heavily on security and other safeguards, and their equipment costs are higher than those for other kinds of generating plants because they handle radioactive material and operate at extreme temperatures. The temperatures at nuclear plants are less extreme than those experienced by their fossil fuel competitors. The radioactive material has proven itself to be less hazardous than the explosive and flammable hydrocarbons fueling natural gas and coal fired power stations. Nuclear equipment costs, especially for the single unit facilities are more driven by the “one of a kind” nature of the technology. They are also increased by the unique, often obsolete quality assurance rules imposed by licensing commitments and the high cost of getting the NRC to change its mind once a rule has been written. Did you know, for example, that many of the units in our existing fleet are still imposing ANSI 45.2-1977 (Quality Assurance Program Requirements for Nuclear Facilities) on their suppliers? That standard was written while I was in high school and published the year I graduated. I’ve been a grandfather for three years. It is extraordinarily expensive to find and qualify suppliers willing to meet a standard that is not even available in a reasonably high quality, searchable format. When I ask colleagues why they have not updated to more modern or more universal quality assurance standards, they describe the minimum of 2-3 years worth of delays and requests for additional information associated with any license change and the subsequent cost of updating all of their existing documentation. There should be no question that higher natural gas prices are the inevitable result of shutting operating nuclear plants, exporting liquified natural gas, and reducing drilling. It is no secret for anyone who listens to earnings calls for natural gas production companies that they are hurting and doing everything in their power to push prices to more profitable levels.

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

#### Fracking is economically unsustainable and can’t maintain low prices

Newman 12 (Alfred, “How do we keep getting these articles about low cost, unlimited amounts of natural gas?,” 8-21-12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertlenzner/2012/08/21/the-exquisite-symmetry-of-the-natural-gas-revolution/

Natural gas prices are increasing and will continue to increase until the price of natural gas balances with the cost of production of natural gas. Fracking is expensive and the cost of natural most likely will double in the coming year to reflect the high cost of fracking. And the price of natural will remain at the cost of natural gas extraction – something called supply and demand. Anyone who makes assumptions based on todays unsustainable low natural gas prices is in for a rude awakening. And anyone who thinks we can just turn the knob on more natural gas production is living in a dream world. Natural gas fracking wells have an 80% depletion rate during the first year. Keeping natural gas production level requires drilling immense numbers of new wells each year – something the natural gas producers are not willing to do at todays unprofitable natural gas prices. To drive this message home, we are producing 4% less natural gas today than we were in January of this year and at the end of this year we will be producing about 10% less natural gas than we were in January of this year. we are in a natural gass bubble and this bubble has been likened to a Ponzi scam. Fracking is not the renaissance of natural gas. fracking is the funeral of natural gas. If you do not understand what this means, you will soon.

#### Incentives solve the nat gas problem – Smith article goes aff

Smith 13 (Rebecca, Correspondent, “Can Gas Undo Nuclear Power?” Wall Street Journal, 1-30, Factiva)

Some nuclear plants are able to stay profitable because they get special payments for just having power plants available that are ready to run, said Hugh Wynne, senior analyst at Sanford C. Bernstein & Co. These special payments are important revenue sources in the big deregulated market in the mid-Atlantic region, supplementing revenue from actual electricity sales. But they're too low in other places, such as the Midwest, to help much, he said.

## GW

#### Not too late – every reduction key

Nuccitelli 12

[Dana, is an environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm in the Sacramento, California area. He has a Bachelor's Degree in astrophysics from the University of California at Berkeley, and a Master's Degree in physics from the University of California at Davis. He has been researching climate science, economics, and solutions as a hobby since 2006, and has contributed to Skeptical Science since September, 2010, <http://www.skepticalscience.com/realistically-what-might-future-climate-look-like.html>, HM]

We're not yet committed to surpassing 2°C global warming, but as Watson noted, we are quickly running out of time to realistically give ourselves a chance to stay below that 'danger limit'. However, 2°C is not a do-or-die threshold. Every bit of CO2 emissions we can reduce means that much avoided future warming, which means that much avoided climate change impacts. As Lonnie Thompson noted, the more global warming we manage to mitigate, the less adaption and suffering we will be forced to cope with in the future. Realistically, based on the current political climate (which we will explore in another post next week), limiting global warming to 2°C is probably the best we can do. However, there is a big difference between 2°C and 3°C, between 3°C and 4°C, and anything greater than 4°C can probably accurately be described as catastrophic, since various tipping points are expected to be triggered at this level. Right now, we are on track for the catastrophic consequences (widespread coral mortality, mass extinctions, hundreds of millions of people adversely impacted by droughts, floods, heat waves, etc.). But we're not stuck on that track just yet, and we need to move ourselves as far off of it as possible by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions as soon and as much as possible. There are of course many people who believe that the planet will not warm as much, or that the impacts of the associated climate change will be as bad as the body of scientific evidence suggests. That is certainly a possiblity, and we very much hope that their optimistic view is correct. However, what we have presented here is the best summary of scientific evidence available, and it paints a very bleak picture if we fail to rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. If we continue forward on our current path, catastrophe is not just a possible outcome, it is the most probable outcome. And an intelligent risk management approach would involve taking steps to prevent a catastrophic scenario if it were a mere possibility, let alone the most probable outcome. This is especially true since the most important component of the solution - carbon pricing - can be implemented at a relatively low cost, and a far lower cost than trying to adapt to the climate change consequences we have discussed here (Figure 4).

#### Their evidence doesn’t say FUTURE emissions key to solve it says what’s already in the air is – plan doesn’t reduce that sufficiently to cause an ice age – only a risk of a link turn

#### Runaway warming collapses the Gulf Stream and results in ice age

Kohler 9 (Rickard – Essay cited by Dr. Ferit Bingel -- Middle East Technical University of Marine Sciences, 1-26, http://www.behav.org/student\_essay/climate/gulf%20stream\_Kohler/gulf%20stream\_ Kohler.htm)

Scientists today are not only concerned with global warming, but the effect it will have on the Gulf Stream. The Gulf Stream may slow and maybe stop. According to recent data, the climate could change and become warmer as soon as the next three years, with the most damaging effects occuring between 2010-2020. Global heating of the Scandinavian lattitudes would decrease the cooling of the surface water, its density and its salt content because of increased raining. This global warming change will increase the sea level 0,4-0,6 m by 2080 by melting the northern glaciers, which in turn would bring more fresh cold water into the Atlantic. The melting of the Greenland ice sheet exceeds the annual snowfall, increasing freshwater runoff and thus increasing the freshening of the water in the North Atlantic Ocean. The large amount of fresh water from the glacier melt would stop the flow of the Gulf Stream, causing the ocean circulation pattern to change and thus stopping the main source of warm water to Scandinavia. If the ocean becomes less salty, the stream would lose its density and sink. The cold water that came from these glaciers would press the Stream back and force the warmer water to sink before it rached the coast of the northern countries. The last time this happened was during the ice age when the polar caps melted, halting the Gulf Stream and leaving everything under ice. Sediments have been found on the bottom of the northern Atlantic Ocean and in the glaciers which proved the warm water streams going towards nothern Europe stopped during the last ice age between Norway and Greenland. If the Gulf Stream did stop, the average temperature may fall as far as 10 degrees celcius. During an ice age, the circulation of the ocean is slow. The Gulf Stream's flow discontinues and would leave Scandinavia covered in a thick sheet of ice. This sea-ice cover in the upper part of Scandinavia would keep them in constant winter and summer would disappear. By 2010, those areas would become un-livable and the population would migrate southward.

#### Warming causes volcanic eruptions

Live Science 7 (“Global Warming Might Spur Earthquakes and Volcanoes”, 8-30, <http://www.livescience.com/environment/070830_gw_quakes.html>)

Earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, tsunamis and landslides are some of the additional catastrophes that climate change and its rising sea levels and melting glaciers could bring, a geologist says. The impact of human-induced global warming on Earth's ice and oceans is [already noticeable](http://www.livescience.com/php/multimedia/imagegallery/igviewer.php?imgid=626&gid=42&index=0): Greenland's glaciers are melting at an increasing rate, and sea level rose by a little more than half a foot (0.17 meters) globally in the 20th century, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. With these trends in ice cover and sea level only expected to continue and likely worsen if atmospheric carbon dioxide levels continue to rise, they could alter the stresses and forces fighting for balance in the ground under our feet—changes that are well-documented in studies of past climate change, but which are just beginning to be studied as possible consequences of the current state of global warming. "Although they've described it in the past, nobody's thought about it in terms of future effects of climate change," said Bill McGuire of the University College London's Hazard Research Center. McGuire's speculations of increased geological activity have not yet been published in a journal, but he has written an article about them published in the Guardian Unlimited. Rebounding crust One particular feature that can change the balance of forces in Earth's crust is ice, in the form of glaciers and ice sheets that cover much of the area around Earth's poles plus mountains at all latitudes. The weight of ice depresses the crust on which it sits. As the ice melts, the crust below no longer has anything sitting on top of it, and so can rebound fairly rapidly (by geological standards). (This rebounding is actually occurring now as a result of the end of the last Ice Age: The retreat of massive ice sheets from the northern United States and Canada has allowed the crust in these areas to bounce back.) Areas of rebounding crust could change the stresses acting on [earthquake faults](http://www.livescience.com/php/trivia/?quiz=quake) and volcanoes in the crust. "In places like Iceland, for example, where you have the Eyjafjallajökull ice sheet, which wouldn't survive [global warming], and you've got lots of volcanoes under that, the unloading effect can trigger eruptions," McGuire said.

#### winter and extinction

NASA 98 (“Volcanoes and Climate Change”, Earth Science Enterprise Series, May,

http://www.gsfc.nasa.gov/gsfc/service/gallery/fact\_sheets/earthsci/eos/volcanoes.pdf)

The eruption of a super volcano "sooner or later" will chill the planet and threaten human civilization, British scientists warned Tuesday. And now the bad news: There's not much anyone can do about it. Several volcanoes around the world are capable of gigantic eruptions unlike anything witnessed in recorded history, based on geologic evidence of past events, the scientists said. Such eruptions would dwarf those of Mount St. Helens, Krakatoa, Pinatubo and anything else going back dozens of millennia. "Super eruptions are up to hundreds of times larger than these," said Stephen Self of Britain's Open University. "An area the size of North America can be devastated, and pronounced deterioration of global climate would be expected for a few years following the eruption," Self said. "They could result in the devastation of world agriculture, severe disruption of food supplies, and mass starvation. These effects could be sufficiently severe to threaten the fabric of civilization." Self and his colleagues at the Geological Society of London presented their report to the British government's Natural Hazard Working Group. "Although very rare, these events are inevitable, and at some point in the future humans will be faced with dealing with and surviving a super eruption," Stephen Sparks of the University of Bristol told LiveScience in advance of Tuesday's announcement. Supporting evidence The warning is not new. Geologists in the United States detailed a similar scenario in 2001, when they found evidence suggesting volcanic activity in Yellowstone National Park will eventually lead to a colossal eruption. Half the United States will be covered in ash up to 3 feet (1 meter) deep, according to a study published in the journal Earth and Planetary Science Letters. Explosions of this magnitude "happen about every 600,000 years at Yellowstone," says Chuck Wicks of the U.S. Geological Survey, who has studied the possibilities in separate work. "And it's been about 620,000 years since the last super explosive eruption there." Past volcanic catastrophes at Yellowstone and elsewhere remain evident as giant collapsed basins called calderas. A super eruption is a scaled up version of a typical volcanic outburst, Sparks explained. Each is caused by a rising and growing chamber of hot molten rock known as magma. "In super eruptions the magma chamber is huge," Sparks said. The eruption is rapid, occurring in a matter of days. "When the magma erupts the overlying rocks collapse into the chamber, which has reduced its pressure due to the eruption. The collapse forms the huge crater." The eruption pumps dust and chemicals into the atmosphere for years, screening the Sun and cooling the planet. Earth is plunged into a perpetual winter, some models predict, causing many plant and animal species to disappear forever.

**Nuclear power solves the ice age- means we adapt**

Zbigniew **Jaworowski**, M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc. Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Warsaw ,Winter **2004**, “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate,” 21st Century Science and Technology, <http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global_warming.pdf>. Gendered language is fixed.

Also, it does not seem possible that we will ever gain influence over the Sun’s activity. However, I think that in the next centuries we shall learn to control sea currents and clouds, and this could be sufficient to govern the climate of our planet. The following “thought experiment” illustrates how valuable our civilization, and the very existence of man’s intellect, is for the terrestrial biosphere. Mikhail Budyko**,** the leading Russian climatologist (now deceased)**,** predicted in 1982 a future drastic CO2deficit in the atmosphere, and claimed that one of the next Ice Age periods could result in a freezing of the entiresurface of theEarth**,** including the oceans**.** The only niches of life, he said, would survive on the active volcanoedges.60 Budyko’s hypothesis is still controversial**,** but 10 years later it was discovered that 700 million years ago, the Earth already underwent such a disaster**,** changinginto “Snowball Earth,” covered in white from Pole to Pole, with an average tempera- ture of minus 40°C.15 However let’s assume thatBudyko has been right and that everything, to the very ocean bottom, will be frozen. Will [hu]mankind survive this? I think yes, it would. The present technology of **nuclear power**, based on the nuclear fission of uranium and thorium, **would secure heat and electricity supplies** for 5 billion people for about 10,000 years. At the same time, the stock of hydrogen in the ocean for future fusion-based reactors would suffice for 6 billion years. Our cities, industrial plants, food-producing greenhouses, our livestock, and also zoos and botanical gardens turned into greenhouses, could be heated virtually forever, and we could survive, together with many other organisms, on a planet that had turned into a gigantic glacier. I think, however, that such a “passive” solu- tion would not fit the genius of our future descendants, and they would learn how to restore a warm climate for ourselves and for everything that lives on Earth.

#### The next closest Ice Age cycle is not for at least 30,000 years

IPCC 7 (International Panel on Climate Change, “What Caused the Ice Ages and Other Important Climate Changes Before the Industrial Era?”, 2007, http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\_and\_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-6-1.html)

Starting with the ice ages that have come and gone in regular cycles for the past nearly three million years, there is strong evidence that these are linked to regular variations in the Earth’s orbit around the Sun, the so-called Milankovitch cycles (Figure 1). These cycles change the amount of solar radiation received at each latitude in each season (but hardly affect the global annual mean), and they can be calculated with astronomical precision. There is still some discussion about how exactly this starts and ends ice ages, but many studies suggest that the amount of summer sunshine on northern continents is crucial: if it drops below a critical value, snow from the past winter does not melt away in summer and an ice sheet starts to grow as more and more snow accumulates. Climate model simulations confirm that an Ice Age can indeed be started in this way, while simple conceptual models have been used to successfully ‘hindcast’ the onset of past glaciations based on the orbital changes. The next large reduction in northern summer insolation, similar to those that started past Ice Ages, is due to begin in 30,000 years.

#### Warming results in less productive plants – initial growth doesn’t outweigh long term consequences

Laeschke 12 (Bernard – Science reporter, George Koch – Professor of Forestry at NAU, Coauthor of Study cited “Global warming: Plants exposed to rising temperatures deteriorate”, 4/10, http://www.global-adventures.us/2012/04/10/global-warming-plants/)

Global warming related to rising average temperatures of Earth's atmosphere, lakes and oceans may initially make the grass greener, but not for long periods of time. Plants begin to deteriorate quickly after the early stages of a warming environment, new research suggests. "We were really surprised by the pattern, where the initial boost in growth just went away," said scientist Zhuoting Wu of Northern Arizona University (NAU), a lead author of the study. "As ecosystems adjusted, the responses changed." Ecologists subjected four grassland ecosystems to simulated climate change during a decade-long study. Plants grew more the first year in the global warming treatment, but this effect progressively diminished over the next nine Drought years and finally disappeared. The research shows the long-term effects of global warming on plant growth, on the plant species that make up a community, and on changes in how plants use or retain essential resources like nitrogen. "The plants and animals around us repeatedly serve up surprises," said Saran Twombly, program director in the National Science Foundation (NSF)'s Division of Environmental Biology. "These results show that we miss these surprises because we don't study natural communities over the right time scales. For plant communities in Arizona, it took researchers 10 years to find that responses of native plant communities to warmer temperatures were the opposite of those predicted." The team transplanted four grassland ecosystems from a higher to lower elevation to simulate a future warmer environment, and coupled the warming with the range of predicted changes in precipitation -more, the same, or less. The grasslands studied were typical of those found in northern Arizona along elevation gradients from the San Francisco Peaks down to the Great Basin Desert. The researchers found that long-term warming resulted in loss of native species and encroachment of species typical of warmer environments, ultimately pushing the plant community toward less productive species. The warmed grasslands also cycled nitrogen more rapidly. This should make more nitrogen available to plants, scientists believed, helping plants grow more. But instead much of the nitrogen was lost, converted to nitrogen gases in the atmosphere or leached out by rainfall washing through the soil. Bruce Hungate, senior author of the paper and an ecologist at NAU, said the study challenges the expectation that warming will increase nitrogen availability and cause a sustained increase in plant productivity. "Faster nitrogen turnover stimulated nitrogen losses, likely reducing the effect of warming on plant growth," Hungate said. "More generally, changes in species, changes in element cycles--these really make a difference. Its classic systems ecology: the initial responses elicit knock-on effects, which here came back to bite the plants. These ecosystem feedbacks are critical--you can't figure this out with plants grown in a greenhouse."

#### CO2 good ev is assuming standard or slightly high levels of C02 – it’s not indicative of the aff’s warming scenario

#### The harms of CO2 outweigh CO2 ag- independently it causes 5.5 billion people to starve

Strom 7 (Robert, University of Arizona planetary science emeritus professor, studied climate change for 15 years, the former Director of the Space Imagery Center at NASA Regional Planetary Image Facility, “Hot House”, SpringerLink, p.211-216)

The future consequences of global warming are the least known aspect of the problem. They are based on highly complex computer models that rely on inputs that are sometimes not as well known or factors that may be completely unforeseen. Most models assume certain scenarios concerning the rise in greenhouse gases. Some assume that we continue to release them at the current rate of increase while others assume that we curtail greenhouse gas release to one degree or another. Furthermore, we are in completely unknown territory. The current greenhouse gas content of the atmosphere has not been as high in at least the past 650,000 years, and the rise in temperature has not been as rapid since civilization began sonic 10,000 years ago. What lies ahead for us is not completely understood, but it certainly will not be good, and it could be catastrophic. We know that relatively minor climatic events have had strong adverse effects on humanity, and some of these were mentioned in previous chapters. A recent example is the strong El Niño event of 1997—1998 that caused weather damage around the world totaling $100 billion: major flooding events in China, massive fires in Borneo and the Amazon jungle, and extreme drought in Mexico md Central America. That event was nothing compared to what lies in store for us in the future if we do nothing to curb global warming. We currently face the greatest threat to humanity since civilization began. This is the crucial, central question, but it is very difficult to answer (Mastrandea and Schneider, 2004). An even more important question is: “At what temperature and environmental conditions is a threshold crossed that leads to an abrupt and catastrophic climate change?” It is not possible to answer that question now, but we must be aware that in our ignorance it could happen in the not too distant future. At least the question of a critical temperature is possible to estimate from studies in the current science literature**.** This has been done by the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Germany’s leading climate change research institute (Hare, 2005). According to this study, global warming impacts multiply and accelerate rapidly as the average global temperature rises. We are certainly beginning to see that now. According to the study, as the average global temperature anomaly rises to i °C within the next 25 years (it is already 0.6°C in the Northern Hemisphere), some specialized ecosystems become very stressed, and in some developing countries food production will begin a serious decline, water shortage problems will worsen, and there will be net losses in the gross domestic product (GDP). At least one study finds that because of the time lags between changes in radiative forcing we are in for a I °C increase before equilibrating even if the radiative forcing is fixed at today’s level (Wetherald et al., 2001). It is apparently when the temperature anomaly reaches 2°C that serious effects will start to come rapidly and with brute force (International Climate Change Taskfòrce, 2005). At the current rate of increase this is expected to happen sometime in the middle of this century. At that point there is nothing to do but try to adapt to the changes. Besides the loss of animal and plant species and the rapid exacerixation of our present problems. there are likely to be large numbers of hungry, diseased and starving people, and at least 1.5 billion people facing severe water shortages. GDP losses will be significant and the spread of diseases will be widespread (see bd ow).We are only about 30 years away from the 440 ppm CO2 level where the eventual 2°C global average temperature is probable. When the temperature reaches 3°C above today’s level, the effects appear to become absolutely critical. At the current rate of greenhouse gas emission that point is expected to be reached in the second half of the century. For example, it is expected that the Amazon rainforest will become irreversibly damaged leading to its collapse, and that the complete destruction of coral reefs will be widespread. As these things are already happening, this picture may be optimistic. As for humans, there will be widespread hunger and starvation with up to 5.5 billion people living in regions with large crop losses and another 3 billion people with serious water shortages. If the Amazon rainforest collapses due w severe drought it would result in decreased uptake of CO2 from the soil and vegetation of about 270 billion tons, resulting in an enormous increase in the atmospheric level of CO2**.** This, of course, would lead to even hotter temperatures with catastrophic results for civilization.A Regional Climate Change Index has been established that estimates the impact of global warming on various regions of the world (Giorgi, 2006). The index is based on fi’mr variables that include changes in suthce temperature and precipitation in 2080—2099 compared to the period 1960—1979. All regions of the world are affected significantly, but some regions are much more vulnerable than others. The biest impacts occur in the Mediterranean and northeastern European regions, followed by high—latitude Northern Hemisphere regions and Central America. Central America is the most affected tropical region Íillowed by southern equatorial Africa and southeast Asia. Other prominent mid—latitude regions very vulnerable to global warming are eastern North America and central Asia. It is entirely obvious that we must start curtailing greenhouse gas emissions now, not 5 or 10 or 20 years from now**.** Keeping the global average temperature anomaly under 2°C will not be easy according to a recent report (Scientific Expert Group Report on Climate Change, 2007). It will require a rapid worldwide reduction in methane, and global CO2 emissions must level off to a concentration not much greater than the present amount by about 2020**.** Emissions would then have to decline to about a third of that level by 2100. Delaying action will only insure a grim Future for our children and grandchildren. If the current generation does not drastically reduce its greenhouse gas emission, then, unfortunately, our grandchildren will get what we deserve.There are three consequences that have not been discussed in previous chapters but could have devastating impacts on humans: food production, health, and the economy. In a sense, all of these topics are interrelated, because they affect each other. Food Production Agriculture is critical to the survival of civilization. Crops feed not only us but also the domestic animals we use for food. Any disruption in food production means a disruption of the economy, government, and health. The increase in CO2 will result in some growth of crops, and rising temperatures will open new areas to crop production at higher latitudes and over longer growing seasons; however,the overall result will be decreased crop production in most parts of the world**.** A 1993 study of the effects of a doubling of CO2 (550 ppm) above pre industrial levels shows that there will be substantial decreases in the world food supply (Rosenzweig et al., 1993). In their research they studied the effects of global warming on four crops (wheat, rice, protein feed, and coarse grain) using four scenarios involving various adaptations of crops to temperature change and CO2 abundance. They found that the amount of world food reduction ranged from 1 to 27%. However, the optimistic value of 1% is almost certainly much too low, because it assumed that the amount of degradation would be offset by more growth from “CO2 fertilization.” We now know that this is not the case, as explained below and in Chapter 7. The most probable value is a worldwide food reduction between 16 and 27%. These scenarios are based on temperature and CO2 rises that may be too low, as discussed in Chapter 7. However, even a decrease in world food production of 16% would lead to large-scale starvation in many regions of the world. Large-scale experiments called Free-Air Concentration Enrichment have shown that the effects of higher C 02 levels on crop growth is about 50% less than experiments in enclosure studies (Long et aL, 2006). This shows that the projections that conclude that rising CO2 will fully offset the losses due to higher temperatures are wrong. The downside of climate change will fair outweigh the benefits of increased CO2 and longer growing seasons. One researcher (Prof. Long) from the University of Illinois put it this way: Growing crops much closer to real conditions has shown that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will have roughly half the beneficial 214 What’s in Store for Us? Officials previously hoped for in the event of climate change. In addition, ground—level ozone, which is also predicted to rise but has not been extensively studied before, has been shown to result in a loss of photosynthesis and 20 per cent reduction in crop yield. Both these results show that we need to seriously re-examine our predictions for future global food production, as they are likely to be tàr lower than previously estimated. Also, studies in Britain and Denmark show that only a few days of hot temperatures can severely reduce the yield of major food crops such as wheat, soy beans, rice, and groundnuts if they coincide with the flowering of these crops. This suggests that there are certain thresholds above which crops become very vulnerable to climate change. The European heat wave in the summer of 2003 provided a large-scale experiment on the behavior of crops to increased temperatures. Scientists from several European research institutes and universities found that the growth of plants during the heat wave was reduced by nearly a third (Ciais et al., 2005). In Italy, the growth of corn dropped by about 36% while oak and pine had a growth reduction of 30%. In the affected areas of the mid-west and California the summer heat wave of 2006 resulted in a 35% loss of crops, and in California a 15% decline in dairy production due to the heat-caused death of dairy cattle. It has been projected that a 2°C rise in local temperature will result in a $92 million loss to agriculture in the Yakima Valley of Washington due to the reduction of the snow pack. A 4°C increase will result in a loss of about $163 million. For the first time, the world’s train harvests have fallen below the consumption level fbr the past tour years according to the Earth Policy Institute (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the shortfall in grain production increased each year, from 16 million tons in 2000 to 93 million tons in 2003. These studies were done in industrialized nations where agricultural practices are the best in the world. In developing nations the impact will be much more severe. It is here that the impact of global warming on crops and domestic animals will be most felt. In general, the world’s most crucial staple food crops could fall by as much as one-third because of resistance to flowering and setting of seeds due to rising temperatures. Crop ecologists believe that many crops grown in the tropics are near, or at, their thermal limits. Already research in the Philippines has linked higher night—time temperatures to a reduction in rice yield. It is estimated that for rice, wheat, and corn, the grain yields are likely to decline by 10% for every local 1 °C increase in temperature. With a decreasing availability of food, malnutrition will become more frequent accompanied by damage to the immune system. This will result in a greater susceptibility to spreading diseases. For an extreme rise in global temperature ( 6°C), it is likely that worldwide crop failures will lead to mass starvation, and political and economic chaos with all their ramifications (be civilization. Health Rising temperatures will result in the spread of disease (Pata et al., 2005). The incidence of certain diseases depends to a large extent on the climate. Diseases that are now found in the tropics will spread to higher latitudes and greater altitudes as the climate warms. Those that occur in subtropical and temperate regions for only short periods each year will afflict residents for longer durations as warming intensifies. There are a number of tropical diseases that are likely to spread northward as the climate warms (McMichel et al., 2003; Martens et al., 1995). These include malaria, dengue fever, schistomiasis, onchoncercia sis, lymphatic filariasis, sleeping sickness, leishmaniisis, chagas disease, and yellow fever. Currently, these diseases infect a total of about 800 million people, but the disease with the greatest potential for dissemination to higher latitudes is malaria. Figure 12.1 shows the potential risk of malaria epidemics for an increase of the global mean temperature of only 1.2°C compared for the risk during the 1931—1981 baseline climate. According to this projection, much of North America and Europe are at risk of large outbreaks of the disease with only moderate amounts of global warming. As the climate warms, human populations will become far more vulnerable to heat—related mortality, air pollution—related illnesses, infectious diseases, and malnutrition. Areas of increased rainfall will become much more susceptible to the spread of waterborne and foodborne disease. Increased local rainfall will also nuke it easier for the insects and animals that carry some human diseases to flourish. At present about 9 million cases of waterbome disease occur each year in the United States where most people have access to treated water. Global warming will almost certainly increase that number. The World Health Organization estimates that currently 150,000 people die annually from the climate changes that have taken place in the past 30 years, and projects that millions of people will die from climate—rated diseases in the coining decades. In fact, the spread of disease has already begun. Malaria has quadrupled between 1995 and 2000 due, at least in part, to warmer climates. Malaria is reappearing both north and south of the tropics. It is showing up more frequently in the United States, and has returned to the Korean peninsula, parts of southern Europe, Russia, and to the coast of South Africa along the Indian Ocean.

**No offense – increase in CO2 will overall lead to decrease in crop production and cause global starvation**

**Strom 7** [Robert Strom, Professor Emeritus of planetary sciences in the Department of Planetary Sciences at the University of Arizona, 2007 (studied climate change for 15 years, the former Director of the Space Imagery Center, a NASA Regional Planetary Image Facility, “Hot House”, SpringerLink, p. 211-216]

Agriculture is critical to **the survival of civilization**. Crops feed not only us but also the domestic animals we use for food. Any disruption in food production means a disruption of the economy, government, and health. The increase in CO2 will result in **some growth** of crops, and rising temperatures will open new areas to crop production at higher latitudes and over longer growing seasons; however, **the overall result** will be **decreased crop production** in most parts of the world. A 1993 study of the effects of a doubling of CO2 (550 ppm) above pre-industrial levels shows that there will be **substantial decreases** in the world food supply (Rosenzweig et al., 1993). In their research they studied the effects of global warming on four crops (wheat, rice, protein feed, and coarse grain) using four scenarios involving various adaptations of crops to temperature change and CO2 abundance. They found that the amount of world food reduction ranged from 1 to 27%. However, the optimistic value of 1% is almost certainly much too low, because it assumed that the amount of degradation would be offset by more growth from "CO2 fertilization." We now know that this is not the case, as explained below and in Chapter 7. The most probable value is a worldwide food reduction between 16 and 27%. These scenarios are based on temperature and CO2 rises that may be too low, as discussed in Chapter 7. However, even a decrease in world food production of 16% would lead to large-scale starvation in many regions of the world. Large-scale experiments called Free-Air Concentration Enrichment have shown that the effects of higher CO2 levels on crop growth is about 50% less than experiments in enclosure studies (Long et al., 2006). This shows that the projections that conclude that rising CO2 will fully offset the losses due to higher temperatures are wrong. The downside of climate change will far outweigh the benefits of increased CO2 and longer growing seasons. One researcher (Prof. Long) from the University of Illinois put it this way: Growing crops much closer to real conditions has shown that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will have roughly half the beneficial effects previously hoped for in the event of climate change. In addition, ground-level ozone, which is also predicted to rise but has not been extensively studied before, has been shown to result in a loss of photosynthesis and 20 per cent reduction in crop yield. Both these results show that we need to seriously re-examine our predictions for future global food production, as they are likely to be far lower than previously estimated. Also, studies in Britain and Denmark show that only a few days of hot temperatures can severely reduce the yield of major food crops such as wheat, soy beans, rice, and groundnuts if they coincide with the flowering of these crops. This suggests that there are certain thresholds above which crops become very vulnerable to climate change. The European heat wave in the summer of 2003 provided a large-scale experiment on the behavior of crops to increased temperatures. Scientists from several European research institutes and universities found that the growth of plants during the heat wave was reduced by nearly a third (Ciais et al., 2005). In Italy, the growth of corn dropped by about 36% while oak and pine had a growth reduction of 30%. In the affected areas of the mid- west and California the summer heat wave of 2006 resulted in a 35% loss of crops, and in California a 15% decline in dairy production due to the heat-caused death of dairy cattle. It has been projected that a 2 °C rise in local temperature will result in a $92 million loss to agriculture in the Yakima Valley of Washington due to the reduction of the snow pack. A 4'C increase will result in a loss of about $163 million. For the first time, the world's grain harvests have fallen below the consumption level for the past four years according to the Earth Policy Institute (Brown, 2003). Furthermore, the shortfall in grain production increased each year, from 16 million tons in 2000 to 93 million tons in 2003. These studies were done in industrialized nations where agricultural practices are the best in the world. In developing nations the impact will be much more severe. It is here that the impact of global warming on crops and domestic animals will be most felt. In general, the world's most crucial staple food crops could fall by as much as one-third because of resistance to flowering and setting of seeds due to rising temperatures. Crop ecologists believe that many crops grown in the tropics are near, or at, their thermal limits. Already research in the Philippines has linked higher night-time temperatures to a reduction in rice yield. It is estimated that for rice, wheat, and corn, the grain yields are likely to decline by 10% for every local 1 °C increase in temperature. With a decreasing availability of food, malnutrition will become more frequent accompanied by damage to the immune system. This will result in a greater susceptibility to spreading diseases. For an extreme rise in global temperature (> 6 'C), it is likely that worldwide crop failures will lead to mass starvation, and political and economic chaos with all their ramifications for civilization.

## Off

### Reduce Restrictions CP

#### Perm do both

#### Liscening is not the barrier – that’s Cunningham and Domenici

#### Doesn’t solve case – it doesn’t provide the necessary incentives to solve

#### It’s not competitive – there’s literally no reason you can’t also incentive – its just a uniqueness counterplan for politics but it probably also links to politics – striking down restrictions would still cost PC

#### Plan solves the counterplan - DOE initiatives make licensing easy for SMR’s

**McMahon, 12** – environmental and green technology journalist, writer and editor, teaches journalism at the University of Chicago (Jeff, 5/23. “Small Modular Nuclear Reactors By 2022 -- But No Market For Them.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2012/05/23/small-modular-reactors-by-2022-but-no-market-for-them/)

The Department of [Energy](http://www.forbes.com/energy/) will spend $452 million—with a match from industry—over the next five years to guide two small modular reactor designs through the nuclear regulatory process by 2022. But cheap natural gas could freeze even small nuclear plants out of the energy market well beyond that date. DOE accepted bids through Monday for companies to participate in the Small Modular Reactor program. A number of reactor manufacturers submitted bids, including [NuScale Power](http://www.energyonline.com/Industry/News.aspx?NewsID=7575&NuScale_Power_LLC_Submits_Proposal_to_DOE_for_SMRs) and a collaboration that includes [Westinghouse and General Dynamic](http://www.sacbee.com/2012/05/21/4505348/westinghouse-burns-mcdonnell-and.html). “This would allow SMR technology to overcome the hurdle of NRC certification – the ‘gold standard’ of the international nuclear industry, and would help in the proper development of the NRC’s regulatory framework to deal with SMRs,” according to Paul Genoa, Senior Director of [Policy](http://www.forbes.com/policy/) Development at the [Nuclear Energy Institute](http://www.nei.org/).

#### Incentives are key – reducing restrictions is NOT sufficient to solve any part of case

**Rosner and Goldberg, 11** – William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics at the University of Chicago, and Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory (Robert and Stephen, November. “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.” <https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf>)

Successful commercialization of SMRs will require a “level playing field” in terms of federal financial incentives relative to other clean energy generation technologies. Wind and solar energy currently qualify for a production tax credit (PTC), which can be converted into either an investment tax credit (ITC), or monetized in the form of a cash grant from the U.S. Treasury. 62 Large commercial LWRs also can qualify for a PTC, which is capped at 6,000 MW of capacity. Early SMR deployments (LEAD or FOAK plants) potentially could meet the statutory 2021 commercial operations date (COD) to qualify for the existing PTC, but would not otherwise meet the current Department of Treasury administrative criteria, including the 2014 date for start of construction. 63 Acceleration of SMR deployment activities to serve national energy policies will require government incentives. Absent government incentives, there is no assurance that current privately funded efforts will be carried to fruition, and even if so, on what schedule.

#### Financial incentives key to develop small modular reactors

**Biello, 12** – associate editor for environment and energy for Scientific American (David, 3/27. “Small Reactors Make a Bid to Revive Nuclear Power.” Scientific American. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=small-reactors-bid-to-revive-nuclear-power)

Small may be beautiful for the nuclear power industry So argue a host of would-be builders of novel nuclear reactors. While the U.S. government has not given up on investing in large units that boast conventional designs, the Department of Energy has also announced the availability of $450 million in funds to support engineering and licensing of so-called "small modular reactors." "The Obama Administration and the Energy Department are committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every source of American energy, including nuclear power," said Secretary of Energy Steven Chu in a statement announcing the funding, which aims to get such modular reactors hooked into the grid by 2022. "The Energy Department and private industry are working to position America as the leader in advanced nuclear energy technology and manufacturing." Globally, large reactor designs remain the predominant technology. One alternative to cut costs could be small, novel reactors, appropriate for areas with smaller electricity demands or as part of a flexible power production facility that could scale up quickly as necessary. Small reactors would have a maximum capacity of 300 megawatts of electricity, or enough to power more than 200,000 U.S. homes for a year. In addition, the reactors would be modular—made in factories and shipped to sites—to reduce costs. But such reactors still require the same electricity-generating, safety, and waste disposal systems as the hulking light-water reactors presently being built as well as identical rigorous licensing requirements, at least in the U.S.—and that may cost them. "Yeah, there's less concrete and, yeah, there's less steel in the reactor vessel," says nuclear engineer Eric Loewen, chief consulting engineer at GE Hitachi Nuclear Energy, which is proposing a modular fast reactor to help the U.K. with its plutonium problem. But the list of other expenses associated with nuclear will not change with the new designs and "that gives pause to small modular reactors." Mini-nuke A modern pressurized water reactor, like the two being built in Georgia, can pump out more than 1,000 megawatts worth of power using the heat from fission to boil water to spin a turbine. Babcock & Wilcox—one-time builder of large pressurized water reactors as well as smaller ones suitable for the submarines of the U.S. Navy—would like to shrink those down to just 180 megawatts. "It's not for lack of knowledge of how to build big reactors," says Chris Mowry, president of B&W Modular Nuclear Energy. Instead, B&W suggests that the fundamental problem facing the adoption of nuclear power is not the technology itself, but the financial risk of committing to a build a big nuclear reactor. Simply put, even the largest utilities do not have the capital to build a $7 billion reactor, and such large projects have a tendency to see costs balloon as projects are delayed. A case in point is the Tennessee Valley Authority's bid to complete a second reactor at its Watts Bar Nuclear Power Plant. The reactor, first begun in the 1970s and resumed in 2007, is behind schedule and "will cost more than forecast," admits TVA spokesman Terry Johnson. "It's a size issue," Mowry argues.

#### DOE initiatives have made licensing easier

**McMahon, 12** – environmental and green technology journalist, writer and editor, teaches journalism at the University of Chicago (Jeff, 5/23. “Small Modular Nuclear Reactors By 2022 -- But No Market For Them.” http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffmcmahon/2012/05/23/small-modular-reactors-by-2022-but-no-market-for-them/)

The Department of [Energy](http://www.forbes.com/energy/) will spend $452 million—with a match from industry—over the next five years to guide two small modular reactor designs through the nuclear regulatory process by 2022. But cheap natural gas could freeze even small nuclear plants out of the energy market well beyond that date. DOE accepted bids through Monday for companies to participate in the Small Modular Reactor program. A number of reactor manufacturers submitted bids, including [NuScale Power](http://www.energyonline.com/Industry/News.aspx?NewsID=7575&NuScale_Power_LLC_Submits_Proposal_to_DOE_for_SMRs) and a collaboration that includes [Westinghouse and General Dynamic](http://www.sacbee.com/2012/05/21/4505348/westinghouse-burns-mcdonnell-and.html). “This would allow SMR technology to overcome the hurdle of NRC certification – the ‘gold standard’ of the international nuclear industry, and would help in the proper development of the NRC’s regulatory framework to deal with SMRs,” according to Paul Genoa, Senior Director of [Policy](http://www.forbes.com/policy/) Development at the [Nuclear Energy Institute](http://www.nei.org/).

#### More evidence

**Madia 12** (William Madia, Stanford Energy Journal, Dr. Madia serves as Chairman of the Board of Overseers and Vice President for the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University. Previously, he was the Laboratory Director at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory from 2000-2004 and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory from 1994-1999., “SMALL MODULAR REACTORS: A POTENTIAL GAME-CHANGING TECHNOLOGY”, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Small_Modular_Reactors_by_William_Madia>, Spring 2012)

**Nevertheless, since the most developed of the SMRs are mostly based on proven and licensed components and are configured at power levels that are passively safe**, **we should not expect many new significant licensing issues to be raised for this class of reactor.**

### K

#### Perm do the plan and reorient our relationship to sustainability and flow -~-- the perm radicalizes reformism

Doran and Barry 6 – worked at all levels in the environment and sustainable development policy arena - at the United Nations, at the Northern Ireland Assembly and Dáil Éireann, and in the Irish NGO sector. PhD--AND-- Reader in Politics, Queen's University School of Politics, International Studies, and Philosophy. PhD Glasgow (Peter and John, Refining Green Political Economy: From Ecological Modernisation to Economic Security and Sufficiency, Analyse and Kritik 28/2006, p. 250–275, http://www.analyse-und-kritik.net/2006-2/AK\_Barry\_Doran\_2006.pdf)

EM = Ecological Modernization

Viewed in isolation EM can be painted as a reformist and limited strategy for achieving a more sustainable economy and society, and indeed questions could be legitimately asked as to whether the development of a recognisably ‘green’ political economy for sustainable development can be based on it. In this paper, it is contended that there are strategic advantages in seeking to build upon and radicalise EM. There are indications in the UK that the debate on sustainable consumption may lead to new deliberative fora for a re-negotiation of the meaning and ends of consumption. Could it be that ‘suﬃciency’ will emerge as the logical complement (on the consumer side) of the early production-side debate on EM on the limits of ‘eﬃciency’ without an ecological context? While there are various reasons one can give for this, in this conclusion we focus on two—one normative/principled the other strategic. From a strategic point of view, it is clear that, as Dryzek and his colleagues have shown, **if green and sustainability goals, aims and objectives are to be integrated within state policy, these need to attach themselves to one of the core state imperatives—accumulation/economic growth or legitimacy** (Dryzek et al. 2003; Barry 2003b). It is clear that the discourse of EM allows (some) green objectives to be integrated/translated into a policy language and framework which complements and does not undermine the state’s core imperative of pursuing orthodox economic growth. Therefore if (in the absence of a Green Party forming a government or being part of a ruling coalition, or even more unlikely of one of the main traditional parties initiating policies consistent with a radical understanding of sustainable development), the best that can be hoped for under current political conditions is the ‘greening of growth and capitalism’ i. e. a narrow, ‘business as usual’ version of EM. Or as Jonathan Porritt has put it, “We need more emphasis about the inherent unsustainability of our dominant economic model, even as we seek to improve the delivery of that model in the short to medium term” (Porritt 2004, 5). 23 On a more principled note, the adoption of EM as a starting point for the development of a model/theory of green political economy does carry with it the not inconsiderable beneﬁt of removing the ‘anti-growth’ and ‘limits to growth’ legacy which has (in our view) held back the theoretical development of a positive, attractive, modern conceptualisation of green political economy and radical conceptualisations of sustainable development. Here the technological innovation, the role of regulation driving innovation and eﬃciency, the promise that the transition to a more sustainable economy and society does not necessarily mean completely abandoning currently lifestyles and aspirations—strategically important in generating democratic support for sustainable development, and as indicated above, importance if the vision of a green sustainable economy is one which promotes diversity and tolerance in lifestyles and does not demand everyone conform to a putative ‘green’ lifestyle. Equally, this approach does not completely reject the positive role/s of a regulated market within sustainable development. However, it does demand a clear shift towards making the promotion of economic security (and quality of life) central to economic (and other) policy. Only when this happens can we say we have begun the transition to implementing the principles of sustainable development rather than fruitlessly seeking for some ‘greenprint’ of an abstract and utopian vision of the ‘sustainable society’.

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

#### No prior questions

**Owen 02** David Owen, 2 Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

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

#### The lifecycle's net negative for warming regardless of uranium

Gronlund 7 )Nuclear power in a Warming world: Assessing the Risks, Addressing the Challenges, Lisbeth Gronlund;  David Lochbaum;  Edwin Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists, <http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear_power/nuclear-power-in-a-warming-world.pdf>

Nuclear power plants do not produce global   warming emissions when they operate. However,   producing nuclear power requires mining and processing uranium ore, enriching uranium to create   reactor fuel, manufacturing and transporting fuel,   and building plants—all of which consume energy.   Today much of that energy is provided by fossil fuels (although that may change if the United   States takes steps to address global warming).   However, the global warming emissions   associated with nuclear power even now are   relatively modest. Indeed, its life cycle emissions   are comparable to those of wind power and hydropower. While estimates of life cycle greenhousegas emissions vary with different assumptions and   methodologies, the basic conclusions of most   analyses are consistent: for each unit of electricity generated, natural gas combustion results in   roughly half the global warming emissions of coal   combustion, while wind power, hydropower, and   nuclear power produce only a few percent of emissions from coal combustion. The life cycle emissions of photovoltaics (PVs) are generally somewhat higher than those for wind power, hydropower, and nuclear power, because manufacture of PVs   entails greater global warming emissions.5  The greenhouse gas emissions stemming from   nuclear power depend greatly on the technology   used to enrich uranium. The technology now used in the United States—gaseous diffusion—requires   a large amount of electricity: roughly 3.4 percent   of the electricity generated by a typical U.S. reactor would be needed to enrich the uranium in   the reactor’s fuel.  6  Because fossil fuels generate 70   percent of U.S. electricity, emissions from that  enrichment would account for some 2.5 percent of   the emissions of an average U.S. fossil fuel plant.   However, in the near future, U.S. uranium will   be enriched using gaseous centrifuge technology,   which consumes only 2.5 percent of the energy   used by a diffusion plant. Thus this part of the   nuclear power life cycle would result in very low   emissions.  7

#### The alternative is illogical – it is not specific to SMR technology – prefer our specific scenarios

#### unique link turn – SMRs run on existing nuclear waste

Szondy 12, David, writes for charged and iQ magazine, award-winning journalist [“Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” February 16th, http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/]

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

### Immigration Reform India 2AC

#### No impact

Tellis 2 (Ashley, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Orbis, Winter, p. 19)

In any event, the saving grace that mutes the potential for exacerbated competition between both countries remains their relatively strong economic constraints. At the Pakistani end, these constraints are structural: Islamabad simply has no discretionary resources to fritter away on an open-ended arms race, and it could not acquire resources for this purpose without fundamentally transforming the nature of the Pakistani state itself—which transformation, if it occurs successfully, would actually mitigate many of the corrosive forces that currently drive Islamabad’s security competition with India. [21](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn22#fn22) At the Indian end, these constraints may be more self-imposed. New Delhi commands a large pool of national resources that could be siphoned off and reallocated to security instruments, but the current weaknesses of the central government’s public finances and its reform program, coupled with its desire to complete the technological modernization programs that have been underway for many decades, prevents it from enlarging the budgetary allocations for strategic acquisitions at will. [22](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808#fn23#fn23) With these constraints on both sides, future nuclearization in India and Pakistan is more likely to resemble an "arms crawl" than a genuine Richardson-type "arms race." The strategic capabilities on both sides will increase incrementally but slowly—and in India will have further to go because of its inferior capabilities compared to China’s. This slowness may be the best outcome from the viewpoint both of the two South Asian competitors and the United States.

#### US-Indian relations low but will never collapse

**Padukone 12** (Neil Padukone is the Felow for geopolitics at the Takshashila Institution, 6/19/2012, "Natural Allies?", pragati.nationalinterest.in/2012/06/natural-allies/)

In the late 1990s, the United States and India embarked on a partnership based largely on three strategic issues: markets, counter-terrorism, and balancing China. With the opening of India’s economy in 1991, the United States saw India’s billion-strong population as a massive market for its businesses. In the wake of 9/11, Washington came to see India’s travails against Islamist militants in Kashmir and Afghanistan through the lens of its War on Terror and increased counter-terrorism cooperation with New Delhi. And as India’s and China’s strategic spaces began to overlap, managing China’s rise became a common concern for both New Delhi and Washington. With that in mind, the United States and India reversed decades of enmity and, through the 2006 nuclear deal, embarked upon a symbolic commitment to what heads of state of both countries have called a “natural alliance.” Yet with all the fanfare- particularly after U.S. President Barack Obama voiced his support for a permanent Indian seat on the UN Security Council in his 2010 Lok Sabha speech- bilateral ties have recently been marked by considerable drift: India has not fallen in line on the issue of Iran, Washington is only slowly coming around on Pakistani militancy, the countries’ UN voting records do not mesh, and trade disagreements abound. Questions have been raised over why U.S.-India relations have cooled, or whether they were over hyped in the first place. The U.S. Department of Defense’s “strategic pivot” toward Asia is one way to shore up relations and realign the Indo-U.S. partnership. India’s geostrategic location at the centre of the Indian Ocean- along with its naval expansion toward the southern Indian Ocean and its Port Blair naval base at the Andaman Islands- enable New Delhi to manage China’s presence in the region. Indeed, India and America’s navies have been more coordinated than any other bureaucracy since 2000. But the implications of this shared Beijing-centric orientation will only come about in the medium-term. One dimension of these ties, the sale of defence technologies, is another place where India has not yet delivered: the recent Medium Multi-Role Combat Aircraft (MMRCA) competition failed to award contracts to American companies. And in the middle of a global recession in which all countries are hunkering down, and domestic inflation and unemployment- not to mention concerns over doing business in India, such as retroactive taxation and tax avoidance measures- have grown, economic reforms that would further open India’s markets have slowed. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s recent visit to Kolkata was largely an effort to encourage India to increase the speed of its market liberalisation, particularly in the retail sector. This may be a prospect for the future, but is doubtful today given India’s economic slowdown and the attendant drop in employment. Yet perhaps the main reason for this strategic drift is that America’s key concern in South Asia these days is Afghanistan. President Obama delivered on his campaign promise to refocus efforts on the war in that country, and from 2009, his administration’s “AfPak” strategy took a regional perspective that originally sought to bring India into the equation. The thinking behind this, as Amitai Etzioni writes, is that “for Pakistanis, conflict (with India) poses an ominous existential challenge that drives their behaviour on all things,” including “their approach to the West and the war in Afghanistan… If the India-Pakistan confrontation could be settled, chances for progress on other fronts would be greatly enhanced.” The implication was that Washington ought to hyphenate India and Pakistan, to see the two as part of the same regional tussle, and try to settle the Kashmir dispute in order to make progress in Afghanistan. This was something New Delhi vehemently opposed and in fact, it sought de-hyphenation from Pakistan – engagement with New Delhi and Islamabad on separate and unconnected tracks. So when the office of the late US Special Adviser on Pakistan and Afghanistan Richard Holbrooke sought to include India and Kashmir in its purview, New Delhi successfully lobbied against it. This effort served one of India’s aims, insofar as it keeps Kashmir out of America’s area of direct intervention. Yet it also takes India, its assets, and its clout out of the broader Afghan resolution. Among these assets is the Indian-constructed Chabahar Road that connects Iran’s eastern Chabahar Port on the Gulf of Oman to western Afghanistan. The road ends Pakistan’s monopoly on seaborne trade to Afghanistan, which has long allowed Islamabad’s pernicious dominance of Kabul’s economic and political life. In light of America’s confrontation with Iran and efforts to sanction the latter’s energy sector, however, Washington opposes India’s use of Chabahar, particularly to import Iranian oil and natural gas. Indeed another goal of Secretary Clinton’s visit was to try to shore up India’s support for sanctions against Iran- to which end India is reducing its dependence on Iranian energy as it awaits an exemption on sanctions from the US State Department. But when New Delhi recently used its Chabahar road to send 100,000 tons of wheat to Kabul, its full potential vis-à-vis Afghanistan became evident. And this food aid was on top of India’s additional commitments to Afghanistan: constructing the Zaranj-Delaram highway in western Afghanistan that connects Chabahar to the Afghan ring road, the development of the Ayni Air base in Tajikistan (originally designed to treat wounded Afghan soldiers), building Afghanistan’s parliament building, exploring the Hajigak iron mine, and even commitments to train the Afghan National Police and Army- all of which amount to pledges of over $1 billion since 2001. Washington has been wary of encouraging India’s presence in Afghanistan citing Islamabad’s fear of encirclement. But, even without American attention, a refutation of Pakistan’s “India Threat” narrative is already underway. In order to remain focused on strategic horizons beyond South Asia, India is reorienting its defence apparatus away from Pakistan and towards China and the southern Indian Ocean; even the Ayni Base and Chabahar Road can be seen as elements of this strategic shift beyond the subcontinent. Together with Pakistan’s focus on the Durand Line and events within its own borders, political breathing space between Islamabad and New Delhi has opened up. India-Pakistan talks have already produced a number of important breakthroughs that portend better bilateral days to come: the granting of Most-Favoured Nation status, enhanced trade measures, as well as discussions on the specific parameters of a Kashmir peace based on economic integration. Specifically regarding the Indo-Pak dynamic in Afghanistan, things are less zero-sum than they appear. Important as the Chabahar route is, the combination of road, sea, and even rail links still comes with massive transport costs for India-Afghanistan trade. As S Verma, chairman of Steel Authority of India and the head of a consortium of Indian industries engaged in Afghanistan’s Hajigak iron mine, put it, “over the longer term,” transporting Afghan minerals over Pakistani territory “will be a productive investment. Not just for us, but others in the region including Pakistan. There are license fees, logistics, and so forth.” Meanwhile, Kaustav Chakrabarti of the Observer Research Foundation has suggested “deploying joint Indo-Pak nation building teams” in Afghanistan that include advisors, military trainers, bureaucrats, developments experts, medical crews and NGOs. These teams would “provide additional resources, bridge political polarities, foster cooperation between India and Pakistan and devise means to verify each other’s role, and ultimately, present a long-term mechanism,” guaranteed by India and Pakistan’s geographic proximity, “to ensure Afghanistan’s neutrality.” He cites as a precedent the collaboration between Indian and Pakistani armed forces in “UN peacekeeping missions in hot spots like Somalia.” Full realisation of any Indo-Pak promise will require more space, and time, between the two countries. The interim period, meanwhile, may indeed take a cooling period between the United States and India, who are unlikely to become allies in the fullest sense due to differing tactical approaches. But the strategic fundamentals of the Indo-American rapport- balancing China, expanding trade, and stabilising South Asia- remain intact.

#### PC fails --- immigration specific.

**Cost**, **2/11**/2013 (Jay – staff writer at the Weekly Standard, The Weekly Standard, p. Lexis)

All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president's job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood. President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one in the arena. What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi's power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side. But little such progress will be due to President Obama. It is highly unlikely that he will act as the collective bargainer Neustadt envisioned. He will not be the one to help hammer out policy differences between Senate Democrats and House Republicans, such as illegal immigrants' status under Obamacare, or help the appropriators find the money needed for enforcement, or create a political space where both parties can declare victory. Sure enough, last week's campaign-style speech in Las Vegas on immigration reform was classic Obama. Not only did it do nothing to advance the ball on the sensitive negotiations in Congress, but the president demanded immediate amnesty, something to which Republicans will never agree. He also said he would insist that Congress vote on his proposal if it did not act in a timely fashion. That captures Obama's problem in a nutshell. Insisting that Congress do something is a good way to make sure nothing happens. Instead, as Harry Truman once said, the president must spend his time flattering, kissing, and kicking people to get them to do what they are supposed to do anyway. Barack Obama does not do this. He thinks it beneath him. After four years in office, he still fails to grasp the essence of modern presidential power

#### SMRs are popular

### Nelson and Northey ‘12

Gabriel and Northey, energy and environment reports for Greenwire, “DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3>, AM

It's not just wind and solar projects that are waiting for federal help as Congress duels over the importance of putting taxpayer dollars on the line for cutting-edge energy projects. Some of the nation's largest nuclear power companies are anxious to hear whether they will get a share of a $452 million pot from the Department of Energy for a new breed of reactors that the industry has labeled as a way to lessen the safety risks and construction costs of new nuclear power plants. The grant program for these "small modular reactors," which was announced in January, would mark the official start of a major U.S. foray into the technology even as rising construction costs -- especially when compared to natural-gas-burning plants -- cause many power companies to shy away from nuclear plants. DOE received four bids before the May 21 deadline from veteran reactor designers Westinghouse Electric Co. and Babcock & Wilcox Co., as well as relative newcomers Holtec International Inc. and NuScale Power LLC. Now the summer has ended with no announcement from DOE, even though the agency said it would name the winners two months ago. As the self-imposed deadline passed, companies started hearing murmurs that a decision could come in September, or perhaps at the end of the year. To observers within the industry, it seems that election-year calculations may have sidelined the contest. "The rumors are a'flying," said Paul Genoa, director of policy development at the Nuclear Energy Institute, in an interview last week. "All we can imagine is that this is now caught up in politics, and the campaign has to decide whether these things are good for them to announce, and how." Small modular reactors do not seem to be lacking in political support. The nuclear lobby has historically courted both Democrats and Republicans and still sees itself as being in a strong position with key appropriators on both sides of the aisle. Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made.

#### No link this evidence is about how to PUBLIC perceives nuclear power not whether it will cost capital in congress

#### No internal link to the DA and only a risk winners win – political capital is a meaningless concept and achieving controversial initiatives makes future success more likely

Hirsch, 2/7/13 – chief correspondent for the National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek (Michael, "There's no such thing as political capital.” <http://news.yahoo.com/no-thing-political-capital-201002390--politics.html>)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, **it** wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. BobbyJindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong**.** “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. **Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote** years ago, **“Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown.** Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. **Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say thatpolitical capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or evendefines it.** “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. **That makes it kind of useless,”** says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors”** Ornstein says**. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”**

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

#### Contentious fights coming now – costs PC

Cillizza 2-6 (Chris, Political Reporter, “President Obama is Enjoying a Second Political Honeymoon. But How Long Will It Last?” Washington Post, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/)

Another factor contributing to the truncation of political honeymoons is that in the world of 24-hour cable networks, Twitter and the fracturing of the traditional media, the attention span of the American public is much shorter than it once was — meaning that momentum simply dies away much faster nowadays. Regardless of the reason, it’s clear that Obama has a limited time — six months perhaps? — to take legislative advantage of his second political honeymoon. He seems committed to taking on three separate and distinct fights during that time: 1) gun control 2) immigration reform 3) debt and spending. Each of those legislative scraps will shorten his honeymoon as he expends political capital to try to get what he wants out of a Congress — particularly in the House — that seems likely to be resistant. And, it’s possible — given the glacially slow pace at which Congress works and the aforementioned partisanship that seems to seize any and every issue — that Obama’s honeymoon will fade well before he gets all three of those priorities accomplished. A look back at the trend line on his job approval in his first term is telling in that regard. Even though Obama started off considerably higher in his first term than he began his second term, by August 2009 he had dropped to 54 percent approval in WaPo-ABC polling — thanks to the bailout of the American auto industry, the fight over the economic stimulus package and the earlier positioning over his health-care bill. Considering that Obama is — at best — in the mid-50s in terms of job approval at the moment and the fact that the past showdowns on fiscal issues have revealed the massively different approaches advocated by the two parties, it’s not at all far-fetched to assume that taking on just one of those fights might be enough to end the president’s second term honeymoon. In short: The time is now for Obama to act on his legislative priorities. His political honeymoon will almost certainly be over by the time Congress recesses for its month-long August break this summer.

#### Obama’s push on citizenship guts the bill --- it’s a poison pill.

Barnes, 2/11/2013 (Fred, Deal Breaker, The Weekly Standard, p. Lexis-Nexis)

What is it about compromise that President Obama doesn't understand? Is it that he and Democrats would have to give up something perhaps numerous things to reach an agreement with Republicans? Or is a bipartisan deal unappealing simply because Obama and Democrats would have to share the credit with Republicans?

The issue this time is immigration. And Obama has resumed his familiar role not as compromise-maker but as compromise-wrecker. He spurned bipartisanship on the stimulus and Obamacare and twice raised his demands so high that a grand bargain with Republicans on taxes and spending was impossible, first in 2011, then in 2012. Now Obama is confronted by a compromise on overhauling the immigration system that's already been reached by eight senators, four Democrats and four Republicans. In a speech last week, Obama said the agreement is very much in line with the principles I've proposed and campaigned on. Yet he's dissatisfied. The president wants more. He would tilt the deal in a Democratic direction by putting the 11 million illegal immigrants in this country instantly on a path to American citizenship. Border security? That comes later (if at all). If Obama prevails, the compromise will be shattered and odds on passage of immigration reform reduced to near zero. That outcome, by the way, would please the zealous bloc of conservatives whose battle cry is Keep Illegal Immigrants Illegal in other words, maintain the unstable status quo, or worse. And it would squander a rare opportunity to break the impasse on immigration with a deal that treats illegals fairly and decently and, better still, is good for America. The Senate agreement is a true compromise. Both sides gave up a lot, and, should it pass in some form or other, neither will be able to claim exclusive victory. It's win-win, which is what a compromise is supposed to be. The eight senators last week issued a set of principles for rewriting immigration laws, and a bill is expected in March. The aim is to pass the legislation by the August recess. The House would take up the immigration issue in the fall. The compromise would do three important things. First, illegal immigrants would be given legal status immediately. They wouldn't be eligible for federal benefits, but they wouldn't be deported either. Second, they would gain green cards and be allowed to apply for citizenship in 8 to 12 years after a special commission that includes state and local officials has certified America's southern border as secure. And third, the newly legalized would go to the end of the immigration line (shortened by cleaning out its backlog). It's a long and tedious process. But the legislation won't be drafted by a few senators in secret meetings, then whisked directly to the floor. That's the way Senate majority leader Harry Reid normally operates. This time, so-called regular order will be followed hearings, mark-ups, and debates, a Senate-House conference, a bill on the president's desk. What's surprising is the breadth of the concessions that produced the compromise. The four Democrats Bob Menendez (New Jersey), Michael Bennet (Colorado), Richard Durbin (Illinois), and Charles Schumer (New York) yielded on a guest worker program, which Democrats usually oppose. They accepted a trigger, based on quantifiable improvements in border security, to clear the path to citizenship. They yielded on federal benefits, Obamacare included, which the new residents won't get. And they agreed to increase the number of highly skilled and educated workers given green cards. All that, plus billions more to enhance border security. Republicans had to accept, finally, that the 11 million could become citizens despite having broken the law upon entering the country. True, it's a two-step process that may take 15 years or so, but it arrives at the same place simple amnesty would. Even before that, the undocumented workers would be legal residents of the United States. Republicans also accepted the Dream Act, which gives special status to immigrants brought here as children. The four Republicans Marco Rubio (Florida), Lindsey Graham (South Carolina), and John McCain and Jeff Flake (both Arizona) are veterans of immigration reform struggles. They knew what they were doing. Rubio told Rush Limbaugh that if the insistence on securing the border were removed, he'd vote against the bill. As for Obama, he had a choice. He can either decide that he wants to be part of the solution or he can decide he wants to be part of a political issue and try to trigger a bidding war, Rubio said. The next day, Obama took the political tack. It won't lead to success. Obama would create a freeway to citizenship from day one. That's a poison pill for Republicans. Scrapping the guest worker program would also alienate Republicans, the business community, and those conservatives who regard it correctly as an alternative to illegal border-crossing.

#### Link is non-unique – Obama has already pushed and taken credit for incentives towards SMRs – that’s the 1ac Koch evidence

#### Immigration won’t pass, PC isn’t key, other issues thump

Page 2-21 (Susan, “Obama supported on guns, debt; Divided and dissatisfied with both sides, public is less aligned with Republicans,” Lexis)

An immigration divide A 51% majority of Americans say it's essential for the president and Congress to pass a sweeping immigration bill this year, and nearly everybody, nine in 10, say a major bill is needed within the next few years. But to do what? One in four want the bill to focus on better border security -- that's down 10 percentage points from a year ago -- and another one in four want the focus to be on creating a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants now in this country. Nearly half of those surveyed, 47%, say both should be equal priorities. There is a predictable partisan divide on the issue: Democrats want a pathway to citizenship while Republicans back stronger security and enforcement of existing immigration laws. That could create problems for Republican leaders, including Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, who are working on bipartisan bills that would include a path to legal status for illegal immigrants as well as border security measures. By a wide margin, 50%-33%, Obama's approach to immigration is preferred over the GOP. For Obama, having higher ratings than congressional Republicans doesn't guarantee passage of any legislation, given the polarization in a divided Congress. But it does put him in a stronger position to bring public pressure on lawmakers. And it complicates Republican efforts to unite a fractured party behind a message that will appeal to voters. "Lots of things need to be passed in Congress, and it seems everything is a filibuster," says Jaime Cortez, 23, of Edinburg, Texas. "I know a lot of strong, far-right Republicans, but I just think they need to ease up and listen to the public's opinion." While most Americans want action on the deficit and immigration this year, Obama faces a more difficult task in pressing two other priorities he's outlined, on gun control and climate change.

#### Relations don’t solve

**Tellis 5** (Ashley, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues. 11/16/05 “The U.S.-India ''Global Partnership'': How Significant for American Interests? ““<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17693>)

Several practical implications, which ought to be of significance to the Congress as it ponders the U.S.-Indian civilian nuclear agreement, flow from these realities. To begin with, the strengthening U.S.-Indian relationship does not imply that New Delhi will become a formal alliance partner of Washington at some point in the future. It also does not imply that India will invariably be an uncritical partner of the United States in its global endeavors. India’s large size, its proud history, and its great ambitions, ensure that it will likely march to the beat of its own drummer, at least most of the time. The first question, for the Congress in particular and for the United States more generally, therefore, ought not to be, “What will India do for us?”—as critics of the civilian nuclear agreement often assert. Rather, the real question ought to be, “Is a strong, democratic, (even if perpetually) independent, India in American national interest?” If, as I believe, this is the fundamental question and if, as I further believe, the answer to this question is “Yes,” then the real discussion about the evolution of the U.S.-Indian relationship ought to focus on how the United States can assist the growth of Indian power, and how it can do so at minimal cost (if that is relevant) to any other competing national security objectives.

#### Dicussion of the plan should have already sparked the DA – voting neg still causes the impact to happen

#### No DA – GOP will block, the votes too far off, and visas for skilled workers are inevitable

Cowan 2-5 (Richard, Editor, “House Republicans Challenge Obama Immigration Plan's Citizenship Goal,” Reuters, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/05/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130205)

Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives on Tuesday challenged President Barack Obama's central goal for immigration reform that would put 11 million undocumented residents on a path to citizenship, adding fresh doubts on whether legislation can be passed this year. During a kick-off hearing, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte explored a possible "middle ground" between the current U.S. policy of deporting those who have come to the United States illegally and of placing them on a path to citizenship, as Obama has demanded. The hearing was the panel's first since last November's elections when Hispanic-Americans voted in droves for Obama and his fellow Democrats in Congress. Those election results caused Republicans to rethink their anti-immigration stances, which were highlighted by presidential candidate Mitt Romney's urging that illegal residents should simply "self-deport." A standoff over Democrats' goal of providing citizenship hopes for the immigrants living illegally in the United States could torpedo reform efforts in this Congress. Still, many Republicans expressed concerns about rewarding illegal immigrants with eventual citizenship, which they often decry as an "amnesty." House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, in a speech to the conservative American Enterprise Institute, noted, "While we are a nation that allows anyone to start anew, we are also a nation of laws." Cantor of Virginia is the second-ranking House Republican and has a say in which bills are debated before the full House. At the House Judiciary hearing, Goodlatte, another Virginia Republican, asked, "Are there options to consider between the extremes of mass deportation and pathway to citizenship?" Julian Castro, the Democratic mayor of San Antonio, Texas, who testified before Goodlatte's panel, responded: "I believe, as the president has pointed out ... that a path to citizenship is the best option" for the 11 million, many of whom have lived in the United States for a decade or more. Some Republicans have sketched out more modest steps in dealing with illegal immigrants who live under the threat of deportation. Instead of putting them in line for citizenship, they have suggested a permanent work visa system. But last week, Senator Dick Durbin of Illinois, the second-ranking Senate Democrat, told Reuters legislation could not be enacted unless it contains a path to full citizenship. During Tuesday's House committee hearing, Democratic Representative Zoe Lofgren of California warned: "Partial legalization, as some are suggesting, is a dangerous path and we need only look at France and Germany to see how unwise it is to create a permanent underclass" in the United States. A PIECEMEAL APPROACH Other Republicans in the House Judiciary Committee raised additional ideas that could complicate comprehensive immigration reform this year, or make it impossible. Representative Spencer Bachus, an Alabama Republican, suggested splitting immigration reform into pieces so that the "more toxic and contentious issue" of citizenship for the 11 million was separated from reforms that have more widespread support. Those reforms include efforts to encourage foreigners earning advanced degrees in mathematics, engineering and science at American universities to stay in the United States and work for American companies. Cantor also hinted at a piecemeal approach, rather than the comprehensive action that Obama and his fellow Democrats want. He called for starting with legalization and citizenship for children who were brought illegally into the United States by their parents, an action that Obama last summer approved temporarily. "One of the great founding principles of our country was that children would not be punished for the mistakes of their parents," Cantor said. While Cantor's call marked movement for Republicans, many of whom opposed citizenship for the youths, it also falls well short of Obama's drive for broader legislation. A bipartisan group of senators last week unveiled a comprehensive plan that they hope to translate into legislation in coming weeks. Major holes in their outline included the kind of system that would be created for allowing future visa applicants. Senate Democrats hope to pass a comprehensive bill by mid-year with a large, bipartisan vote that could improve chances for passage of a bill in the Republican-controlled House. But House Republican leaders have not decided on whether they would pursue a major reform bill this year, according to one aide. Goodlatte acknowledged that U.S. immigration laws were badly in need of repair, but he warned against rushing to enact an immigration bill. Congress, he said, "needs to take the time to learn from the past so that our efforts to reform our immigration laws do not repeat the same mistakes."

#### Nuclear power has tons of political support.

Koplow, ‘11

[Doug, founder of Earth Track, Inc., has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for more than 20 years, mainly in the energy sector, holds a B.A. in economics from Wesleyan University, M.B.A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Union of Concerned Scientists, February, “Nuclear Power: Still Not Viable Without Subsidies,” http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_subsidies\_report.pdf]

The industry and its allies are now pressuring all levels of government for large new subsidies to support the construction and operation of a new generation of reactors and fuel-cycle facilities. The substantial political support the industry has attracted thus far rests largely on an uncritical acceptance of the industry’s economic claims and an incomplete understanding of the subsidies that made—and continue to make—the existing nuclear fleet possible.

#### Pol cap isn’t key–Obama is letting congress work out the details

Elise Foley, staff writer, 1/15/13 [“Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” HuffPost, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html]

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.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. The White House also needs to convince GOP lawmakers that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said **the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership** -- while keeping the president heavily involved.¶ In other words, **it's not the place for steamrolling**. "He needs to be an honest broker here," said Ali Noorani, executive director of the National Immigration Forum, which works on bipartisan consensus for reform. "Instead of the politician forcing immigration reform, Obama needs to be the statesman creating immigration reform."¶ Beyond the border, Obama will push for changes to the legal immigration system, which is universally considered to be out of date and ill-suited to the labor market and to managing the future flow of immigrant workers. Any bill will almost certainly include an increase in visas for graduates with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering or math, and more and better flexibility for foreign migrant labor.

#### Democrats will block

Reagan 2-6 (Michael, Political Consultant and Son of President Ronald, “Democrats Thwarting Immigration Reform,” Oncida Daily Dispatch, 2013, <http://oneidadispatch.com/articles/2013/02/06/opinion/doc5112f5a0e9a23697016524.txt?viewmode=fullstory>)

The president and his liberal friends in the media like to make everyone think it’s Republicans who’ve been thwarting comprehensive immigration reform all these years. But the dirty little political secret is that it’s the Democrats who are really the ones who don’t want to see immigration reform happen anytime soon. As long as immigration policy remains a political football to fight over, Democrats can use the issue as a way to brand Republicans as anti-immigrant and continue to capture the vast majority of Latino voters.

#### Capital does not affect the agenda

**Dickinson 9** (Matthew, Professor of political science at Middlebury College, Sotomayer, Obama and Presidential Power, Presidential Power, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### Immigration is not a priority --- promises of action will not fast track it.

**Voorhees**, **1/3**/2013 (Josh – editor of The Slatest, White House (Quietly) Promises Immigration Push, Slate, p. http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2013/01/03/obama\_s\_immigration\_plans\_white\_house\_officials\_suggest\_early\_2013\_won\_t.html)

With one fiscal-cliff fight in the rearview mirror and several more likely looming not too far up the road, many liberals are fretting aloud that President Obama won't have the energy or desire to tackle other issues near the top of his—and their—second-term wish list. White House officials, however, are doing their best to allay those concerns with the (somewhat quiet) promise of action on two high-profile issues: immigration and gun control. The Huffington Post: An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. In the wake of last month's tragedy in Newtown, the president promised to send a gun-control proposal to Congress early this year, likely as soon as this month. The suggestion that the White House will also get to work on immigration reform—long a priority of the president but one that has largely taken a back seat during his time in office—comes as slightly more of a surprise. However, just because the administration is declaring that an unofficial launch to the immigration push is imminent doesn't mean anyone should expect major action anytime soon. The aides who laid out the plans to HuffPo cautioned that it would probably take about two months to cobble together a bipartisan bill, and then another few before either chamber votes on it. That would mean that if all goes as planned (something that is far from certain) it would likely be early or mid-summer before any concrete actions are taken.

#### Visa’s not key to reverse brain drain

Wadhwa 9

Vivek Wadhwa, executive in residence/adjunct professor at the Pratt School of Engineering at Duke University and a senior research associate with the Labor and Worklife Program at Harvard Law School, Spring 2009, “A Reverse Brain Drain,” Issues in Science and Technology, <http://www.issues.org/25.3/wadhwa.html>

To our surprise, visa status was not the most important factor determining their decision to return home. Three of four indicated that considerations regarding their visa or residency permit status did not contribute to their decision to return to their home country. In fact, 27% of Indian respondents and 34% of Chinese held permanent resident status or were U.S. citizens. For this highly select group of returnees, career opportunities and quality-of-life concerns were the main reasons for returning home. Family considerations are also strong magnets pulling immigrants back to their home countries. The ability to better care for aging parents and the desire to be closer to friends and family were strong incentives for returning home. Indians in particular perceived the social situation in their home country to be significantly superior. The move home also appeared to be something of a career catalyst. Respondents reported that they have moved up the organization chart by returning home. Only 10% of the Indian returnees held senior management positions in the United States, but 44% found jobs at this level in India. Chinese returnees went from 9% in senior management in the United States to 36% in China. Opportunities for professional advancement were considered to be better at home than in the United States for 61% of Indians and 70% of Chinese. These groups also felt that opportunities to launch their own business were significantly better in their home countries.

#### Obama pushing SMRs now

Ervin 12-28 [Dan Ervin is a professor of finance at Salisbury University, “Dan Ervin: Modular reactors are the future of nuclear energy”, December 28th, 2012, <http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20121230/OPINION03/312300005>, Chetan]

The Obama administration’s decision to kick-start commercial use of small modular reactors has made one thing clear: The notion that nuclear power is slipping away is wrong. Although nuclear power faces difficult challenges, industry and government are working together to forge a new path. The Department of Energy has earmarked funds for a new public-private partnership to help develop innovative small reactors that are about one-third the size of those in large conventional nuclear plants. These small reactors are modular, meaning they will be built in factories before they are shipped and installed at nuclear sites. This production method has the potential to reduce the cost of nuclear power significantly.

#### Weak labor market deters effective immigration reform.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

Moreover, increasing legal immigration above the current level of 1 million annually could be seen as a blow to those born in America. Hurting "the American worker with bad immigration policy is not going to get [Republicans] more Hispanic votes," says Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, a group that advocates lower immigration levels. "They've got to do something else." In that respect, increasing legal immigration might be a difficult sell in 2013. "I do not see Congress acting in this area in a robust way until the labor market is stronger," says Andrew Schoenholtz, deputy director for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. "Just how strong is hard to tell."

### A2: Accidents

#### SMRs can’t meltdown

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### SMRs use safeguards-by-design

Scherer et al 10 (C. Scherer, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, et al. R. Bean, Idaho Natl Laboratory, M. Mullen, Los Alamos Natl Laboratory, and G. Pshakin, State Scientific Centre of the Russian Federation-Institute for Physics and Power Engineering, 2010 <http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/Symposium/2010/Documents/PapersRepository/164.pdf>)

This report is one of the initial efforts in the Russian and United States cooperative effort. Both the U.S. and Russia see the benefit in incorporating safeguards early in the design process. For the next phase of the joint effort, safeguards experts from the United States and the Russian Federation will use the SBD methodology for advanced nuclear energy systems. They will be specifically developing SBD\* guidance documents for the design of small modular reactors, such as the Russian SVBR (lead-bismuth fast reactor) and a yet-to-bedetermined U.S. small reactor. Both countries are investigating the application of both domestic and international safeguards in the SBD guidance documents. SBD guidance documents for these future nuclear facilities will need to cover many standard elements. These elements are the major requirements in nuclear material accountancy, additional safeguards measures, and design verification, as mentioned previously. Specific areas for design guidance in the design of nuclear reactors are potential nuclear material diversion pathways and the means to mitigate them, off-loading and onloading fuel into the reactor, safeguards needs specific to fuel containing direct-use material (e.g., Pu or highly enriched uranium), and supply of safeguards equipment and services. Functional areas for safeguards design are barriers for the containment and surveillance system, tamper-indicating seals, video surveillance, efficient fuel identification and verification, detection of irradiation of undeclared fertile material, fuel transfers to and from facility areas, safeguards needs specific to fuel containing plutonium (such as MOX), and to fuel shipping/receiving areas.

\*SBD = safeguards-by-design

# 2AC Round 6

### Tax Incentives 2ac [Long]

#### We meet – production cost incentives include direct payment funding

Rosner and Goldberg 11 – William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics at the University of Chicago, and Special Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory (Robert and Stephen, November. “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.” <https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf>)

Production Cost Incentive: A production cost incentive is a performance-based incentive. With a production cost incentive, the government incentive would be triggered only when the project successfully operates. The project sponsors would assume full responsibility for the upfront capital cost and would assume the full risk for project construction. The production cost incentive would establish a target price, a so-called “market-based benchmark.” Any savings in energy generation costs over the target price would accrue to the generator. Thus, a production cost incentive would provide a strong motivation for cost control and learning improvements, since any gains greater than target levels would enhance project net cash flow. Initial SMR deployments, without the benefits of learning, will have significantly higher costs than fully commercialized SMR plants and thus would benefit from production cost incentives. Because any production cost differential would decline rapidly due to the combined effect of module manufacturing rates and learning experience, the financial incentive could be set at a declining rate, and the level would be determined on a plant-by-plant basis, based on the achievement of cost reduction targets. 43 The key design parameters for the incentive include the following: 1. The magnitude of the deployment incentive should decline with the number of SMR modules and should phase out after the fleet of LEAD and FOAK plants has been deployed. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit. 2. The incentive should be market-based rather than cost-based; the incentive should take into account not only the cost of SMRs but also the cost of competing technologies and be set accordingly. 3. The deployment incentive could take several forms, including a direct payment to offset a portion of production costs or a production tax credit.

#### AND

#### Counter-interpretation – “Financial incentives” means exchange of money, credits and reduction in price paid

Montana Secretary of State 94 (“CASHING PAYROLL CHECKS -- DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES,” Rule: 23.16.3502, 10-28, http://www.mtrules.org/gateway/ruleno.asp?RN=23.16.3502)

23.16.3502 CASHING PAYROLL CHECKS -- DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

(1) A licensee may not offer financial incentives or conduct promotional games of chance in connection with an offer to cash payroll checks on the premises.

(2) A "financial incentive," means any inducement involving the payment of money, any reduction in price paid for goods or services, or any award of credit.

## Japan

## GW

### SO2 Screw – 2AC

#### Warming fast and rapid now – that’s the Deibel evidence -

#### SO2 emissions have been cut dramatically

AECT 12 (Blog of the Association of Electric Companies of Texas (AECT), “EPA data: NO2 and SO2 emissions decreasing rapidly”, 5/11, http://aectnet.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/epa-data-no2-and-so2-emissions-decreasing-rapidly/)

Based on data from the Environmental Protection Agency, total emissions of nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide have fallen substantially since 1980. But what’s especially telling is that those total emissions plummeted between 2008 and 2010, showing a far larger decrease. In addition to the long-term decreases in these emissions, this data also shows that NOx emissions fell by 20% between 2008 and 2010, while SO2 emissions fell by 30% over the same period. This is partially due to lessened energy usage during times of limited economic growth nationwide, but electric generators have also made billions of dollars in investment nationwide to reduce emissions.

#### SO2 causes warming

Science Daily 10 (“Best Hope for Saving Arctic Sea Ice Is Cutting Soot Emissions, Say Researchers”, 7/30, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/07/100728092617.htm)

The quickest, best way to slow the rapid melting of Arctic sea ice is to reduce soot emissions from the burning of fossil fuel, wood and dung, according to a new study by Stanford researcher Mark Z. Jacobson. His analysis shows that soot is second only to carbon dioxide in contributing to global warming. But, he said, climate models to date have mischaracterized the effects of soot in the atmosphere. Because of that, soot's contribution to global warming has been ignored in national and international global warming policy legislation, he said. "Controlling soot may be the only method of significantly slowing Arctic warming within the next two decades," said Jacobson, director of Stanford's Atmosphere/Energy Program. "We have to start taking its effects into account in planning our mitigation efforts and the sooner we start making changes, the better." To reach his conclusions, Jacobson used an intricate computer model of global climate, air pollution and weather that he developed over the last 20 years that included atmospheric processes not incorporated in previous models. He examined the effects of soot -- black and brown particles that absorb solar radiation -- from two types of sources. He analyzed the impacts of soot from fossil fuels -- diesel, coal, gasoline, jet fuel -- and from solid biofuels, such as wood, manure, dung, and other solid biomass used for home heating and cooking in many locations. He also focused in detail on the effects of soot on heating clouds, snow and ice. What he found was that the combination of both types of soot is the second-leading cause of global warming after carbon dioxide. That ranks the effects of soot ahead of methane, an important greenhouse gas. He also found that soot emissions kill more than 1.5 million people prematurely worldwide each year, and afflicts millions more with respiratory illness, cardiovascular disease and asthma, mostly in the developing world where biofuels are used for home heating and cooking. Jacobson's study will be published in Journal of Geophysical Research (Atmospheres). Reducing soot could have immediate impact It is the magnitude of soot's contribution, combined with the fact that it lingers in the atmosphere for only a few weeks before being washed out, that leads to the conclusion that a reduction in soot output would start slowing the pace of global warming almost immediately. Greenhouse gases, in contrast, typically persist in the atmosphere for decades -- some up to a century or more -- creating a considerable time lag between when emissions are cut and when the results become apparent. Mark Jacobson found that eliminating soot produced by the burning of fossil fuel and solid biofuel could reduce warming above parts of the Arctic Circle in the next 15 years by up to 1.7 degrees Celsius. Jacobson found that eliminating soot produced by the burning of fossil fuel and solid biofuel could reduce warming above parts of the Arctic Circle in the next 15 years by up to 1.7 degrees Celsius. For perspective, net warming in the Arctic has been at least 2.5 degrees Celsius during the last century and is expected to warm significantly more in the future if nothing is done. The most immediate, effective and low-cost way to reduce soot emissions is to put particle traps on vehicles, diesel trucks, buses, and construction equipment. Particle traps filter out soot particles from exhaust fumes. Soot could be further reduced by converting vehicles to run on clean, renewable electric power. Jacobson found that although fossil fuel soot contributed more to global warming, biofuel-derived soot caused about eight times the number of deaths as fossil fuel soot. Providing electricity to rural developing areas, thereby reducing usage of solid biofuels for home heating and cooking, would have major health benefits, he said. Soot from fossil fuels contains more black carbon than soot produced by burning biofuels, which is why there is a difference in impact. Black carbon is highly efficient at absorbing solar radiation in the atmosphere, just like a black shirt on a sunny day. Black carbon converts sunlight to heat and radiates it back to the air around it. This is different from greenhouse gases, which primarily trap heat that rises from the Earth's surface. Black carbon can also absorb light reflecting from the surface, which helps make it such a potent warming agent. First model of its type Jacobson's climate model is the first global model to use mathematical equations to describe the physical and chemical interactions of soot particles in cloud droplets in the atmosphere. This allowed him to include details such as light bouncing around inside clouds and within cloud drops, which he said are critical for understanding the full effect of black carbon on heating the atmosphere. "The key to modeling the climate effects of soot is to account for all of its effects on clouds, sea ice, snow and atmospheric heating," Jacobson said. Because of the complexity of the processes, he said it is not a surprise that previous models have not correctly treated the physical interactions required to simulate cloud, snow, and atmospheric heating by soot. "But without treating these processes, no model can give the correct answer with respect to soot's effects," he said. Jacobson argues that leaving out this scale of detail in other models has led many scientists and policy makers to undervalue the role of black carbon as a warming agent. The strong global heating due to soot that Jacobson found is supported by recent findings of Veerabhadran Ramanathan, a professor of climate and atmospheric science at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, who measures and models the climate effects of soot. "Jacobson's study is the first time that a model has looked at the various ways black carbon can impact climate in a quantitative way," said Ramanathan, who was not involved in the study. Black carbon has an especially potent warming effect over the Arctic. When black carbon is present in the air over snow or ice, sunlight can hit the black carbon on its way towards Earth, and also hit it as light reflects off the ice and heads back towards space. "It's a double-whammy over the ice surface in terms of heating the air," Jacobson said. Black carbon also lands on the snow, darkening the surface and enhancing melting. "There is a big concern that if the Arctic melts, it will be a tipping point for the Earth's climate because the reflective sea ice will be replaced by a much darker, heat absorbing, ocean below," said Jacobson. "Once the sea ice is gone, it is really hard to regenerate because there is not an efficient mechanism to cool the ocean down in the short term." Jacobson's work was supported by grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, the NASA high-end computing program and the National Science Foundation.

#### Sulfur dioxide doesn’t solve warming—greenhouse gases overwhelm

Dannevik 96 (William, Atmospheric Sciences Division leader, a position he has held since 1995. He came to Lawrence Livermore in 1988, as a member of the A-Division code group; “Assessing Humanity’s Impact on Global Climate” https://www.llnl.gov/str/Dannevik.html)

In recent years, we have been addressing the apparent disparity between the GCM predictions of global warming and the observational record. According to the models, greenhouse gases such as CO2 should have raised average temperatures worldwide by 1°C during the past 100 years. Instead, temperatures climbed by about only half a degree, as shown in Figure 1. One hypothesis to explain the disparity states that atmospheric sulfate aerosols might partially offset the effects of greenhouse gases. Suspended in the atmosphere, these micrometer-size particles tend to cool the Earth by scattering sunlight back into space. The aerosols result from photochemical reactions of sulfur dioxide emitted into the atmosphere through the combustion of fossil fuels. To test that hypothesis, we developed the world's first global chemistry-climate model. This model involved combining three others: (1) the LLNL version of an atmospheric model developed by the National Center for Atmospheric Research for use by the global climate research community, (2) a simple ocean model that represents conditions of the ocean's upper layers (within 50 meters from the surface), and (3) the GRANTOUR tropospheric chemistry model developed at Livermore. GRANTOUR simulates the transport, transformation, and removal of various sulfur species in the troposphere (lowest 10 to 20 kilometers of the atmosphere). It was needed for predicting the formation of sulfate aerosols from sulfur dioxide gas released into the atmosphere. We used the chemistry-climate model in a series of experiments that were the first attempt to simulate how temperatures are affected by combinations of carbon dioxide and sulfate aerosols.4 Numerical integrations began with a control run using the pre-industrial CO2 level and no sulfur emissions. Next, we ran an experiment to simulate CO2 increased to the present-day carbon dioxide level and examined the difference in temperature compared to the control run (Figure 2a). The next run combined CO2 and sulfate aerosols, and again we considered the difference compared to the control run (Figure 2b). These two sets of results can be compared to the observed temperature changes. Figure 2c depicts the difference between temperature data taken in 1948 and 1988. The run depicted in Figure 2b, which included both CO2 and sulfur emissions, predicted results much closer to the temperature difference map, which is based on observations. These results showed that the sulfate aerosols offset CO2-induced warming and could even produce net cooling in regions of the Northern Hemisphere where sulfur emissions are highest.4 Follow-up statistical studies found that the patterns of climate change resulting from both greenhouse gases and sulfate aerosols are a closer match to actual observed temperatures than patterns of change predicted by models that only include greenhouse gases.5,6These Laboratory results are included in a United Nations report prepared by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.3 That report, written by dozens of internationally prominent scientists including several from Lawrence Livermore, contains the most recent model-generated predictions of temperature change to the year 2100 (an increase between 1 and 3.5°C) and includes the presence of both sulfate aerosols and greenhouse gases. The sulfate aerosols counteract global warming to some extent; however, the potential warming that the report describes may still be significant enough to pose a threat to human economies and natural ecosystems. Also, it is important to note that greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere far longer than sulfate aerosols, and thus their effects would dominate even more if present sulfur and greenhouse emission rates continue.

#### CO2 overwhelms—SO2 is a mask, not an offset

Gelbspan 97 (Ross, Pulitzer Prize Winner, frmr editor and reporter of Boston Globe, Village Voice, The Heat is On: The Climate Crisis, The Cover Up, The Prescription, 1997, pg. 20)

- Unfortunately, the sulfate aerosols cannot be considered a long-term neutralizing agent against global warming. For one thing, they remain airborne for only several weeks and mostly in localized areas, while carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere for one or two centuries Since both by-products of fossil fuel burning are released simultaneously, the much-longer-lived carbon dioxide will eventually overwhelm the transient sulfates. The sulfates emitted by power plants, factories, automobiles, and volcanoes are regarded by scientists less as an offset than as a mask.

#### SO2 acidifies the ocean

Doney 7 (Scott Doney, Senior Scientist, WHOI, “News Release: Acid Rain Has a Disproportionate Impact on Coastal Waters,” Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, 9/7, www.whoi.edu/page.do?pid=7545&tid=282&cid=31286&ct=162)

the release of sulfur and nitrogen into the atmosphere by power plants and agricultural activities plays a minor role in making the ocean more acidic on a global scale, but the impact is greatly amplified in the shallower waters of the coastal ocean, according to new research by atmospheric and marine chemists. Ocean “acidification” occurs when chemical compounds such as carbon dioxide, sulfur, or nitrogen mix with seawater, a process which lowers the pH and reduces the storage of carbon. Ocean acidification hampers the ability of marine organisms—such as sea urchins, corals, and certain types of plankton—to harness calcium carbonate for making hard outer shells or “exoskeletons.” These organisms provide essential food and habitat to other species, so their demise could affect entire ocean ecosystems. The findings were published this week in the online “early edition” of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences; a printed version will be issued later this month. “Acid rain isn’t just a problem of the land; it’s also affecting the ocean,” said Scott Doney, lead author of the study and a senior scientist in the Department of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI). “That effect is most pronounced near the coasts, which are already some of the most heavily affected and vulnerable parts of the ocean due to pollution, over-fishing, and climate change.” In addition to acidification, excess nitrogen inputs from the atmosphere promote increased growth of phytoplankton and other marine plants which, in turn, may cause more frequent harmful algal blooms and eutrophication (the creation of oxygen-depleted “dead zones”) in some parts of the ocean. Doney collaborated on the project with Natalie Mahowald, Jean-Francois Lamarque, and Phil Rasch of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Richard Feely of the Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, Fred Mackenzie of the University of Hawaii, and Ivan Lima of the WHOI Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry Department. “Most studies have traditionally focused only on fossil fuel emissions and the role of carbon dioxide in ocean acidification, which is certainly the dominant issue,” Doney said. “But no one has really addressed the role of acid rain and nitrogen.” The research team compiled and analyzed many publicly available data sets on fossil fuel emissions, agricultural, and other atmospheric emissions. They built theoretical and computational models of the ocean and atmosphere to simulate where the nitrogen and sulfur emissions were likely to have the most impact. They also compared their model results with field observations made by other scientists in the coastal waters around the United States.

#### Extinction results

Craig 3 (Robin Kundis, Associate Prof Law, Indiana U School Law, Lexis)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems.Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with usu.

#### Aerosol pollution damages the hydrological cycle

American Embassy 1 (Information Resource Center, “Text: Aerosol Pollution Could Threaten Earth's Water Supply,” 11/10, http://www.usembassyjakarta.org/aerosol.html

U.S. researchers report that particles of human-produced pollution may be reducing rainfall and threatening the Earth's fresh water supplies. According to a December 6 press release, a new study by researchers at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography suggests that tiny aerosol particles of soot and other pollutants -- formed by fossil fuel combustion and the burning of forests and other biomass -- are having a far greater effect on the planet's hydrological cycle than previously realized. The study is based in part on new satellite data from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and in part on the international Indian Ocean Experiment (INDOEX), a multiplatform analysis of the Indian Ocean using satellites, aircraft, ships and surface stations. When sunlight heats the ocean as part of the hydrological cycle, water escapes into the atmosphere and falls out as rain. Through INDOEX it was found that aerosol pollutants are cutting down the sunlight reaching the ocean and weakening the hydrological cycle. According to the study, if pollutants lead to reduced rain and snowfall, it could directly affect the replenishment of the world's major stores of freshwater, including lakes, groundwater supplies, glaciers and high elevation snow pack. The study not only warns about the role aerosols are playing on the regional and global water cycle, but also suggests that aerosol pollution increases the solar heating of the atmosphere, and reduces the solar heating of the surface of the planet. The researchers say these effects may be comparable to the global warming effects of greenhouse gases.

#### Extinction – planetary survival depends on fresh water

Issues in Ecology 1 (“Water in a Changing World,” Issues in Ecology, Number 9, Spring, 2001, http://www.biology.duke.edu/jackson/issues9.pdf)

Life on earth depends on the continuous flow of materials through the air, water, soil, and food webs of the biosphere. The movement of water through the hydrological cycle comprises the largest of these flows, delivering an estimated 110,000 cubic kilometers (km3) of water to the land each year as snow and rainfall. Solar energy drives the hydrological cycle, vaporizing water from the surface of oceans, lakes, and rivers as well as from soils and plants (evapotranspiration). Water vapor rises into the atmosphere where it cools, condenses, and eventually rains down anew. This renewable freshwater supply sustains life on the land, in estuaries, and in the freshwater ecosystems of the earth. Renewable fresh water provides many services essential to human health and well being, including water for drinking, industrial production, and irrigation, and the production of fish, waterfowl, and shellfish. Fresh water also provides many benefits while it remains in its channels (nonextractive or instream benefits), including flood control, transportation, recreation, waste processing, hydroelectric power, and habitat for aquatic plants and animals. Some benefits, such as irrigation and hydroelectric power, can be achieved only by damming, diverting, or creating other major changes to natural water flows. Such changes often diminish or preclude other instream benefits of fresh water, such as providing habitat for aquatic life or maintaining suitable water quality for human use.

## Off

### 2AC - Carbon Taxes

**Carbon taxes inefficient - Ireland proves**

Rapple 9 (Colm, economist by training and a journalist by profession, "Carbon tax is a nonsense, inequitable and economically inefficient" Colm's Columns, http://colmrapple.com/?p=118) BSB

The carbon tax is a nonsense. It will have scant impact on our carbon emissions. It’s inequitable, in so far as it will bear heaviest on low income earners. And it is economically inefficient in that it will adversely affect the competitiveness of many Irish businesses. It will also give a massive boost to cross border shopping, not for groceries and drink but rather for solid fuel. It’s another example of the good intentions and woolly thinking that has informed much of the Green Party’s input to Government. With some honourable exceptions, there seems to be a reluctance to criticise this tax, perhaps because of a fear of being accused of killing polar bears. Or perhaps there was so much in the budget that it has just got sidelined. There was widespread opposition to the tax when it was first mooted by Charlie McCreevy some years ago, some of it from within the civil service. In a submission presented to Charlie McCreevy at the time, the Department of Transport maintained that a carbon tax could cause significant economic damage without any corresponding economic benefits. It argued that the tax would have little or no impact on the behaviour of transport users or on the level of emissions from the transport sector. That latter point is not even disputed by Green Minister, Éamon Ryan. Demand for fossil fuel products is, as he put it himself, relatively inelastic. In other words even a large increase in price doesn’t have much impact on the amount purchased. That’s particularly true of motor fuels, which will be bearing almost two-thirds of the carbon tax burden.

**Carbons taxes fail – laundry list**

Swezey 11 (Devon, contributor for Forbes, “The Carbon Tax, Then and Now,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2011/09/20/the-carbon-tax-then-and-now/>) KA

In the debate over climate legislation in 2009 and 2010, it was conventional wisdom that a price on carbon was the sine qua non of effective climate policy. All Very Serious People knew that you could not reduce carbon emissions or drive clean energy innovation without a price on carbon, either through a carbon tax or a cap and trade system. Indeed, leading venture capitalist John Doerr used to travel around the country hammering home the three top things that the government needed to do to catalyze a clean energy revolution. In order, they were: 1) put a price on carbon, 2) put a price on carbon and 3) put a price on carbon. How the times have changed. In a piece posted over the weekend, Tyler Cowen, a prolific blogger and card- carrying economist at George Mason University, writes that there are a number of reasons–10, in fact–why the case for a carbon tax is not as airtight as its advocates claim: 1. Other countries won’t follow suit and then we are doing something with almost zero effectiveness. 2. It may push dirty industries to less well regulated countries and make the overall problem somewhat worse. 3. There is Jim Manzi’s point that Europe has stiff carbon taxes, and is a large market, but they have not seen a major burst of innovation, just a lot of conservation and some substitution, no game changers. Denmark remains far more dependent on fossil fuels than most people realize and for all their efforts they’ve done no better than stop the growth of carbon emissions; see Robert Bryce’s Power Hungry, which is in any case a useful contrarian book for considering this topic. 4. Especially for large segments of the transportation sector, there simply aren’t plausible substitutes for carbon on the horizon. 5. A tax on energy is a sectoral tax on the relatively productive sector of the economy — making stuff — and it will shift more talent into finance and other less productive sectors. 6. Oil in particular will become so expensive in any case that a politically plausible tax won’t add much value (careful readers will note that this argument is in tension with some of those listed above). 7. A carbon tax won’t work its magic until significant parts of the energy and alternative energy sector are deregulated. No more NIMBY! But in the meantime perhaps we can’t proceed with the tax and expect to get anywhere. Had we had today’s level of regulation and litigation from the get-go, we never could have built today’s energy infrastructure, which I find a deeply troubling point. 8. A somewhat non-economic argument is to point out the regressive nature of a carbon tax. 9. Jim Hamilton’s work suggests that oil price shocks have nastier economic consequences than many people realize. 9b. A more prosperous economy may, for political and budgetary reasons, lead to more subsidies for alternative energy, and those subsidies may do more good than would the tax. Maybe we won’t adopt green energy until it’s really quite cheap, in which case let’s just focus on the subsidies. 10. The actual application of such a tax will involve lots of rent-seeking, privileges, exemptions, inefficiencies, and regulatory arbitrage.

**The CP links to politics**

**Turgeon 10** (Evan N. Turgeon, Legal Associate at the Cato Institute; J.D.University of Virginia School of Law 2009; B.A. Tufts University 2004, “Triple-Dividends: Toward Pigovian Gasoline Taxation,” Journal of Land, Resources, & Environmental Law 2010, pg lexis//um-ef)

1. The American Public As it currently stands, Americans do not perceive climate change as a severe threat. Consequently, Americans are unwilling to incur significant costs to mitigate this risk, especially **if those costs come in the form of higher gasoline taxes.** [\*173] **Simply put, "the fuel tax is perhaps one of the most resented in our society**." n187 It seems that the public's hostility to fuel taxes exceeds its general opposition to excise taxes in general, n188 which suggests that opposition more reflects the item being taxed than the method of taxation. Indeed, the public accepts other instances of federal government price manipulation in the name of economic efficiency as a matter of course. The Federal Reserve, for example, routinely adjusts the discount rate and thereby the cost of borrowing to influence consumer pur-chasing decisions. This suggests that **gasoline taxation provokes an emotional, rather than an analytical, response**. That gasoline is widely consumed, that price drives consumer preference, and that prices are visible and volatile likely contribute to this phenomenon. n189 More important still, the car is freighted with notions of "freedom," given the sprawling development of American society and widespread dependence on cars, almost as the exclusive method of transportation. Increasing the cost of car use is seen as constraining individual freedom of movement. n190 Public attachment to cars by the public partly explains economically inefficient government policies focused on making trips cleaner rather than fewer in number. 2. Elected Representatives But public sentiment is only half the battle**; politicians must be convinced of Pigovian fuel taxation's benefits as well**. Even more so than their constituencies, short-term incentives govern the behavior of lawmakers. "In reality politicians are moved by concerns which are entirely different from those of social welfare maximization[,]" n191 **namely satisfying certain constituent groups in order to survive an upcoming election**. So, although the public may demand action on a given issue, an ineffective government response will likely result if politicians are not independently motivated to act. n192 Consequently, "an important means for a government to ensure survival is to finance government expenditures with as little popular resistance as possible." n193 Political concerns also motivate the method of government action adopted. "[Politicians] prefer direct interventions via [\*174] commands and controls, which have the added advantage that any successes can more easily be attributed to the government's actions." n194 Indeed, the United States' inefficient but politically useful energy policies reflect these motivations. Tepid public desire to secure energy independence and improve the environment provided politicians an opportunity to increase concentrated spending for biofuel subsidies and military operations. Policies that broadly advance societal welfare through economic efficiency enjoy markedly less support from lawmakers. For example, "the Clinton Administration achieved an increase in the federal gasoline tax rate of only [$ .04 per gallon] in 1993, despite a major effort." n195 Large but diffuse benefits thus tend to take a backseat to small but concentrated benefits. n196

#### They’ve conceded that SMRs solve for global desalination – that’s 1ac Silverstein

#### Disastrous Sino-Indian conflict results from shortages of water – cooperation and relations won’t solve

Brennan 8 (James F. Lieutenant, United States Navy, Master of Arts in Security Studies “THE CHINA-INDIA-PAKISTAN WATER CRISIS: PROSPECTS FOR INTERSTATE CONFLICT” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA488648)

A. PURPOSE This thesis examines how China’s growing water requirements may affect Beijing’s relations with South Asia. China’s shrinking water resources may lead Beijing to build dams and take other actions on the Tibetan Plateau in order to address this growing concern. 1 The Tibetan Plateau serves as an untapped resource for China and is the origin of many neighboring countries essential water supplies. More specifically, the Tibetan Plateau is the origin of India and Pakistan’s great rivers – the Indus, Ganges, and Brahmaputra. The decision to focus on the Tibetan Plateau as a solution to China’s water crisis will likely will affect the Brahmaputra River, essential to India. Additionally, although less likely due to geographical challenges, Beijing’s decision to dam Tibetan rivers could also impact the Indus and Ganges River, essential to India and Pakistan. The ongoing tension between India and Pakistan over critical water resources in the Kashmir region sets the stage for increased regional tension if Beijing moves forward with its proposed plans. The consequences of such actions could include a degradation of recently improved relations among these countries, and even to armed conflict. B. IMPORTANCE Water scarcity is a serious issue in many countries around the world. Historically, water-related crises originated in the Middle East – occasionally leading to armed conflict over the resource. Recently, however, Asia has increasingly faced a steady reduction in fresh water availability. 2 These water dilemmas, in conjunction with ineffective policies concerning shared resources, may set in motion a chain of events resulting in future armed conflict between China, India, and Pakistan. In order to prevent a potential disaster, it is important to identify the problem at hand. China, India, and Pakistan are all reliant on shared water supplies originating in the Tibetan Plateau (see Figure 1).3 For China, the Tibetan Plateau serves as an unexploited resource that could help to resolve a mounting water crisis. For India and Pakistan, the Tibetan Plateau serves as the starting point for their most important water lifelines – the Brahmaputra, Ganges, and Indus River. 4 In either case, as water requirements rise for these countries and as resources shrink, it is becoming clear that efforts to tap these resources may foster competition – possibly leading to interstate conflict. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the current status of the availability of water, examine the causes of the shortages, and discuss the proposed solutions that directly affect the possible outcome of this evolving situation.

#### Sino-Indian conflict ensures a massive retaliation and nuclear war

Kanwal 2k (Gurmeet, Senior Fellow – Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, “Does India Need Tactical Nuclear Weapons?”, Strategic Analysis: A Monthly Journal of the ISDA, May, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa\_may00kag01.html)

China is a status quo nuclear power with a long-standing territorial and boundary dispute with India. Despite the Border Peace and Tranquillity Agreement (BPTA) of 1993 and the confidence building measures (CBMs) agreed upon in 1996, the Line of Actual Control (LAC) continues to remain ill-defined and ambiguous and its early 'clarification' still appears to be a distant goal as China is apparently in no hurry for further progress on these substantive issues. China's continuing nuclear and missile collusion and defence cooperation with Pakistan, its support to the military regime in Myanmar and increasing activities in the Bay of Bengal, its attempts to isolate India in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and its relentless efforts to increase its influence in Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh, are all pointers to a carefully orchestrated plan aimed at the strategic encirclement of India. Apparently, China poses a long-term strategic challenge to India as a competing regional power in Asia. A border war between these two Asian giants, though improbable, cannot be ruled out. Jasjit Singh has stated that, "The non-strategic category of weapons, which constitute 96 percent (if warheads on SLBMs are taken into account, the proportion drops to a little over 93 percent) of China's nuclear arsenal, even after 34 years, have relevance only for China's immediate neighbours." [26](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note26) Besides some ICBMs and IRBMs, China has deployed a large number of medium-and short-range nuclear-tipped missiles and nuclear capable aircraft in Tibet. [27](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note27) As China has already signed a de-targeting agreement with Russia and the US, it is not clear where these nuclear weapons are aimed or intended to be aimed. These deployed nuclear weapons constitute a 'threat-in-being' to India. Also, China has lately modified its original no-first-use doctrine. "China's military strategists do not consider the use of nuclear weapons in their own territory as violating their NFU (no-first-use) doctrine." [28](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note28) Though China has never bothered to clarify the ambiguities inherent in this stand as it suits its purpose to play a guessing game, it can be deduced that since China clearly considers Taiwan as its own territory, the use of China's nuclear weapons during a war over Taiwan would not violate its no-first-use doctrine. As a corollary, Indian analysts are justified in concluding that as China has not renounced its claim over Arunachal Pradesh, or for that matter is still to recognise Sikkim, it may seriously consider the first use of tactical nuclear weapons during a border conflict with India in the future. China is continuing to modernise its nuclear and missile forces and tactical nuclear weapons, [29](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note29) including by acquiring Western technology through clandestine means. The US has claimed that China has acquired the technology for its W-88 nuclear warhead through illegal means. Notwithstanding the US claim and China's vigorous denial, it is clear that China is continuing to place immense emphasis on tactical nuclear weapons. It naturally follows that China's concept of fighting a 'limited war under high-tech conditions' includes a nuclear warfighting strategy. Hence, India may expect to witness Chinese mushroom clouds over the high Himalayas during a future Sino-Indian border war, particularly if the Chinese Military Region commander is convinced that Indian forces are gaining advantage at the operational level. Due to India's affinity and long-standing cultural links with the Tibetan people, India would naturally like to ensure that collateral damage in Tibet is scrupulously avoided. In fact, even more worrisome would be the long-term contamination of the Himalayan water sources. Since most of the Tibetan rivers drain into the Indian plains, it is in India's interest to ensure that nuclear exchanges over the Himalayan watershed are not allowed to occur. It is also for this reason that India must ensure that ADMs are not employed by either side during a Himalayan conflict, contrary to the proposals made by Bharat Karnad, [30](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/sa/sa_may00kag01.html#note30) et al. How, then, is such a threat to be countered? Some Indian analysts argue that India must retaliate in kind on China's forward troops, firepower assets, headquarters, logistics support areas and communications choke points and that raising the ante and targeting Chinese cities would prove to be counter-productive as China has a much superior nuclear arsenal. In the unlikely event that China employs battlefield nuclear weapons against the Indian army on the grounds that it is justified in using them on the territory that it claims in 'self-defence', India will really have no option but to retaliate massively against Chinese cities and economic centres on China's well developed eastern seaboard. Only such a declaratory policy and matching operational plans will make the first use cost for China prohibitive. It is a moot point whether the loss of a single Chinese city would be acceptable to the proponents of the first use of battlefield nuclear weapons within the Chinese Central Military Commission

#### Only SMR’s solve – they’re uniquely key because of technology and grid capacity

IAEA 7 (“Economics of Nuclear Desalination: New Developments and Site Specific Studies”, July, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1561_web.pdf>)

Seventy percent of the planet is covered with water, but only 2.5% of that is fresh water. Nearly 70% of this fresh water is frozen in the icecaps of Antarctica and Greenland. Most of the rest is in the form of soil moisture or in deep inaccessible aquifers or comes in the form of heavy rains and floods that are difficult to contain and exploit. Consequently, only less than 0.008% (about 70 000 km3) of the world’s water is readily accessible for direct human use, and even that is very unevenly distributed. Recent statistics show that currently 2.3 billion people live in water-stressed areas and among them 1.7 billion live in water-scarce areas, where the water availability per person is less than 1000 m3/year. In fact, the situation is expected to worsen further since, by 2025, the number of people suffering from water stress or scarcity could swell to 3.5 billion, out of which 2.4 billion would live in water-scarce regions. Water scarcity is a global issue. Every year new countries are affected by growing water problems. It is for this reason that the Millennium Declaration by UN General Assembly in 2000 set up a target to halve, by the year 2015, the world population, which is unable to reach, or to afford, safe drinking water. Vision 21: shared vision for Hygiene, Water Supply and Sanitation, has a target to provide water, sanitation and hygiene for all by 2025. Better water conservation, water management, pollution control and water reclamation are all part of the integrated solution to projected water stresses. So too are new sources of fresh water, including the desalination of seawater. Desalination technologies have been well established since the mid-20th century and widely deployed in the Middle East and North Africa. The contracted capacity of desalination plants has increased steadily since 1965 and is now about 36 million m3/day worldwide, as shown in Figure 1. This capacity could cater to world’s population roughly 6 litres a day per capita of fresh potable water. If this capacity were available to 1.5 billion in the world without direct access to drinking water, it would provide approximately 20 litres/day/capita. Large scale commercially available desalination processes can generally be classified into two categories: (a) distillation processes that require mainly heat plus some electricity for ancillary equipment, and (b) membrane processes that require only electricity. In the first category (distillation) there are two major processes: multi-stage flash (MSF) and multi-effect distillation (MED). In both processes, seawater is heated; the steam that evaporates is condensed and collected as freshwater; and the residual brine is discharged. In the second category (membranes) is the reverse osmosis process (RO), in which pure water passes from the high-pressure seawater side of a semi-permeable membrane to the low-pressure freshwater side. The pressure differential must be high enough to overcome the natural tendency for water to move from the low concentration freshwater side of a membrane to the high concentration seawater side in order to balance osmotic pressures. The energy for the desalination plants is generally supplied in the form of either steam or electricity. Conventional fossil fuel-powered plants have normally been utilized as the primary sources but their intensive use raises increasing environmental concerns, specifically in relation to greenhouse gas emissions (Section 1.3.3). The depleting sources and the future price uncertainty of the fossil fuels and their better use for other vital industrial applications are also the factors to be considered. 1.3. THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN DESALINATION The world energy requirements are presently met from oil, coal, gas, hydro, nuclear and renewable energies in that order as shown in Table 1. It is now universally recognized that there will be an increase in the world’s requirement for electricity over the next few decades. The present trend towards meeting this demand includes the building of fossil fuel plants, particularly combined cycle gas fired plants. However, the spiralling increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions has resulted in setting the emission targets in international meetings held at Toronto, Rio de Janeiro and Kyoto. The IAEA predicts that the GHG emissions would be 36-50% higher by 2010 compared to 1990 levels. Many analysts, therefore, feel that the only viable alternative to fossil fuels is nuclear energy to reduce the rate of increase of GHG, particularly, carbon dioxide. Yet another incentive for nuclear power is to maintain diversity of supply. A national strategy limited to one particular form of energy (fossil fuels) will be vulnerable to increased fuel costs and pressures from exporting countries. Nuclear power is a proven technology, which has provided more than 16% of world electricity supply in over 30 countries. More than ten thousand reactor-years of operating experience have been accumulated over the past 5 decades. There are many reasons which favour a possible revival of the nuclear power production in the years to come. It is thus expected that this revival would also lead to an increased role of nuclear energy in non-electrical energy services, which, at the moment, are almost entirely dominated by fossil energy sources. Among various utilization of nuclear energy for non-electrical products, using it for the production of freshwater from seawater (nuclear desalination) has been drawing broad interest in the IAEA Member States as a result of acute water shortage issues in many arid and semi-arid zones worldwide. With technical co-ordination or support of the IAEA, several demonstration programs of nuclear desalination are also in progress in several Member States to confirm its technical and economical viability under country-specific conditions The desalination of seawater using nuclear energy is a feasible option to meet the growing demand for potable water. Over 175 reactor-years of operating experience on nuclear desalination have already been accumulated worldwide. 1.3.1. Nuclear desalination In the IAEA terminology, nuclear desalination is defined to be the production of potable water from seawater in a facility in which a nuclear reactor is used as the source of energy for the desalination process. Electrical and/or thermal energy may be used in the desalination process on the same site. The facility may be dedicated solely to the production of potable water, or may be used for the generation of electricity and production of potable water, in which case only a portion of the total energy output of the reactor is used for water production. The design approaches for a nuclear desalination plant are essentially derived from those of the nuclear reactor alone, with some additional aspects to be considered in the design of a desalination plant and its integration with the nuclear system. All nuclear reactor types can provide the energy required by the various desalination processes. In this regard, it has been shown that Small and Medium Reactors (**SMRs) offer the largest potential as coupling options to nuclear desalination systems in developing countries**. The development of innovative reactor concepts and fuel cycles with enhanced safety features as well as their attractive economics are expected to improve the public acceptance and further the prospects of nuclear desalination. The coupling with nuclear system is not difficult technically but needs some consideration in (a) avoiding cross-contamination by radioactivity, (b) providing backup heat or power sources in case the nuclear system is not in operation (e.g. for refuelling and maintenance), (c) incorporation of certain design features, minimising the impact of the thermal desalination systems’ coupling to the nuclear reactors (Section 1.6). 1.3.2. Why nuclear desalination? The International Atomic Energy Agency is a specialized organization of the UN system that seeks to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The institutional basis for the IAEA’s involvement in nuclear desalination is in its Statute and Medium Term Strategy. Article II of the IAEA Statute provides that: “ The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world”. This refers implicitly to nuclear desalination as an option for the use of nuclear technologies. The same applies to the Article III of the Statute, which authorizes the IAEA: “ To encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world….”; (Article III, A.1); and “To foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy.” (Article III, A.3). In addition, Objective A.3 of the Agency’s Medium Term Strategy requires the Agency: “ To support and facilitate the development of new and emerging applications of nuclear technologies by co-generation and heat applications, including seawater desalination”. Request of assessing feasibility of using nuclear energy for seawater desalination was first made by the five North African countries to the IAEA in 1989 and the General Conference adopted its resolution to resume the study. These countries are located in semi-arid zones and already suffer from water shortages. In recent years, interests have been also been indicated by Member States in South and South East Asia for the feasibility, as well as the demonstration, of nuclear desalination projects. The issue has since then been repeatedly stressed at the General Conference (Committee on the Whole) and supported by many Member States including most members of Group-77. The support stems not only from their expectation of its possible contribution to the freshwater issue but has also been motivated by a variety of reasons that include: the economic competitiveness of nuclear desalination in areas lacking cheap hydropower or fossil fuel resources, energy supply diversification, conservation of fossil fuel resources and spin-off effects of nuclear technology for industrial development. Looking to the future, there are several reasons for focusing now on expanding nuclear power’s contribution to desalination. Apart from the expanding demand for freshwater and the increasing concern about GHG emissions and pollution from fossil fuels, **there is a renewed and growing emphasis on small** and medium sized nuclear **reactors, and this is particularly important for desalination because the countries most in need of new sources of freshwater often have limited industrial infrastructures and relatively weaker electricity grids**. The size of the grid limits the possibilities for integrating a co-generating nuclear power plant into the grid to supply the electricity market, in addition to meeting the energy requirements of a desalination plant. The largest power unit that can be integrated into an electricity grid must not exceed about 10-20 % of the total grid capacity. Of course, smaller nuclear reactors would be more appropriate for remote areas that are not suitable for connections to the grid. For nuclear desalination to be attractive in any given country, two conditions have to be satisfied simultaneously: a lack of water and the ability to use nuclear energy for desalination. In most regions, only one of the two is present. Both are present for example **in China**, the Republic of **Korea, India and Pakistan**. These regions already account for almost half the world’s population, and thus represent a potential long term market for nuclear desalination. The market will expand further to the extent that regions with high projected water needs, such as the Middle East and North Africa, increase their nuclear expertise and capabilities. 1.3.3. Environmental impact of desalination by fossil fuelled energy sources Desalination is an energy intensive process. A future desalination strategy based only on the use of fossil fuelled systems is not sustainable: Fossil fuel reserves are finite and must be conserved for more important uses such as transport, petrochemical industry etc. Besides, the demands for desalted water would continue increasing as population grows and standards of living improve. Conservation measures such as the modernisation of water networks to minimise leakages, the recycling of used water etc. will certainly reduce the future water demands slightly but they would not be able to halt the dissemination of desalination plants and consequently of the fossil fuelled based systems for the production of needed electricity and heat. The following paragraphs illustrate the damaging consequences of such a policy by taking the example of the Mediterranean region. Following the recent “Blue Plan” [2], the total available natural water resources (1), based on the statistics from 1990 to 1998, in the principle countries of the Mediterranean region, are as shown in Table 2. The projected demands (3) for the year 2025 [31] are also included in Table 1. It is obvious that available natural water resources would rather decrease in 2025 because of increased pollution, over exploitation and other human activities. However, to keep matters simple, it would be supposed that they would remain at the same level as in 1998. It can be observed that, in 2025, the total projected water deficit (balance) in the Mediterranean region would of the order of 294 km3/per year. Not all this required capacity would be met by desalination plants. Current contribution of desalination is of the order of 1 to 2 %. If it is supposed that in 2025, this contribution would be about 2.5 %, then the total required desalting capacity would be 7.3 km3/year (20.1 million m3/day). According to the EC ExternE study2, the total emissions of GHG per MW(e).h of electricity produced by representative fossil fuelled power plants in France, are as presented in Table 3. The specific heat and electricity consumptions of three main desalination plants are given in Table 4, [3]. The data presented in the above Tables allows to calculate the approximate3 total GHG emissions produced by the fossil fuelled plants and the three desalination plants. Results for a total desalting capacity of 20.1 million m3/day are presented in Table 5. It can thus be concluded that for a desalting capacity of 20.1 million m3/day in the Mediterranean region alone, required in 2025, one would produce, depending upon the energy source and the desalination process used, 13 to 264 million tonnes/year of CO2. 1350 to 1 310 000 tonnes/year of SOx. 21 100 to 540 000 tonnes/year of NOx. 1190 to 40 000 tonnes/year of particles. The potential levels of GHG and particle emissions on the world scale could then be more than double these figures. **These could naturally be avoided through the use of nuclear energy.**

### 2AC – Kritik

#### No link – science proves our problems exist, it’s not war gaming – that’s Mueller

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

Krier 85 James E., Professor of Law at the University of Michigan, “The Un-Easy Case for Technological Optimism,” Michigan Law Review, Vol. 84, No. 3; December 1985, pp. 405-429

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

#### Plan Focus – you can vote for any representation that we present, but none of them are necessarily tied to the plan – just reject the bad representations and vote for the good ones – this is justified by the fact that they get to kick their representations because of conditionality.

#### Epistemology must be secondary to the prior question of political practice

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128-9)

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggle as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and destitute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the émigrés of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, “So what?” To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics” be judged pertinent, relevant, helpful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholastically excited by abstract and recondite debate. Contrary to Ashley’s assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than analyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render and intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places.

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond grandiose statements of intent. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the mechanisms by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a fatally flawed enterprise.

#### Consumption focus fails-~--political action key

Bryant 12—prof of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, Black Ecology: A Pessimistic Moment, larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/03/19/black-ecology-a-pessimistic-moment/)

So why is this an issue? It’s an issue because while environmentalists prescribe all sorts of action we need to take to avert the climate catastrophe, it seems to me that in failing to engage in an ecology of social and political institutions they are whistling past the graveyard by failing to address the question of the conditions under which action is possible. Here’s the part where everyone gets angry with me. Given the way in which government and corporations are today intertwined, I don’t think there’s much we can do to avert the coming catastrophe. As Morton says, referring to logical time, “the catastrophe has already happened”. So what would it mean, I wonder, to take Morton’s thesis seriously? Here I know Tim will disagree with me. When I look at environmental discussions in popular media and from many around me, I see the discussion revolving almost entirely around consumers. We’re told that we have to consume differently to solve this problem. I agree that we need to consume differently, but **I don’t see any feasible way in which** driving fuel efficient cars, **using less** heat and AC, eating less meat, etc **will solve these problems**. This is because the lion’s share of our climate change problems arise from the production and distribution end of the equation, rather than the consumption end. They are problems arising from agricultural practices, factories, and how we ship goods throughout countries and the world. The problem is that given the way in which governments and corporations are intertwined with one another, and given the way in which third world countries are dependent on fossil fuels for their development, and given the fact that only governmental solutions can address problems of production and distribution, **we’re left with no recourse for action**. We can only watch helplessly while our bought and sold politicians continue to fiddle as the world burns.

#### Alt fails – maximizing energy production is human nature and reducing consumption doesn’t solve their impact

Datschefski 4 (Edwin – BioThinking International, “Consumption is Good ? !”, January, http://www.biothinking.com/consume.pdf)

It seems that it's natural to use energy, and the more the better. Ecologists like Lotka (1922) and Odum and Pinkerton (1955) suggested that the biological systems that survive are those that develop the most power inflow and u se it to best meet their needs for survival. Schneider and Kay (1994) proposed that a better description of these "power laws" would be that biological systems develop in a manner as to "increase their degradation rate, and that biological growth, ecosystem development and evolution represent the development of new dissipative pathways." As ecosystems develop or mature they tend to increase their total dissipation, and develop more complex structures with greater diversity, more cycling, more energy flow and more hierarchical levels. So ecological theory shows us that a complex adaptive system like the current industrial system will inherently evolve to maximise throughput of energy and materials. I'm not disputing the benefits of efficiency, or the limits to growth. But there does seem to be a lot of (in my view) futile effort directed at encouraging people to consume l ess. People are natural-born shoppers. I defy anyone reading this to claim that they have deprived themselves of that hifi, boat, shoes, camera, etc. that they really fancied. You also can't solve environmental problems by simply using less. There is a fundamental package of food and goods that a household requires, and while it's possible to make the footprint of that package smaller, we're still looking at about 7 tonnes of stuff per household per year, which is about 140 tonnes including embodied energy and mass. You can avoid this shooting up to 10 or 15 tonnes of stuff by renting and buying durable products and so on, but even the thriftiest household will still have a basic consumption requirement. The focus for improvement must therefore be on changing product and process design so that materials flow is more systemic. All products are ultimately disposable. We just need all of them to be designed to go back and become food for another system. So don't feel guilty about buying the products you have to get. Buy with caution and respect for the materials used. And divert the energy of your concerns into action -- tell the manufacturer of your new camera / car / bed etc. about how they can make it better. Most manufacturers think they are doing perfectly OK if they are complying with the law and have no -one demonstrating outside their head office. Going 100% cyclic solar and safe simply isn't on the agenda yet. So what if every member of every environment group (that's about 5 to 50% of the population, depending what country you live in) asked the manufacturers of the myriad of products that they

#### -- Framework – evaluate the aff vs. status quo or a competitive policy option. That’s best for fairness and predictability – there are too many frameworks to predict and they moot all of the 1ac – makes it impossible to be aff. Only our framework solves activism.

#### Alt doesn’t solve the case –

1. doesn’t build nuclear reactors – it rejects tech
2. changing relations to nature doesn’t change temp
3. there’s no spillover between demand we reject tech and people doing it

#### -- Case turns the K – nuclear tech is inevitable – other countries view nature as a standing reserve – plan sends a global signal to other countries to use environment-friendly tech.

#### -- Valuing nature as standing reserve of natural resources for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species

**Younkins 4** (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. **Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer**. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. **People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently** of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. **All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans]** men **affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress**. Mankind’s **survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things**, even man himself. **Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe**. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. **Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value**. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. **The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature**. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. **Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans]** men **sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them**. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, **only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation**. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This **antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.**

### A2: Prolif DA

#### Can’t make weapons from SMRs

**Szondy, 12** – freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington (David, 2/16. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

#### Solves problems with large reactors – they’re buried underground, are protected by concrete, and have secure refueling

**Loudermilk, 11** – research associate with the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program at National Defense University (Micah, 5/31. “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs.” Journal of Energy Security. <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?view=article&catid=116%3Acontent0411&id=314%3Asmall-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&tmpl=component&print=1&page=&option=com_content&Itemid=375>)

As to the small reactors themselves, the designs achieve a degree of proliferation-resistance unmatched by large reactors. Small enough to be fully buried underground in independent silos, the concrete surrounding the reactor vessels can be layered much thicker than the traditional domes that protect conventional reactors without collapsing. Coupled with these two levels of superior physical protection is the traditional security associated with reactors today. Most small reactors also are factory-sealed with a supply of fuel inside. Instead of refueling reactors onsite, SMRs are returned to the factory, intact, for removal of spent fuel and refueling. By closing off the fuel cycle, proliferation risks associated with the nuclear fuel running the reactors are mitigated and concerns over the widespread distribution of nuclear fuel allayed.

**SMR’s are prolif resistant**

**Kuznetsov 8** – former Lead Researcher at the Kurchatov Institute (Russia) (Vladimir, March-August. “Options for small and medium sized reactors (SMRs) to overcome loss of economies of scale and incorporate increased proliferation resistance and energy security” Progress in Nuclear Energ Vol 50 issues 2-6, p 248. ScienceDirect)

For many less developed countries, these are the features of enhanced proliferation resistance and increased robustness of barriers for sabotage protection that may ensure the progress of nuclear power. All NPPs with innovative SMRs will provide for the implementation of the established safeguards veriﬁcation procedures under the agreements of member states with the IAEA. In addition to this, many innovative **SMRs offer** certain **intrinsic proliferation resistance features to prevent the misuse, diversion or undeclared production of ﬁssile materials and/or to facilitate the implementation of safeguards** (IAEA, 2006b). For example, many of **water-cooled SMRs employ low enrichment uranium and once-through fuel cycle as basic options**. Therefore, **the features contributing to proliferation resistance of such SMRs are essentially similar to that of presently operated PWRs and BWRs. They also include an unattractive isotopic composition of the plutonium in the discharged fuel, and radiation barriers provided by the spent fuel. The intrinsic proliferation resistance features** common to all HTGRs **include high fuel burn-up** (low residual inventory of plutonium, high content of 240 Pu); a **difﬁcult to process fuel matrix; radiation barriers; and a low ratio of ﬁssile to fuelblock/fuel-pebble** mass. Although several HTGRs make a provision for reprocessing of the TRISO fuel, the corresponding technology has not been established yet and, until such time as when the technology becomes readily available, the lack of the technology is assumed to provide an enhanced proliferation resistance. All liquid metal cooled SMRs are fast reactors that can ensure a self-sustainable operation on ﬁssile materials or realize fuel breeding to feed other reactors present in nuclear energy systems. In both cases, and **if the fuel cycle is closed, the need of fuel enrichment and relevant uranium enrichment facilities would be eliminated, which is a factor contributing to enhanced proliferation resistance. Other features to enhance proliferation resistance of fast reactors are** the following: **No separation of plutonium and uranium at any fuel cycle stage and leaving a small** (1e2% by weight) fr**action of ﬁssion products permanently in the fuel; Denaturing of the ﬁssile materials,** e.g., through the optimization of the core design to achieve a higher content of 238 Pu in the plutonium, to preclude the possibility of weapon production via securing an inadmissibly high level of residual heat of the plutonium fuel e the 238 Pu/Pu ratio needed to achieve this still needs to be deﬁned adequately.

#### Nuclear reactor terrorism unlikely – no capability or motive

**Ferguson and Potter 4** (Charles, Science-in-Residence – Monterey Institute of International Studies, and William, Professor and Director of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies – Monterey Institute of International Studies, The Four Faces of Nuclear Terrorism, p. 192-193)

Despite these benefits to the attackers, causing a significant radioactive release from a nuclear installation would be a **daunting challenge**, requiring considerable technical, organizational, and financial resources. Technical skills would be needed to identify relevant buildings and equipment within what are typically large and complex industrial installations; to identify and implement the actions needed to cause a radioactive release; and to defeat all backup safety systems. Organizational requirements would also be very substantial. A ground assault on a nuclear facility would require a sizeable number of assailants, probably divided into teams, a cadre roughly comparable to the 19-man group that executed the 9/11 attacks. Since all U.S. nuclear reactor facilities, except research reactors, are protected by **armed guard forces**, the assaulting group also would need military-style training to mount a successful attack. Appropriate plan personnel would have to be identified and strategies devised and implemented to gain insider support through ideological indoctrination, bribery, or coercion. Aerial attacks on nuclear facilities would require equally sophisticated planning. If a group of terrorists were to succeed in gaining control of an aircraft, they would also have to be capable of precisely targeting vital plant safety systems, such as the reactor's containment structure, or the spent fuel pools in order to generate substantial off-site release of radioactivity. Significant financial resources would be needed to meet the foregoing technical and organizational requirements. However, the group would not necessarily require the multinational capabilities necessary for nuclear weapon and IND plots involving the transportation of a nuclear weapon or fissile material from locations abroad to the United States. A relatively small number of terrorist organizations are likely to possess the motivations and capabilities to mount an attack on a nuclear facility. The 9/11 attacks are a strong reminder, however, that these abilities could be within the grasp of a well-organized and well-trained terrorist group.

### Immigration Reform Econ 2AC

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425), Ofir]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

#### PC fails --- immigration specific.

**Cost**, **2/11**/2013 (Jay – staff writer at the Weekly Standard, The Weekly Standard, p. Lexis)

All of these stories point in the same direction: This president does not have a solid congressional outreach program, does not have a steady grasp of the expectations of legislators in either party, and does a notably poor job of communicating to them what he expects. Thus, a drifting and listless policy process, finally given direction by some power player outside the White House, often acting to avert imminent disaster, has marked almost every major deal during his tenure. There is little reason to expect anything different in the next four years. In the end, President Obama simply does not spend enough time talking to members of Congress. He is too aloof, and most accounts suggest he dislikes the seemingly petty, parochial nature of Capitol Hill. In an interview with journalist Ron Suskind, President Obama articulated what he believes to be the core of a president's job, and what he learned from the troubles of his first term: While this statement would surely make the republicans of the founding generation turn over in their graves, it does encapsulate the job of the modern president, but only in part. Yes, he is to stand, almost godlike, above the political process and tell a story, but the modern presidential deity is not in line with the watchmaker God of the 18th-century rationalists. It is not enough to put the pieces in motion, then stand back. Instead, a president must be more like the God of the Old and New Testaments, above the world and sovereign over it, but also intimately involved in it, guiding, encouraging, cajoling, and threatening people to make the right choices. The ideal modern president, to borrow a phrase from Theodore Roosevelt, is one actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood. President Obama does not much care for the arena, and his successes came despite this distaste, not because of it. In fact, Nancy Pelosi probably deserves most of the credit for the legislative victories of 2009-2010. She functioned as a de facto prime minister, with her eyes always on big, national projects while she dealt with the provincial concerns of this committee chair or that subcommittee member. She, not Obama, was the one in the arena. What this means is that major breakthroughs on legislation in the next four years are likely to depend on political actors outside the White House. Pelosi's power is only a fraction of what it was, but policy success will still depend on congressional entrepreneurs as long as the White House remains disengaged. Thus, a whole host of issues will likely go unaddressed, above all, the looming entitlement crisis. One issue that could see movement is immigration reform, a topic of discussion where there is overlap between the parties and there are potential leaders in Congress, like Marco Rubio, who could help in whipping his party and negotiating a compromise with the other side. But little such progress will be due to President Obama. It is highly unlikely that he will act as the collective bargainer Neustadt envisioned. He will not be the one to help hammer out policy differences between Senate Democrats and House Republicans, such as illegal immigrants' status under Obamacare, or help the appropriators find the money needed for enforcement, or create a political space where both parties can declare victory. Sure enough, last week's campaign-style speech in Las Vegas on immigration reform was classic Obama. Not only did it do nothing to advance the ball on the sensitive negotiations in Congress, but the president demanded immediate amnesty, something to which Republicans will never agree. He also said he would insist that Congress vote on his proposal if it did not act in a timely fashion. That captures Obama's problem in a nutshell. Insisting that Congress do something is a good way to make sure nothing happens. Instead, as Harry Truman once said, the president must spend his time flattering, kissing, and kicking people to get them to do what they are supposed to do anyway. Barack Obama does not do this. He thinks it beneath him. After four years in office, he still fails to grasp the essence of modern presidential power

#### Link is non-unique – Obama has already pushed and taken credit for incentives towards SMRs – that’s the 1ac Koch evidence

#### Obama’s push on citizenship guts the bill --- it’s a poison pill.

Barnes, 2/11/2013 (Fred, Deal Breaker, The Weekly Standard, p. Lexis-Nexis)

What is it about compromise that President Obama doesn't understand? Is it that he and Democrats would have to give up something perhaps numerous things to reach an agreement with Republicans? Or is a bipartisan deal unappealing simply because Obama and Democrats would have to share the credit with Republicans?

The issue this time is immigration. And Obama has resumed his familiar role not as compromise-maker but as compromise-wrecker. He spurned bipartisanship on the stimulus and Obamacare and twice raised his demands so high that a grand bargain with Republicans on taxes and spending was impossible, first in 2011, then in 2012. Now Obama is confronted by a compromise on overhauling the immigration system that's already been reached by eight senators, four Democrats and four Republicans. In a speech last week, Obama said the agreement is very much in line with the principles I've proposed and campaigned on. Yet he's dissatisfied. The president wants more. He would tilt the deal in a Democratic direction by putting the 11 million illegal immigrants in this country instantly on a path to American citizenship. Border security? That comes later (if at all). If Obama prevails, the compromise will be shattered and odds on passage of immigration reform reduced to near zero. That outcome, by the way, would please the zealous bloc of conservatives whose battle cry is Keep Illegal Immigrants Illegal in other words, maintain the unstable status quo, or worse. And it would squander a rare opportunity to break the impasse on immigration with a deal that treats illegals fairly and decently and, better still, is good for America. The Senate agreement is a true compromise. Both sides gave up a lot, and, should it pass in some form or other, neither will be able to claim exclusive victory. It's win-win, which is what a compromise is supposed to be. The eight senators last week issued a set of principles for rewriting immigration laws, and a bill is expected in March. The aim is to pass the legislation by the August recess. The House would take up the immigration issue in the fall. The compromise would do three important things. First, illegal immigrants would be given legal status immediately. They wouldn't be eligible for federal benefits, but they wouldn't be deported either. Second, they would gain green cards and be allowed to apply for citizenship in 8 to 12 years after a special commission that includes state and local officials has certified America's southern border as secure. And third, the newly legalized would go to the end of the immigration line (shortened by cleaning out its backlog). It's a long and tedious process. But the legislation won't be drafted by a few senators in secret meetings, then whisked directly to the floor. That's the way Senate majority leader Harry Reid normally operates. This time, so-called regular order will be followed hearings, mark-ups, and debates, a Senate-House conference, a bill on the president's desk. What's surprising is the breadth of the concessions that produced the compromise. The four Democrats Bob Menendez (New Jersey), Michael Bennet (Colorado), Richard Durbin (Illinois), and Charles Schumer (New York) yielded on a guest worker program, which Democrats usually oppose. They accepted a trigger, based on quantifiable improvements in border security, to clear the path to citizenship. They yielded on federal benefits, Obamacare included, which the new residents won't get. And they agreed to increase the number of highly skilled and educated workers given green cards. All that, plus billions more to enhance border security. Republicans had to accept, finally, that the 11 million could become citizens despite having broken the law upon entering the country. True, it's a two-step process that may take 15 years or so, but it arrives at the same place simple amnesty would. Even before that, the undocumented workers would be legal residents of the United States. Republicans also accepted the Dream Act, which gives special status to immigrants brought here as children. The four Republicans Marco Rubio (Florida), Lindsey Graham (South Carolina), and John McCain and Jeff Flake (both Arizona) are veterans of immigration reform struggles. They knew what they were doing. Rubio told Rush Limbaugh that if the insistence on securing the border were removed, he'd vote against the bill. As for Obama, he had a choice. He can either decide that he wants to be part of the solution or he can decide he wants to be part of a political issue and try to trigger a bidding war, Rubio said. The next day, Obama took the political tack. It won't lead to success. Obama would create a freeway to citizenship from day one. That's a poison pill for Republicans. Scrapping the guest worker program would also alienate Republicans, the business community, and those conservatives who regard it correctly as an alternative to illegal border-crossing.

#### SMRs are popular

### Nelson and Northey ‘12

Gabriel and Northey, energy and environment reports for Greenwire, “DOE funding for small reactors languishes as parties clash on debt,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/09/24/3>, AM

It's not just wind and solar projects that are waiting for federal help as Congress duels over the importance of putting taxpayer dollars on the line for cutting-edge energy projects. Some of the nation's largest nuclear power companies are anxious to hear whether they will get a share of a $452 million pot from the Department of Energy for a new breed of reactors that the industry has labeled as a way to lessen the safety risks and construction costs of new nuclear power plants. The grant program for these "small modular reactors," which was announced in January, would mark the official start of a major U.S. foray into the technology even as rising construction costs -- especially when compared to natural-gas-burning plants -- cause many power companies to shy away from nuclear plants. DOE received four bids before the May 21 deadline from veteran reactor designers Westinghouse Electric Co. and Babcock & Wilcox Co., as well as relative newcomers Holtec International Inc. and NuScale Power LLC. Now the summer has ended with no announcement from DOE, even though the agency said it would name the winners two months ago. As the self-imposed deadline passed, companies started hearing murmurs that a decision could come in September, or perhaps at the end of the year. To observers within the industry, it seems that election-year calculations may have sidelined the contest. "The rumors are a'flying," said Paul Genoa, director of policy development at the Nuclear Energy Institute, in an interview last week. "All we can imagine is that this is now caught up in politics, and the campaign has to decide whether these things are good for them to announce, and how." Small modular reactors do not seem to be lacking in political support. The nuclear lobby has historically courted both Democrats and Republicans and still sees itself as being in a strong position with key appropriators on both sides of the aisle. Likewise, top energy officials in the Obama administration have hailed the promise of the new reactors, and they haven't shown any signs of a change of heart. DOE spokeswoman Jen Stutsman said last week that the department is still reviewing applications, but she did not say when a decision will be made.

#### Obama will nominate Moniz - he'll cause a fight

Clarke 2/22/13 (Chris, Contributor @ ReWire, "Obama's Rumored Pick for Energy Secretary is Fracking and Nuclear Friendly," http://www.kcet.org/news/rewire/government/concern-mounts-over-obamas-likely-energy-department-pick.html)

President Obama's declaration in his 2013 State Of The Union that he'd pursue an "all of the above" energy strategy is being underscored by his likely choice for Steven Chu's replacement as Secretary of the Department of Energy. And that rumored pick, Ernest Moniz, an MIT professor who directs that university's Energy Initiative (MITEI), is being described by some observers as too friendly to the natural gas and nuclear industries to promote renewable energy effectively.¶ Under Moniz's direction, according to Peter Mantius at D.C. Bureau, MITEI received $25 million from each of its "founding members": BP, Shell, Saudi Aramco, and the Italian energy company ENI. In return, each company was granted a stake in determining the scope and direction of MITEI's research. Smaller contributors were also given some say into research priorities, but the founding members were able to place their own researchers in MITEI labs in exchange for their largesse.¶ MITEI is probably best known for a 2011 report it co-produced with the "Clean Skies foundation," "The Future of Natural Gas." As Mantius reminds us, the Clean Skies Foundation was launched by Chesapeake Energy, an early proponent of hydraulic fracturing -- fracking -- and the donor of $26 million in secret donations to the Sierra Club that seriously damaged that leading environmental group's reputation when revealed last year.¶ The influence of Chesapeake's indirect funding of the MITEI natural gas report is arguable, as is that of the additional funding from other energy firms. But the "Future of Natural Gas" as described in the MITEI report is an unquestionably rosy one, as long as companies engaging in fracking follow unspecified "best practices":¶ The environmental impacts of shale development are challenging but manageable. Shale development requires large-scale fracturing of the shale formation to induce economic production rates. There has been concern that these fractures can also penetrate shallow freshwater zones and contaminate them with fracturing ﬂuid, but there is no evidence that this is occurring. There is, however, evidence of natural gas migration into freshwater zones in some areas, most likely as a result of substandard well completion practices by a few operators.¶ MITEI's too-cozy involvement with the natural gas industry isn't unique: in the last year Penn State, UT Austin, and the State University of New York at Buffalo have come under fire for similar entanglements. Mantius' piece at D.C. Bureau discusses this so-called "Frackademia" scandal in some detail.¶ As Mantius points out, Moniz' involvement in such ethically questionable relationships between business and academia is cause for concern, as his name rises to the top of the list of potential Energy Secretary nominees. Also relevant is Moniz's support for U.S. exports of liquefied natural gas (LNG), and for nuclear energy: A nuclear physicist by training, Moniz has advocated for $36 billion in government loan guarantees to promote new nuclear power stations built with existing technology, as for example in this 2011 interview with Dan Rather:

#### -- No motive for cyber-terror

Green 2 (Joshua, Editor – Washington Monthly, “The Myth of Cyberterrorism”, Washington Monthly, November,

http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html#byline)

Despite all the media alarm about terrorists poised on the verge of cyberattack, intelligence suggests that they're doing no more than emailing and surfing for potential targets. When U.S. troops recovered al Qaeda laptops in Afghanistan, officials were surprised to find its members more technologically adept than previously believed. They discovered structural and engineering software, electronic models of a dam, and information on computerized water systems, nuclear power plants, and U.S. and European stadiums. But nothing suggested they were planning cyberattacks, only that they were using the Internet to communicate and coordinate physical attacks. "There doesn't seem to be any evidence that the people we know as terrorists like to do cyberterrorism," says Libicki. Indeed, in a July report to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee detailing the threats detected to critical infrastructure, the General Accounting Office noted "to date none of the traditional terrorist groups such as al Qaeda have used the Internet to launch a known assault on the U.S.'s infrastructure." It is much easier, and almost certainly much deadlier, to strike the old-fashioned way.

**-- Err Neg – their evidence is biased**

Green 2 (Joshua, Editor – Washington Monthly, “The Myth of Cyberterrorism”, Washington Monthly, November,

http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html#byline)

Why all this brooding over so relatively minor a threat? Ignorance is one reason. Cyberterrorism merges two spheres--terrorism and technology--that most lawmakers and senior administration officials don't fully understand and therefore tend to fear, making them likelier to accede to any measure, if only out of self-preservation. Just as tellingly, many are eager to exploit this ignorance. Numerous technology companies, still reeling from the collapse of the tech bubble, have recast themselves as innovators crucial to national security and boosted their Washington presence in an effort to attract federal dollars. As Ohio State University law professor Peter Swire explained to Mother Jones, "Many companies that rode the dot-com boom need to find big new sources of income. One is direct sales to the federal government; another is federal mandates. If we have a big federal push for new security spending, that could prop up the sagging market." But lately, a third motive has emerged: Stoking fears of cyberterrorism helps maintain the level of public anxiety about terrorism generally, which in turn makes it easier for the administration to pass its agenda.

#### Immigration won’t pass, PC isn’t key, other issues thump

Page 2-21 (Susan, “Obama supported on guns, debt; Divided and dissatisfied with both sides, public is less aligned with Republicans,” Lexis)

An immigration divide A 51% majority of Americans say it's essential for the president and Congress to pass a sweeping immigration bill this year, and nearly everybody, nine in 10, say a major bill is needed within the next few years. But to do what? One in four want the bill to focus on better border security -- that's down 10 percentage points from a year ago -- and another one in four want the focus to be on creating a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants now in this country. Nearly half of those surveyed, 47%, say both should be equal priorities. There is a predictable partisan divide on the issue: Democrats want a pathway to citizenship while Republicans back stronger security and enforcement of existing immigration laws. That could create problems for Republican leaders, including Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, who are working on bipartisan bills that would include a path to legal status for illegal immigrants as well as border security measures. By a wide margin, 50%-33%, Obama's approach to immigration is preferred over the GOP. For Obama, having higher ratings than congressional Republicans doesn't guarantee passage of any legislation, given the polarization in a divided Congress. But it does put him in a stronger position to bring public pressure on lawmakers. And it complicates Republican efforts to unite a fractured party behind a message that will appeal to voters. "Lots of things need to be passed in Congress, and it seems everything is a filibuster," says Jaime Cortez, 23, of Edinburg, Texas. "I know a lot of strong, far-right Republicans, but I just think they need to ease up and listen to the public's opinion." While most Americans want action on the deficit and immigration this year, Obama faces a more difficult task in pressing two other priorities he's outlined, on gun control and climate change.

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

#### 1NC concedes the Myers evidence – Natural gas price spikes are coming and nuclear energy is key to stabilize them

#### Price volatility undermines industry

Hayward 11 (Stephen – K. Weyerhaeuser fellow at AEI, “The gas revolution”, 4/11, http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/conventional-energy/the-gas-revolution/)

When Andrew Liveris took over as CEO of Dow Chemical at the end of 2004, the company was in the midst of a wrenching reorganization that saw it shed 7,000 jobs--14 percent of its workforce--and close 23 older chemical plants in this country. Looking ahead to a new product cycle in a fast-growing global marketplace, Liveris faced a stark choice: Should Dow invest in new capacity in the United States, or should he locate more facilities in emerging markets? One factor made expanding overseas much more attractive--not labor costs but the price of natural gas. Dow and several other **industrial manufacturing sectors use natural gas as a basic feedstock for much of their product line**, not primarily as an energy source. As such there are few substitutes or efficiency strategies the company could use. As Liveris told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in the fall of 2005, "This [natural gas] price of $14, simply put, renders the entire U.S. chemical industry uncompetitive. We simply cannot compete with the rest of the world at these prices. When faced with a choice of investing in the United States at $14 gas versus $2 to $3 elsewhere, how can I recommend investing here?" Not long after, Dow Chemical announced plans for a major expansion in Kuwait and Oman, both of which were able to guarantee long-term rock-bottom natural gas prices. Other chemical companies followed suit, and a sector that was once among the nation's strongest export industries became a net importer. Between 1997 and 2005, overall industrial consumption of natural gas in the United States fell 22.4 percent. One of the less appreciated facts of the U.S. energy marketplace is that the price of natural gas has been much more volatile than the price of oil over the last 15 years. Unlike oil, which trades at globally uniform prices, natural gas has always been a more locally traded commodity, with wide price differences from region to region. And in the middle years of the last decade, when the U.S. natural gas price spiked to $14 per thousand cubic feet, up from $2 or less for most of the 1990s, both Middle Eastern and Russian gas could be had much more cheaply--if you were located in their neighborhood. Like domestic production of oil, U.S. production of natural gas had been relatively flat for years. All of the official public and private forecasts expected domestic gas production to decline, with the result that the United States, hitherto nearly self-sufficient in natural gas (we have been importing about 10 percent of our gas from Canada and Mexico), would have to import as much as 20 percent of our needs by the year 2020. Most of the new gas imports were expected to come from the Persian Gulf, extending American dependency on that politically sketchy region. The oil and gas industry argued that the only way to turn around our gas fortunes was to open up more areas for exploration and production, especially offshore on the continental shelf, but this ran into the same buzzsaw of political opposition that has hobbled domestic oil production. Now, within an astonishingly short time, the entire picture has changed. In mid-December the Energy Information Administration released new estimates of U.S. natural gas showing proved reserves at their highest level since 1967, up 33 percent in the last three years and 62 percent over the last 10 years. Natural gas production in the United States in 2009 (21.6 trillion cubic feet) was the highest since 1973, even though demand was down on account of the recession. The Department of Energy now predicts gas reserves will grow by at least another 20 percent over the next decade, though a number of energy forecasters think reserves will grow by much more, securing a 100-year supply for our needs. Even as oil and gasoline prices rise again to uncomfortable levels, the price of natural gas has declined 80 percent from its mid-recession level in the summer of 2008, to about $4 per thousand cubic feet, and it is likely to stay at this level or perhaps fall further. Although price volatility may not be a thing of the past, it is unlikely we'll see spikes to $14 again for a very, very long time. How did this startling turnabout occur? The phrase suddenly in every newsroom copybook (the cover of Time magazine last week, a series in the New York Times last month) is "unconventional gas," chiefly shale gas and coal-bed methane, produced through a technique known as hydraulic fracturing or "fracking." Fracking involves sending high pressure fluid deep into wells to force cracks in the surrounding rock formations, which releases gas (and also oil where oil deposits are mixed in rock). From the recent news reports you'd think shale gas and fracking had just been discovered, but neither is brand new. It has been known for decades that deep shale rock formations contain lots of natural gas, and oil drillers have employed fracking for years to enhance oil recovery. But fracking for shale gas was not economical until a second technology achieved major breakthroughs in the last decade and a half: directional drilling. It is possible today to drill several wells from a single platform in many different directions, often for several miles laterally, and navigational advances enable drillers to know their exact position down to a few inches from thousands of feet away. Combined with advances in underground geological surveying, directional drilling and fracking over the last decade have allowed us to tap into previously uneconomic shale gas deposits. At the present time shale gas accounts for about 20 percent of total U.S. gas production (up from 1 percent in 2000), but it is projected to account for nearly half of U.S. gas production by the year 2035. One remarkable aspect of the shale gas revolution is that it was not the product of an energy policy edict from Washington, or the result of a bruising political battle to open up public lands and offshore waters for new exploration. Although the Halliburtons of the world are now big in the field, its pioneers were mostly smaller risk-taking entrepreneurs and technological innovators. George P. Mitchell, an independent producer based in Houston, is widely credited as being the prime mover in shale gas, pushing the idea against skeptics. The technology was mainly deployed on existing oil and gas leaseholds or on private land beyond the reach of bureaucrats (for the time being, anyway). That is why shale gas seemed to sneak up unannounced to the media and Beltway elites, even though people inside the gas industry realized several years ago what was rapidly taking place. Mitchell worked the Barnett shale formation near Dallas, but the biggest shale gas "play" is the Marcellus--a massive deep shale formation stretching from West Virginia through upstate New York. Now that shale gas is front-page news, everyone wants a piece of the action. Environmentalists, who have supported natural gas as a "bridge fuel" to kill coal, are starting to turn against gas now that it looks more abundant. Regulators want to regulate it; state legislators want to tax it more. And politicians are eager to "help" the market decide how best to use this newfound bounty, which is music to the gas industry's ears, as they fear a glut might collapse prices and do to their industry what the collapse in oil prices in 1986 did to the small producers in the oil patch. In other words, the one thing that might disrupt this amazing success story has arrived on the scene: politics. The shale gas revolution presents two main issues. The first concerns fracking, which is currently unregulated or lightly regulated by state and local governments. Fracking is currently exempt from some sections of the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, though it is subject to all of the wastewater and hazardous material rules and regulations. Fracking fluids, once they have done their work loosening the gas, contain some toxic chemicals (and can pick up low levels of radiation from deep underground). Environmentalists are raising a predictable hue and cry about threats to groundwater from well casing leaks or from water that returns to the surface. The environmental crusade against fracking has its own Inconvenient Truth-style documentary, Gasland, by Pennsylvania filmmaker Josh Fox, which was nominated for best documentary at the Academy Awards and aired on HBO. Gasland features dramatic footage of gas-infused well water that can be ignited at a kitchen tap, though it is not established that this is the result of nearby shale gas drilling. Hitting pockets of gas has been a well-known phenomena in shallow water wells in parts of Pennsylvania for decades. Most shale gas fracking is conducted as far as 5,000 feet underground, thousands of feet below the aquifer and beneath impermeable rock layers that separate it from drinking water. Still, spills and leaking well casings near the surface have caused some localized water pollution problems, providing just enough traction for environmentalist complaints. The EPA has **launched a major study of fracking** that is expected to report findings in 2014, and New York's outgoing governor David Paterson imposed a moratorium on new gas drilling last year in response to claims that fracking threatened groundwater, even though New York's state geologist concluded fracking presented a low risk to the state's groundwater. Environmentalists used to love natural gas--so long as it was expensive and used in part as a backstop for intermittent wind and solar power. Now that it is suddenly cheap and practical for baseload generation, environmentalists are changing their minds. Politico's Bob King noted this about-face in a mid-February story, "Greens Sour on Natural Gas." The Environmental Defense Fund, ProPublica, and the Sierra Club are suddenly voicing opposition to the expansion of natural gas use. King quoted Sierra Club chairman Carl Pope calling for phasing out natural gas use in the United States entirely by the year 2050, and Sierra's deputy executive director Bruce Hamilton said, "We want people to know that natural gas is not a clean fuel." As recently as a December appearance with me on CNBC, Hamilton endorsed using "clean" natural gas "for a very long time." You might call this the theorem of environmental duplicity: namely, there is no form of "clean" or "alternative" energy that environmentalists won't decide to oppose if it becomes practical and affordable on a large scale. From the standpoint of the increasingly desperate and forlorn climate campaign, environmentalists have a point. Natural gas has long been regarded as the cleanest of the fossil fuels because it is much lower in conventional air pollutants (that is, the emissions that cause ozone, particulates, and carbon monoxide) than coal or oil. But it is still a prodigious producer of carbon dioxide; climate change orthodoxy calls for reducing CO2 emissions to almost 1 billion tons by the year 2050, yet carbon dioxide emissions from current levels of natural gas use are 1.2 billion tons a year. There is no way to reach the targets of climate orthodoxy if we expand our use of natural gas. Still, it may be a mistake to adopt a dirigiste policy of pushing natural gas use in the electric power sector, because coal remains abundant and cheap, and neither climate hysteria nor conventional air pollution concerns are compelling enough reasons to suppress coal power deliberately. (Conventional air pollutants and mercury emissions from coal plants are falling steadily, and will continue to do so even without a new suite of EPA regulations.) Substituting natural gas for coal power plants would not reduce our imports of foreign oil by a single barrel. But adopting natural gas as a transportation fuel in our car and truck fleet would, if done on a large scale, and this is the most tantalizing prospect. T. Boone Pickens has been pushing this idea for the last two years, arguing that we should start with the trucking fleet. But the conversion costs are high. It costs about $50,000 or more to convert a diesel truck to run on compressed natural gas, and natural gas-powered autos would be considerably more expensive than gasoline-powered autos. The one commercial natural gas car currently available, a Honda Civic, costs about $10,000 more than a gasoline engine Civic. Natural gas vehicles would require a large compressed gas infrastructure that does not currently exist. Pickens and other natural gas transportation enthusiasts are lobbying for tax credits for truck fleet conversions and filling station gas compression upgrades--another subsidy the federal budget doesn't need right now. But federal subsidies may not be necessary. If diesel reaches $5 a gallon, the unsubsidized payback period for converting a high-mileage long-haul truck would be two years or less at current natural gas prices. That's why UPS is starting to expand its fleet of natural gas trucks. For comparatively low-mileage passenger cars, the price of gasoline would have to be much higher than it is today for gas conversion to look attractive, somewhere in the neighborhood of $8 or $9 a gallon. With all of the emphasis--and confusion--in the automotive industry about whether to develop hybrid-electric cars or other power sources, policymakers ought to tread carefully before piling on a new market-distorting tax credit or subsidy. Furthermore, natural gas can be converted to liquid fuels, especially methanol, that can be used in current gasoline-powered cars for a minimal extra conversion cost. At current natural gas prices, methanol can be produced at a cost of about $1.30 a gallon, though methanol has a lower energy content than gasoline, so the equivalent gasoline price would be closer to about $1.60 a gallon--attractive at current oil prices, but not if oil drops again to 2009 levels. Finally, it is not a slam dunk **that newly abundant natural gas supplies should be used** primarily for new energy production. Current low prices are inducing the chemical industry to begin looking to our shores again for expansion. Two weeks ago CP Chem, a joint venture of Chevron and ConocoPhillips, announced that it is considering a major expansion at a Gulf Coast facility that would utilize shale gas, a development Chemical Week called "the most significant yet related to the improved cost position of U.S. petro-chemicals." **The chief fear of the chemical industry is that the price volatility** that drove them overseas in the last decade **might not be over**. The chemical industry, like electric utilities, has been bit before by confident assurances that cheap gas was here to stay.

#### **Manufacturing is key to the economy**

Boushey 12 – Heather Boushey, Senior Economist, Center for American Progress Action Fund, July 19th, 2012, "Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Meanson Tax Reform and the U.S. Manufacturing Sector" waysandmeans.house.gov/uploadedfiles/boushey\_testimony.pdf

**Having a strong manufacturing industry in the United States should be at the top of our national economic agenda. Without a vibrant and innovative manufacturing base,** we will not be a global leader **for long. Moreover, as more of our energy** future will rely on high-tech manufacturing**, our** economic competitiveness will be even more closely aligned with our ability to be an innovator and producer of manufactured goods**.**¶ Further, this is an urgent national issue and one of those cases where success begets success. Economists have begun to study and show that the “industrial commons” matters for innovation and the extent to which we allow manufacturing processes to continue to go overseas, we only make it that much harder to regain our place as a global leader.11 As my colleagues Michael Ettlinger and Kate Gordon have put it, “the cross-fertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness.”12¶ Manufacturing is not only a key part of our economy, but moving forward it will remain critical to our nation’s economic vitality¶ **The U.S. manufacturing sector is still a force internationally and an important part of our economy, despite employment losses and the relative rise in manufacturing in other countries over the past few decades**.13 **Last year, manufacturing contributed over** $1.8 trillion **to U.S.** g**ross** d**omestic** p**roduct, or about** 12 percent of the economy.14 Two years ago, manufacturing accounted for 60 percent of all U.S. exports.15 In 2008, the United States ranked first in the world in manufacturing value added, and it was the third largest exporter of manufactured goods to the world, behind only China and Germany and ahead of Japan and France.16 Between 1979 and 2010 manufacturing output per hour of labor in the United States increased by an average of 4 percent annually, and the United States has one of the world’s most productive workforces.17 Moreover, in 2009 there were 11.8 million direct jobs in manufacturing and 6.8 million additional jobs in related sectors.18 Put another way, one in six U.S. private-sector jobs is directly linked to manufacturing.19¶ Yet the industry suffered declines in the 2000s. The U.S. share of worldwide manufacturing value added dropped from 26 percent in 1998 to less than 20 percent in 2007, and we have gone from being a net exporter of manufactured goods in the 1960s to a net importer.20 Manufacturing as a share of U.S. GDP has declined from more than 15 percent in 1998 to 11 percent in 2009.21 And jobs in U.S. manufacturing declined from 17.6 million in January 1998 to 11.5 million in January 2010.22 And although the manufacturing sector has gained jobs in every month since then, for a total of 504,000 jobs as of June 2012, its share of total employment is down from 16.8 percent in 1998 to 10.8 percent today.23¶ These trends matter because the United States needs a strong manufacturing sector. **Manufacturing** provides good, middle-class jobs; **propels U.S. leadership in technology and innovation**, which is critical to our economic growth and vitality; and is important to balancing the trade deficit, as well as important for our nation’s long-term national security. The manufacturing sector has historically been a source of solid, middle-class jobs and it continues to be so today. **The average manufacturing worker earns a weekly wage that is 8.4 percent higher than non-manufacturing workers,** taking into account worker and job characteristics that influence wages, including unionization.24 **Economist Susan Helper and her colleagues conclude** that the economic evidence points to the fact that “the main reason why manufacturing wages and benefits are higher than those outside of manufacturing is that manufacturers need to pay higher wages to ensure that their workers are appropriately skilled and motivated.” 25 U.S.-based **manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs in other industries,** including higher skill service jobs such as accountants, bankers, and lawyers, as well as a broad range of other jobs such as basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work.26 Compared to jobs in other economic sectors, manufacturing jobs have the highest “multiplier effect**,” that is, the largest effect on the overall economy for each job created, relative to jobs in other industries.** To put this in perspective, each job in motor vehicle manufacturing creates 8.6 indirect jobs, each job in computer manufacturing creates 5.6 indirect jobs, and each job in steel product manufacturing creates 10.3 indirect jobs.27¶ Manufacturing is also important because it fuels the United States’ leadership in technology and innovation, which are critical to maintain for our future economic competitiveness.28 Manufacturing firms are more likely to innovate than firms in other industries: **Research from the National Science Foundation finds that 22 percent of manufacturing companies are active innovators compared to only 8 percent of nonmanufacturing companies.**29 This number is even higher for specific sectors within manufacturing. For example, in computer and electronic products manufacturing, 45 percent of companies are product innovators and 33 percent are process innovators.30 Manufacturing firms also **perform the vast majority of private research and development**: Despite comprising just 12 percent of the nation’s GDP in 2007, manufacturing companies contributed 70 percent of private research and development spending.31 ¶ In addition to what manufacturers spend on innovation, there is **increasingly strong empirical evidence showing a tight link between innovation and manufacturing production.** Economic research now shows that the United States will not likely be able to keep the highly skilled technical jobs if the production jobs go overseas. Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih have written about the decline of the “industrial commons” in the United States: the collective R&D, engineering, and manufacturing capabilities that mutually reinforce each other to sustain innovation.32 **For many types of manufacturing,** geographic proximity is key **to having a strong “commons,” and they point to evidence showing that there are few hightech industries where the feedback loop from the manufacturing process is not a factor in developing new products.**33 As they put it, “product and process innovation are intertwined.” Pisano and Shih point to the example of rechargeable batteries as a product where innovation followed manufacturing. Rechargeable battery manufacturing left the United States many years ago, leading to the migration of the batteries commons to Asia. Now new technology (batteries for hybrid and electric vehicles) are being designed in Asia where the commons are located. I’d draw your attention to a January New York Times article on China’s increasing investment in research and development, which asked, “**Our global competitiveness is based on being the origin of the newest, best ideas.** How will we fare if those ideas originate somewhere else?”34

#### Contentious fights coming now – costs PC

Cillizza 2-6 (Chris, Political Reporter, “President Obama is Enjoying a Second Political Honeymoon. But How Long Will It Last?” Washington Post, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/02/06/president-obama-is-enjoying-a-second-political-honeymoon-but-how-long-will-it-last/)

Another factor contributing to the truncation of political honeymoons is that in the world of 24-hour cable networks, Twitter and the fracturing of the traditional media, the attention span of the American public is much shorter than it once was — meaning that momentum simply dies away much faster nowadays. Regardless of the reason, it’s clear that Obama has a limited time — six months perhaps? — to take legislative advantage of his second political honeymoon. He seems committed to taking on three separate and distinct fights during that time: 1) gun control 2) immigration reform 3) debt and spending. Each of those legislative scraps will shorten his honeymoon as he expends political capital to try to get what he wants out of a Congress — particularly in the House — that seems likely to be resistant. And, it’s possible — given the glacially slow pace at which Congress works and the aforementioned partisanship that seems to seize any and every issue — that Obama’s honeymoon will fade well before he gets all three of those priorities accomplished. A look back at the trend line on his job approval in his first term is telling in that regard. Even though Obama started off considerably higher in his first term than he began his second term, by August 2009 he had dropped to 54 percent approval in WaPo-ABC polling — thanks to the bailout of the American auto industry, the fight over the economic stimulus package and the earlier positioning over his health-care bill. Considering that Obama is — at best — in the mid-50s in terms of job approval at the moment and the fact that the past showdowns on fiscal issues have revealed the massively different approaches advocated by the two parties, it’s not at all far-fetched to assume that taking on just one of those fights might be enough to end the president’s second term honeymoon. In short: The time is now for Obama to act on his legislative priorities. His political honeymoon will almost certainly be over by the time Congress recesses for its month-long August break this summer.

#### -- Cyber-terrorism inevitable

Keefe 3 (Bob, Staff – Cox, “Cyberspace an Invisible Front in War on Terrorism”, Cox News Service, 3-19, Lexis)

The so-called Slammer computer worm, for instance, spread faster than any other computer attack ever when it ravaged computers worldwide in January. In just 10 minutes' time, the worm damaged an estimated 75,000 computers, exploiting vulnerabilities that had been identified by other worms and other hackers. "These folks who write these worms, they share information, they talk to each other," said Steve Lipner, director of security assurance for Microsoft Corp., whose server software is a favorite target of hackers because of its widespread use and its known flaws. "Certainly, it felt like Slammer took advantage of what was sort of like research" by other hackers. It's easy to understand why **it's impossible to secure** the Internet **from** hackers and **cyberterrorists**. The Web is accessible from anywhere, at anytime, by anybody \_ anonymously. No one person or organization or government agency controls or polices it. All a hacker needs to launch a worldwide attack on the Internet is a single Web-connected computer without proper security software \_ a grandmother's desktop, a university's e-mail server, a government agency's wireless laptop. Using the e-mail software or other applications on an unprotected computer, hackers can rapidly bog down the Internet with "distributed denial of service" attacks that generate more traffic than the network can handle. "A chain is only as strong as the weakest link, and we have a lot of weak links out there," said Pete Allor of Atlanta-based Internet Security Systems Inc., which works with the FBI and other government agencies to identify and stop hacker attacks. The stakes for computer security are high and getting higher as more government and private infrastructure \_ from banking to electrical grids to nuclear power plant control systems \_ are operated by computer systems connected to the Internet. A comforting note, according to Cooper and others, is that Internet capabilities in countries tied to terrorism, such as Iraq and Afghanistan, generally aren't good enough to launch wide-scale cyberattacks. That could change in coming years as computers become more ubiquitous. At the Department of Homeland Security, officials admit that **the** **U**nited **S**tates **will** likely **never be** completely **safe from attacks** that could shut down the Web and those who rely on it.

#### No DA – GOP will block, the votes too far off, and visas for skilled workers are inevitable

Cowan 2-5 (Richard, Editor, “House Republicans Challenge Obama Immigration Plan's Citizenship Goal,” Reuters, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/05/us-usa-immigration-idUSBRE9130V620130205)

Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives on Tuesday challenged President Barack Obama's central goal for immigration reform that would put 11 million undocumented residents on a path to citizenship, adding fresh doubts on whether legislation can be passed this year. During a kick-off hearing, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte explored a possible "middle ground" between the current U.S. policy of deporting those who have come to the United States illegally and of placing them on a path to citizenship, as Obama has demanded. The hearing was the panel's first since last November's elections when Hispanic-Americans voted in droves for Obama and his fellow Democrats in Congress. Those election results caused Republicans to rethink their anti-immigration stances, which were highlighted by presidential candidate Mitt Romney's urging that illegal residents should simply "self-deport." A standoff over Democrats' goal of providing citizenship hopes for the immigrants living illegally in the United States could torpedo reform efforts in this Congress. Still, many Republicans expressed concerns about rewarding illegal immigrants with eventual citizenship, which they often decry as an "amnesty." House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, in a speech to the conservative American Enterprise Institute, noted, "While we are a nation that allows anyone to start anew, we are also a nation of laws." Cantor of Virginia is the second-ranking House Republican and has a say in which bills are debated before the full House. At the House Judiciary hearing, Goodlatte, another Virginia Republican, asked, "Are there options to consider between the extremes of mass deportation and pathway to citizenship?" Julian Castro, the Democratic mayor of San Antonio, Texas, who testified before Goodlatte's panel, responded: "I believe, as the president has pointed out ... that a path to citizenship is the best option" for the 11 million, many of whom have lived in the United States for a decade or more. Some Republicans have sketched out more modest steps in dealing with illegal immigrants who live under the threat of deportation. Instead of putting them in line for citizenship, they have suggested a permanent work visa system. But last week, Senator Dick Durbin of Illinois, the second-ranking Senate Democrat, told Reuters legislation could not be enacted unless it contains a path to full citizenship. During Tuesday's House committee hearing, Democratic Representative Zoe Lofgren of California warned: "Partial legalization, as some are suggesting, is a dangerous path and we need only look at France and Germany to see how unwise it is to create a permanent underclass" in the United States. A PIECEMEAL APPROACH Other Republicans in the House Judiciary Committee raised additional ideas that could complicate comprehensive immigration reform this year, or make it impossible. Representative Spencer Bachus, an Alabama Republican, suggested splitting immigration reform into pieces so that the "more toxic and contentious issue" of citizenship for the 11 million was separated from reforms that have more widespread support. Those reforms include efforts to encourage foreigners earning advanced degrees in mathematics, engineering and science at American universities to stay in the United States and work for American companies. Cantor also hinted at a piecemeal approach, rather than the comprehensive action that Obama and his fellow Democrats want. He called for starting with legalization and citizenship for children who were brought illegally into the United States by their parents, an action that Obama last summer approved temporarily. "One of the great founding principles of our country was that children would not be punished for the mistakes of their parents," Cantor said. While Cantor's call marked movement for Republicans, many of whom opposed citizenship for the youths, it also falls well short of Obama's drive for broader legislation. A bipartisan group of senators last week unveiled a comprehensive plan that they hope to translate into legislation in coming weeks. Major holes in their outline included the kind of system that would be created for allowing future visa applicants. Senate Democrats hope to pass a comprehensive bill by mid-year with a large, bipartisan vote that could improve chances for passage of a bill in the Republican-controlled House. But House Republican leaders have not decided on whether they would pursue a major reform bill this year, according to one aide. Goodlatte acknowledged that U.S. immigration laws were badly in need of repair, but he warned against rushing to enact an immigration bill. Congress, he said, "needs to take the time to learn from the past so that our efforts to reform our immigration laws do not repeat the same mistakes."

#### No internal link to the DA and only a risk winners win – political capital is a meaningless concept and achieving controversial initiatives makes future success more likely

Hirsch, 2/7/13 – chief correspondent for the National Journal and former senior editor and columnist at Newsweek (Michael, "There's no such thing as political capital.” <http://news.yahoo.com/no-thing-political-capital-201002390--politics.html>)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, **it** wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. BobbyJindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong**.** “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. **Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote** years ago, **“Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown.** Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. **Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say thatpolitical capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or evendefines it.** “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. **That makes it kind of useless,”** says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors”** Ornstein says**. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”**

#### Dicussion of the plan should have already sparked the DA – voting neg still causes the impact to happen

#### Capital does not affect the agenda

**Dickinson 9** (Matthew, Professor of political science at Middlebury College, Sotomayer, Obama and Presidential Power, Presidential Power, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### Democrats will block

Reagan 2-6 (Michael, Political Consultant and Son of President Ronald, “Democrats Thwarting Immigration Reform,” Oncida Daily Dispatch, 2013, <http://oneidadispatch.com/articles/2013/02/06/opinion/doc5112f5a0e9a23697016524.txt?viewmode=fullstory>)

The president and his liberal friends in the media like to make everyone think it’s Republicans who’ve been thwarting comprehensive immigration reform all these years. But the dirty little political secret is that it’s the Democrats who are really the ones who don’t want to see immigration reform happen anytime soon. As long as immigration policy remains a political football to fight over, Democrats can use the issue as a way to brand Republicans as anti-immigrant and continue to capture the vast majority of Latino voters.

#### Contraception thumps the DA

Fox 2/1

[Maggie, NBC News, 2/1/13, <http://vitals.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/02/01/16809018-white-house-tries-for-new-compromise-on-birth-control?lite>]

The Obama administration is taking another stab at a compromise over the contentious issue of making employers pay for birth control, offering a way for women to get the coverage without forcing religiously affiliated organizations to pay for it. The proposed new rule would have insurance companies provide the coverage free of charge through separate, individual health insurance policies. It’s not quite clear how much it would cost or who, exactly, would end up paying for it. “Under the proposed accommodations, the eligible organizations would not have to contract, arrange, pay or refer for any contraceptive coverage to which they object on religious grounds, the proposed rule reads. The 2010 Affordable Care Act requires all health insurers to pay for a woman’s contraceptive care without charging her anything. Religious organizations such as the Catholic Church, which oppose artificial birth control, have objected strongly. While churches and other overtly religious organizations were always exempted, things were a little fuzzier for religiously affiliated organizations, such as universities, and private employers who said they had their own personal conscientious objections. Some employers who don’t oppose birth control in general oppose the requirement that products such as emergency birth control, which they equate with abortion, be supplied. At least 44 lawsuits have been filed against the government over the issue, The Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, a legal organization helping oppose the mandate, says. It has been a big thorn in the side for the Obama administration.

#### Pol cap isn’t key–Obama is letting congress work out the details

Elise Foley, staff writer, 1/15/13 [“Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” HuffPost, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html]

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.¶ "Enforcement is certainly part of the picture," the official said. "But if you go back and look at the 2006 and 2007 bills, if you go back and look at John McCain's 10-point 'This is what I've got to get done before I'm prepared to talk about immigration,' and then you look at what we're actually doing, it's like 'check, check, check.' We're there. The border is as secure as it's been in a generation or two, so it's really time."¶ One key in the second term, advocates say, will be convincing skeptics such as Republican Sen. John Cornyn of Texas that the Obama administration held up its end of the bargain by proving a commitment to enforcement. The White House also needs to convince GOP lawmakers that there's support from their constituents for immigration reform, which could be aided by conservative evangelical leaders and members of the business community who are pushing for a bill.¶ Immigrant advocates want more targeted deportations that focus on criminals, while opponents of comprehensive immigration reform say there's too little enforcement and not enough assurances that reform wouldn't be followed by another wave of unauthorized immigration. The Obama administration has made some progress on both fronts, but some advocates worry that the president hasn't done enough to emphasize it. The latest deportation figures were released in the ultimate Friday news dump: mid-afternoon Friday on Dec. 21, a prime travel time four days before Christmas.¶ Last week, the enforcement-is-working argument was bolstered by a report from the nonpartisan Migration Policy Institute, which found that the government is pouring more money into its immigration agencies than the other federal law-enforcement efforts combined. There are some clear metrics to point to on the border in particular, and Doris Meissner, an author of the report and a former commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, said she hopes putting out more information can add to the immigration debate.¶ "I've been surprised, frankly, that the administration hasn't done more to lay out its record," she said, adding the administration has kept many of its metrics under wraps.¶ There are already lawmakers working on a broad agreement. Eight senators, coined the gang of eight, are working on a bipartisan immigration bill. It's still in its early stages, but nonmembers of the "gang," such as Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) are also talking about reform.¶ It's still unclear what exact role the president will play, but sources say he does plan to lead on the issue. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.), the top Democrat on the House immigration subcommittee, said **the White House seems sensitive to the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to work out the issue in Congress -- no one is expecting a fiscal cliff-style arrangement jammed by leadership** -- while keeping the president heavily involved.¶ In other words, **it's not the place for steamrolling**. "He needs to be an honest broker here," said Ali Noorani, executive director of the National Immigration Forum, which works on bipartisan consensus for reform. "Instead of the politician forcing immigration reform, Obama needs to be the statesman creating immigration reform."¶ Beyond the border, Obama will push for changes to the legal immigration system, which is universally considered to be out of date and ill-suited to the labor market and to managing the future flow of immigrant workers. Any bill will almost certainly include an increase in visas for graduates with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering or math, and more and better flexibility for foreign migrant labor.

#### Immigration is not a priority --- promises of action will not fast track it.

**Voorhees**, **1/3**/2013 (Josh – editor of The Slatest, White House (Quietly) Promises Immigration Push, Slate, p. http://www.slate.com/blogs/the\_slatest/2013/01/03/obama\_s\_immigration\_plans\_white\_house\_officials\_suggest\_early\_2013\_won\_t.html)

With one fiscal-cliff fight in the rearview mirror and several more likely looming not too far up the road, many liberals are fretting aloud that President Obama won't have the energy or desire to tackle other issues near the top of his—and their—second-term wish list. White House officials, however, are doing their best to allay those concerns with the (somewhat quiet) promise of action on two high-profile issues: immigration and gun control. The Huffington Post: An Obama administration official said the president plans to push for immigration reform this January. The official, who spoke about legislative plans only on condition of anonymity, said that coming standoffs over deficit reduction are unlikely to drain momentum from other priorities. The White House plans to push forward quickly, not just on immigration reform but gun control laws as well. In the wake of last month's tragedy in Newtown, the president promised to send a gun-control proposal to Congress early this year, likely as soon as this month. The suggestion that the White House will also get to work on immigration reform—long a priority of the president but one that has largely taken a back seat during his time in office—comes as slightly more of a surprise. However, just because the administration is declaring that an unofficial launch to the immigration push is imminent doesn't mean anyone should expect major action anytime soon. The aides who laid out the plans to HuffPo cautioned that it would probably take about two months to cobble together a bipartisan bill, and then another few before either chamber votes on it. That would mean that if all goes as planned (something that is far from certain) it would likely be early or mid-summer before any concrete actions are taken.

#### Obama pushing SMRs now

Ervin 12-28 [Dan Ervin is a professor of finance at Salisbury University, “Dan Ervin: Modular reactors are the future of nuclear energy”, December 28th, 2012, <http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20121230/OPINION03/312300005>, Chetan]

The Obama administration’s decision to kick-start commercial use of small modular reactors has made one thing clear: The notion that nuclear power is slipping away is wrong. Although nuclear power faces difficult challenges, industry and government are working together to forge a new path. The Department of Energy has earmarked funds for a new public-private partnership to help develop innovative small reactors that are about one-third the size of those in large conventional nuclear plants. These small reactors are modular, meaning they will be built in factories before they are shipped and installed at nuclear sites. This production method has the potential to reduce the cost of nuclear power significantly.

#### Obama won’t push CIR --- other priorities.

**Daily Caller**, **12/31**/2012 (Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest, p. <http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/>)

However, Obama’s language suggested that increased Latino immigration is a lower priority for him than other measures, and that he’s concerned any revamp would fail because of public opposition. Many previous immigration reform bills have died when leading supporters quietly backed away amid furious public opposition to what was perceived as an attempt at a general amnesty. In 2007, then-Sen. Obama voted against a temporary-worker provision in a pending immigration bill, helping kill the overall legislation. During his first term as president, Obama declined to push a comprehensive immigration bill, despite promising such a revamp while on the 2008 campaign trail. In his NBC interview, Obama showed more enthusiasm about other priorities. “We’ve got a huge opportunity around energy,” he said, “The most immediate thing I’ve got to do … is make sure that taxes are not going up on middle class families,” he claimed. Another priority, he added, is “rebuilding our infrastructure, which is broken.”

#### Weak labor market deters effective immigration reform.

**Grant**, **12/28**/2012 (David, Immigration reform: Is 'amnesty' a possibility now?, Christian Science Monitor, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2012/1228/Immigration-reform-Is-amnesty-a-possibility-now>)

Moreover, increasing legal immigration above the current level of 1 million annually could be seen as a blow to those born in America. Hurting "the American worker with bad immigration policy is not going to get [Republicans] more Hispanic votes," says Roy Beck, executive director of Numbers USA, a group that advocates lower immigration levels. "They've got to do something else." In that respect, increasing legal immigration might be a difficult sell in 2013. "I do not see Congress acting in this area in a robust way until the labor market is stronger," says Andrew Schoenholtz, deputy director for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. "Just how strong is hard to tell."