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#### CIR with path to citizenship will pass---sustained momentum’s key

Cohen 2/8 Micah is a writer for NYT’s 538 blog. “Signs of a Shift on Immigration Among G.O.P. Rank-and-File,” 2013, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/02/08/signs-of-a-shift-on-immigration-among-g-o-p-rank-and-file/

With notable speed after the Nov. 6 presidential election, a number of Republican politicians and opinions makers — from House Speaker John A. Boehner to the talk show host Sean Hannity — altered their positions on immigration and expressed a new openness to comprehensive reform.¶ Since then, **the push to overhaul the nation’s immigration system appears to have sustained momentum.** A new ABC News/Washington Post poll found a jump in public approval of President Obama’s handling of immigration, and most recent polls have found a majority of Americans support providing immigrants who have come here illegally a pathway to United States citizenship.¶ So, has the shift on immigration among some — but not all — Republican legislators, strategists and media personalities filtered down to rank-and-file Republicans?¶ The polling evidence — with a few significant caveats — says “possibly, yes.” There are signs of an uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship, or at least a conditional pathway to citizenship.¶ First, the caveats. Tracking opinions on immigration policy over time is tricky because each pollster asks different questions with different options, making for apples-to-oranges comparisons. In addition, when narrowing the focus to self-identified Republicans and Republican leaners, small sample sizes and large margin of sampling errors become a problem. A typical national survey includes about 1,000 respondents, making the subsample of Republicans pretty small, usually around 200 to 300.¶ But keeping those disclaimers in mind, the most recent polls on immigration suggest an increase in the percentage of Republicans who favor immigration reform that includes a route to United States citizenship.¶ On average, the share of Republicans who favor providing undocumented immigrants with a path to citizenship is 48 percent among the six national polls released so far in 2013 and included in the PollingReport.com database. (The release of a CNN poll conducted Jan. 14-15 did not provide a breakdown by political party and is not included in the average).¶ Among the six previous polls that asked about a pathway to citizenship and released results by party identification, an average of only 38 percent of Republicans favored providing a path to citizenship.¶ Question wording has an effect here. Two of the polls that found the highest level of Republican support emphasized the requirements illegal immigrants might have to meet to become citizens. Conservative voters might be more likely to support a path to citizenship if it involves certain qualifications.¶ For instance, a Fox News poll conducted Jan. 15-17 among registered voters found that 56 percent of Republicans said the government should “allow illegal immigrants to remain in the country and eventually qualify for U.S. citizenship, but only if they meet certain requirements like paying back taxes, learning English, and passing a background check.”¶ And a Gallup poll released this week found that 59 percent of Republicans would vote for “a law that would allow undocumented immigrants living in the United States the chance to become legal residents or citizens if they meet certain requirements.”¶ On the other hand, a CBS News poll of adults conducted Jan. 24-27 found that only 35 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants currently working in the country “should be allowed to stay in their jobs and to eventually apply for U.S. citizenship.” (CBS found that 25 percent of Republicans said illegal immigrants should be able to stay as guest workers and 36 percent said they should be required to leave the United States).¶ The apples-to-apples comparisons we have are more mixed: Republican support in the mid-January AP/GfK poll jumped to 53 percent from 31 percent in 2010. The latest ABC News/Washington Post poll moved to 42 percent Republican support for a path to citizenship from 37 percent in November 2012 (that’s inside the margin of sampling error). The CBS News poll did not move at all, finding 35 percent Republican support in both its December 2012 and late January 2013 surveys. And Quinnipiac polls, released on Thursday and in early December 2012, both found roughly 40 percent of registered Republicans support a path to citizenship and just more than 10 percent support legal status without citizenship.¶ An uptick in Republican support for a pathway to citizenship could be statistical noise. And even if it is real, it could reverse itself. Some political science research suggests that anti-immigrant attitudes increase when immigration is in the news.¶ But there are reasons to think that immigration, over all, has become less of a hot-button issue. A Pew study found that the number of illegal immigrants living in the United States has dropped since the 2007 push for change. Another Pew survey found that only 44 percent of Republicans see dealing with immigration as a top priority. That’s down from previous peaks of 69 percent in 2007 and 61 percent in 2011.¶ Further polling is needed before a more concrete picture of Republican attitudes emerges. But if Republican voters have warmed to providing a conditional path to citizenship, **it could increase the likelihood of an overhaul becoming law by freeing House Republicans, in particular, to back some kind of reform.**

#### Fusion’s unpopular

Chameides 12 Bill is the Dean of Duke University’s School of the Environment. “Fusion: Maybe Less Than 30 Years, But This Year Unlikely,” 10/8, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-chameides/fusion-maybe-less-than-30_b_1949573.html>

But by July 19, 2012, **the fusion bubble was burst**. An external review (pdf) of NIF by the National Nuclear Security Administration presented a mixed bag of praise -- "NIF has demonstrated an 'unprecedented level of quality and accomplishment'" -- and circumspection -- "considerable hurdles must be overcome to reach ignition ... [G]iven the unknowns with the present ...approach, the probability of ignition before the end of December is extremely low."¶ Bad Timing¶ Just so happens that LIFE's funding was to run out at the end of this fiscal year, which fell on September 30. Perhaps that's why the fusion researchers were so publicly sanguine about having results by the end of 2012. So now the scientists hand off this energy holy grail to the politicians, transforming, at least for the time being, a scientific quest into a political football, or, you might say fusing the scientific and the political. What should Congress do? Scrap the project or double down? Just another spending issue poised on the fiscal cliff our **folks on the Hill will have to wrestle with.**

#### PC’s key

Foley 1/15 Elise is a writer @ Huff Post Politics. “Obama Gears Up For Immigration Reform Push In Second Term,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/15/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2463388.html

Obama has repeatedly said he will push hard for immigration reform in his second term, and administration officials have said that other contentious legislative initiatives -- including **gun control and the debt ceiling -- won't be allowed to get in the way.** At least at first glance, he seems to have politics on his side. GOP lawmakers are entering -- or, in some cases, re-entering -- the immigration debate in the wake of disastrous results for their party's presidential nominee with Latino voters, who support reform by large measures. Based on those new political realities, "it would be a suicidal impulse for Republicans in Congress to continue to block [reform]," David Axelrod, a longtime adviser to the president, told The Huffington Post.¶ Now **there's the question of how Obama gets there.** While confrontation might work with Republicans on other issues -- the debt ceiling, for example -- the consensus is that the GOP is serious enough about reform that the president can, and must, play the role of broker and statesman to get a deal.¶ It starts with a lesson from his first term. Republicans have demanded that the border be secured first, before other elements of immigration reform. Yet the administration has been by many measures the strictest ever on immigration enforcement, and devotes massive sums to policing the borders. The White House has met many of the desired metrics for border security, although there is always more to be done, but Republicans are still calling for more before they will consider reform. Enforcing the border, but not sufficiently touting its record of doing so, the White House has learned, won't be enough to win over Republicans.¶ In a briefing with The Huffington Post, a senior administration official said the White House believes it has met enforcement goals and must now move to a comprehensive solution. The administration is highly skeptical of claims from Republicans that immigration reform can or should be done in a piecemeal fashion. Going down that road, the White House worries, could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants.¶ "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.

#### **Reform’s key to heg**

Nye 12 Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. **Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the** decline of American power**.**¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation**, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.**¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition**, skilled immigrants can be important to** particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely **because the US attracts the best and brightest** from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting **immigration reform** in his second term, he **will** have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

#### Nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 Zalmay, the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992, February 8, “The Economy and National Security; If we don’t get our economic house in order, we risk a new era of multi-polarity,” online: <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad>

We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of **escalation.**¶ The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.¶ American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.¶ As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of **great-power competition**. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.
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#### Ag industry’s collapsing now---immigration’s key

Alfonso Serrano 12, Bitter Harvest: U.S. Farmers Blame Billion-Dollar Losses on Immigration Laws, Time, 9-21-12, http://business.time.com/2012/09/21/bitter-harvest-u-s-farmers-blame-billion-dollar-losses-on-immigration-laws/

The Broetjes and an increasing number of farmers across the country say that a complex web of local and state anti-immigration laws account for acute labor shortages. With the harvest season in full bloom, stringent immigration laws have forced waves of undocumented immigrants to flee certain states for more-hospitable areas. In their wake, **thousands of acres of crops have been left to rot** in the fields, as **farmers have struggled to compensate for labor shortages** with domestic help.¶ “The enforcement of **immigration policy has devastated the skilled-labor source that we’ve depended on** for 20 or 30 years,” said Ralph Broetje during a recent teleconference organized by the National Immigration Forum, adding that last year Washington farmers — part of an $8 billion agriculture industry — were forced to leave 10% of their crops rotting on vines and trees. “**It’s** getting worse **each year,**” says Broetje, “and it’s going to end up **putting** some **growers out of business** if Congress doesn’t step up and do immigration reform.”¶ (MORE: Why Undocumented Workers Are Good for the Economy)¶ Roughly 70% of the 1.2 million people employed by the agriculture industry are undocumented. No U.S. industry is more dependent on undocumented immigrants. But acute labor shortages brought on by anti-immigration measures **threaten to heap** record losses on an industry emerging from years of stiff foreign competition. Nationwide, labor shortages will result in **losses of up to $9 billion**, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation.

#### It’s ‘path to citizenship’ or nothing---means uniqueness doesn’t outweigh---it could be derailed

Helderman 1/31 Rosalind and Peter Wallsten, WashPost. “Citizenship question roils both parties as immigration debate gets underway,” 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/citizenship-question-roils-both-parties-as-immigration-debate-gets-underway/2013/01/31/0588b44a-6b97-11e2-bd36-c0fe61a205f6\_story.html

Rising tensions over whether to give illegal immigrants a chance to pursue full citizenship **could ruin** what President Obama and congressional leaders agree is a pivotal moment in resolving long-simmering problems in the country’s **immigration** system.¶ Immigrant advocates and their Democratic allies insist that now, at long last, is their time. After various failed proposals over the past decade, they finally feel they have the leverage to accept nothing less than a path to full citizenship for the millions of people living illegally in the country.¶ But although Republican leaders are newly interested in a compromise on immigration, many in the party say that allowing undocumented immigrants to live here legally is enough and that a push for citizenship would face fierce, and possibly insurmountable, opposition from conservatives.¶ The tension has deepened in recent days, with disagreements emerging within each party as bipartisan groups in the House and the Senate try to move toward a compromise even as they face hard-line opposition from some voices in their political bases.¶ On the right, some conservatives have begun heaping criticism on one of their own rising stars, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), the Cuban American who is a potential presidential candidate and who is championing a compromise. On the left, some liberals are privately grousing that Democratic senators working with Rubio are giving too much ground.¶ A key question is whether to require that certain conditions be met before illegal immigrants could be put on the path to citizenship — and how the government would determine success.¶ The Senate group, which includes Rubio and top members of both parties, would require that the U.S.-Mexico border be found secure and that other strict enforcement measures be enacted before those here illegally could become citizens. Many on the left say the path needs to be more straightforward, while many on the right see even the compromise idea as a non-starter, deeming it too lenient.¶ A path to citizenship is “certainly going to be a problem in the House,” said Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which will hold a hearing next week on the issue. “There are a lot of options between deporting 11 million people, which most people don’t believe will happen, and giving [them] citizenship.”¶ On the other side, Richard Trumka, president of the AFL-CIO, said he would support only legislation that gives every deserving illegal immigrant a chance at citizenship. “If it’s too exclusionary, then we’ll fight against it,” he said.¶ The tensions underscore the difficulty of forging consensus on such a politically charged issue, even after Obama’s decisive election win last year among Hispanics led several prominent Republicans to express an eagerness to strike a deal.¶ The senators behind the framework — Republicans Rubio, John McCain (Ariz.), Jeff Flake (Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (S.C.), along with Democrats Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.), Richard J. Durbin (Ill.), Robert Menendez (N.J.) and Michael F. Bennet (Colo.) — have been exuding confidence that a deal was within reach.¶ “I’ve never felt more positive about the prospects of real immigration reform than I do today,” Durbin said at a news conference Thursday.¶ Yet even if the senators find agreement among themselves, selling their recommendations to their colleagues and the activists on both sides of the debate will be a far steeper challenge.¶ Immigration advocates close to the White House have vowed to pressure Obama if he agrees to what they consider unreasonable preconditions to citizenship for illegal immigrants. Conservatives are either insisting on strict contingencies or refusing to back the idea of citizenship.¶ “The world now thinks that this is inevitable,” said one person with knowledge of the deliberations who spoke on the condition of anonymity. “This is far from inevitable. There’s a million land mines in the way.”

#### The Senate won’t pass it without path to citizenship

Latin American Herald Tribune 2/7 “Senate Democrats: Immigration Reform Must Include Path to Citizenship,” 2013, http://www.laht.com/article.asp?ArticleId=675450&CategoryId=12395

WASHINGTON – Democratic Senate leaders said Thursday that **they will not accept anything less than a comprehensive immigration reform plan that allows for** the legalization and eventual attainment of **citizenship** for the 11 million undocumented immigrants in the United States.¶ At a roundtable with Spanish-language media, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and other senators involved in the negotiations for immigration reform said that they will avoid the mistakes of 2006 when an earlier reform attempt failed.¶ “This notion that we can have a comprehensive bill and not include a path to citizenship is unacceptable,” said Sen. Dick Durbin, one of the “Gang of Eight” pushing a bipartisan reform plan.

#### Will pass but there are sticking points

Graham 2/7 David is an associate editor of The Atlantic. “Why Immigration-Reform Advocates Feel Good About Their Chances,” 2013, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/02/why-immigration-reform-advocates-feel-good-about-their-chances/272977/

The way John McCain and Michael Bennet talk about it, you'd be surprised immigration reform hasn't passed already.¶ "We have the opportunity to pass a broad-based bill that deals not just with one problem or two problem but takes on the entire of array in ways this touches our economy," said Bennet, a Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado, at an Atlantic conference in Washington Thursday. (Bennet is the brother of Atlantic Editor in Chief James Bennet.) "I do think you've got two parties that've got reasons to get this done."¶ And McCain, as usual, was colorful and blunt. A veteran of several failed attempts at reform, he offered one big explanation for why this time would be different.¶ "**The climate has changed,** American opinion has changed, elections have changed ... and I'm working with people who are effective," he said. "Chuck Schumer is effective. I hate him! But he's effective."¶ Of course, there's more to it, especially for Republicans like McCain, who along with Bennet is a member of the "Gang of Eight" senators working on a bipartisan proposal. The Arizonan pinpointed three reasons this is the time to get reform done. One is simple political math: As many Republicans seem to be realizing, the GOP will find it harder and harder to win elections if it continues to alienate Latino voters. A second is technological, he said, repeatedly citing drones and other technological advances developed to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan as useful tools for policing the border with Mexico more effectively.¶ But much of it comes down to fairness, he concluded.¶ "Can we leave 11 million people in the shadows forever?" McCain asked, referring to the estimated number of illegal immigrants in the country. "The people that wash our dishes, cut our lawns, take care of our children -- is it right to leave them in the shadows forever? I don't think so."¶ Intriguingly, the two Democratic senators who bookended McCain's appearance -- Bennet and Minnesota's Amy Klobuchar -- offered economic rationales for reform, while the Republican made the compassionate case. But what's interesting is how views often associated with one party or the other seem to have been pushed aside, if not totally dispensed with. Bennet said it was reasonable to expect immigrants to learn English, and he said it was fine to make legislation contingent upon border security as long as employee verification, the standard Democratic priority, was part of a comprehensive bill. Bennet would offer only oblique criticism of GOP hardliners like David Vitter and Ted Cruz, saying, "There are some people that are better at putting themselves in other people's shoes that others."¶ Meanwhile, the occasionally cranky McCain was all smiles and jokes, with praise for both Klobuchar and Bennet; he saved his fire for budgetary matters. Asked about the sequester -- which he voted for -- he said, "It's insane, and it's unacceptable." And he criticized his 2008 rival Barack Obama's campaign-style strategy of barnstorming the country to drum up grassroots backing for his side. The real solution, McCain said, was to invite legislators to the White House to hash out a compromise. "There's no point in going out and giving another speech."¶ There should be no illusion that the road forward on immigration reform will be smooth. Panelists identified two big ones. First is the already-cliched "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants, which McCain pointed out was likely to disappoint some advocates -- it **won't be a walk in the park**. The second sticking point is likely to be a guest-worker program. While lawmakers in both parties seem to agree that the country should lift caps on visas for highly skilled workers, the fate of agricultural and other low-skill workers seems certain to provoke acrimonious debate.¶ For the time being, however, it's the not-inconsiderable common ground between the parties that's on display.

#### Will pass including path to citizenship---momentum

Karst 2/7 Tom is a writer @ The Packer. “House committee considers immigration reform,” 2013, http://www.thepacker.com/fruit-vegetable-news/House-Judiciary-Committee-considers-path-to-immigration-reform-190283571.html

Though some House Republicans still seem hesitant to support a pathway to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S., Congress opened the door on immigration reform with a hearing by the House Judiciary Committee.¶ With rumors of comprehensive immigration legislation being worked on by **bipartisan groups in the House and Senate,** Washington sources said there appears to be momentum for reform.

#### Previous immigration pushes failed because Obama spent too much PC on other issues and couldn’t arm-twist the GOP effectively---their ev doesn’t account for the GOP’s tendency toward intransigence which makes PC true in the context of immigration

Earl Ofari Hutchinson 2-1, author and political analyst, associate editor of New America Media, host of the weekly Hutchinson Report on KPFK-Radio and the Pacifica Network, and KTYM Radio Los Angeles, 2/1/13, “No Risk for President Obama in Immigration Reform Fight,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/earl-ofari-hutchinson/no-risk-for-obama\_b\_2591792.html

But Obama even as his popularity numbers slightly fell among Latinos did not totally ignore the issue. He lashed the GOP for torpedoing comprehensive immigration reform legislation in Congress on the two occasions when it appeared that an immigration bill might be reintroduced.¶ Obama was not to blame that this didn't happen. The crushing problems and bruising fights over deficit reduction, spending, health care reform, coupled with high soaring gas prices and the jobless crisis were endless and time consuming. The fights required every bit of his political capital and arm twisting to make any headway against an obstructionist, intransigent and petty GOP determined to make him pay a steep political price for every inch of legislative ground he sought to gain.¶ The 2012 election changed only one thing with the GOP. That was its in your face, xenophobic rants against illegals supposedly stealing jobs from Americans and breaking the law. GOP leaders had no choice but to tamp down their saber rattle immigration rhetoric for the simple fact that Latino voters punished the party mightily in 2012 for that rhetoric, and sent an even stronger signal that it would continue to punish the GOP if it didn't change at least its tone on immigration. The 2012 election changed one other thing. It gave Obama the long sought and awaited opening he needed to go full throttle on immigration reform. ¶ The election result was not the only strong point for Obama on reform. In 2007, then President George W. Bush was widely and unfairly blamed for making a mess of the immigration reform fight in Congress by not pushing hard enough for passage of the bill. Immigrant rights groups lambasted Republican senators for piling crippling demands for tight amnesty, citizenship and border security provisions in the bill. Leading Republican presidential contenders didn't help matters by flatly opposing the bill as much too soft on amnesty and border enforcement. ¶ This did much to kill whatever flickering hope there was for the bill's passage. This undid the inroads that Bush made in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections when he scored big with Latino voters. A big part of that then was due to the perception (and reality) that Bush would push hard for immigration reform. But the GOP didn't learn a thing from this. It was almost as if Bush's Latino vote ramp up was an aberration. The GOP's metallic ear on immigration culminated in the idiotic quip from GOP presidential loser Mitt Romney that the best way to solve the immigration crisis was for undocumented workers to "self-deport." ¶ Obama's battle for the Latino vote in 2012 was never intended to head off any mass defection of Latino voters to the GOP. There was never any chance of that. The polls that showed Latinos less than enthusiastic about Obama also showed absolutely no enthusiasm for any GOP would-be presidential candidate, let alone that there would be a massive vote for GOP candidates. ¶ Still, Obama's frontal challenge to the GOP to do something about immigration reform is not only a long overdue move to right a long simmering policy wrong, but a move that if handled right can do much to shove the wrenching issue of what to do about the nation's millions that are here without papers, and are here to stay, off the nation's political table. There's absolutely no risk, only gain, for Obama in taking the point on immigration reform to try and make that happen.

#### PC is key and zero sum---best scholarship proves

Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar 11, Profs Department of Political Science, @ University of California Irvine "How Presidents Push, When Presidents Win" Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3 SAGE

Before developing presidents’ lobbying options for building winning coalitions on Capitol Hill, it is instructive to consider **cases where the president has no political capital** and no viable lobbying options. In such circumstances of **imposed passivity** (beyond offering a proposal), **a president’s fate is clear**: his proposals are subject to pivotal voters’ preferences. So if a president lacking political capital proposes to change some far-off status quo, that is, one on the opposite side of the median or otherwise pivotal voter, a (Condorcet) winner always exists, and it coincides with the pivot’s predisposition (Brady and Volden, 1998; Krehbiel, 1998) (see also Black (1948) and Downs (1957)). Considering that there tends to be substantial ideological distance between presidents and pivotal voters, positive presidential inﬂuence without lobbying, then, is not much inﬂuence at all.¶ As with all lobbyists, presidents looking to push legislation must do so indirectly by **push**ing the **lawmakers whom they need to pass it**. Or, as Richard Nesustadt artfully explained:¶ The essence of a President’s persuasive task, with congressmen and everybody else, is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his…Persuasion deals in the coin of self-interest with men who have some freedom to reject what they ﬁnd counterfeit. (Neustadt, 1990: 40) ¶ Fortunately for contemporary presidents, today’s White House affords its occupants an unrivaled supply of **persuasive carrots and sticks**. Beyond the ofﬁce’s unique visibility and prestige, among both citizens and their representatives in Congress, presidents may also **sway lawmakers** by using their discretion in budgeting and/or rulemaking, unique fundraising and campaigning capacity, control over executive and judicial nominations, veto power, or numerous other options under the chief executive’s control. Plainly, when it comes to the arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading that so often characterizes legislative battles, modern presidents are uniquely well equipped for the ﬁght. In the following we employ the omnibus concept of ‘presidential political capital’ to capture this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining.¶ Speciﬁ- cally, we deﬁne presidents’ political capital as the **class of tactics White House ofﬁcials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior.**¶Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only **meshes with previous scholarship** on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also **presidential practice.** For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members:¶ The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237) Of course, **presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a ﬂoating value**. Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a **ﬁnite supply of political capital**; **he can only promise or pressure so much**. What is more, this capital **ebbs and ﬂows as realities and/or perceptions change**. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, **however important those margins may be** (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how **presidents may systematically inﬂuence them.**

#### Executive action doesn’t solve

Leopold 1-22 [David, General Counsel and Past President, American Immigration Lawyers Association, "Obama takes action on guns and immigration: Now its Congress' turn" Huffington Post [www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/congress-guns-immigration\_b\_2501651.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/congress-guns-immigration_b_2501651.html)]

And the same holds true for immigration. As even the newest polls show, the majority of Americans -- including Republicans, Democrats, and Independents -- want the immigration system fixed; they want a safe border and an immigration policy that serves the needs of American families and businesses, and includes a pathway to earned citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants living in the shadows. Yes, the system is broken, but the president is well within his rights to use his executive authority to make sure the law is administered as intelligently and humanely as possible until Congress acts to fix it.¶ But, as Mr. Obama reminded the nation last Wednesday, when it comes to changing the law he cannot do it alone. Real change can come only when the American people demand it, whether it is to ban semi-automatic assault weapons and high capacity clips or enact an overhaul of the immigration "system" we currently deal with, made up of a mismatched patchwork of policies and procedures.

#### **Immigration’s top of the docket**

Papich 2/6 Michael is a writer for The Pendulum. “**Immigration reform returns to** legislative forefront,” 2013, http://www.elonpendulum.com/2013/02/immigration-reform-returns-to-legislative-forefront/

Four years ago, it was the stimulus package and the health care bill. Now, it’s immigration reform. Recent proposals from the Senate and the president may make immigration reform the first big legislative push of Barack Obama’s next four years.¶ A bipartisan committee of eight senators put out a framework for an immigration reform bill Jan. 28. Among other things, the proposal includes a system to provide undocumented immigrants currently in the United States a way to obtain “probationary legal status” after completing a background check and paying various fines and taxes. To receive a green card, these individuals would complete mandatory English and civics courses, show a history of employment and undergo further background checks.

#### Immigration before anything else---insiders citing possible state of the union

Miller 1/27 Zeke, "Reaching For History, Obama Could Make Same Mistakes As George W. Bush", 2013, www.buzzfeed.com/zekejmiller/reaching-for-history-obama-poised-to-make-same-mi

While Obama's relationship with the last Congress was defined by dealing with manufactured crises — government shutdown threats, fiscal cliffs — he is now suddenly trying to shape a broader legacy by taking on marquee issues like climate change, gun control, and immigration reform. Each goal would be ambitious in its own right, but tackled together, they could produce a legislative nightmare.¶ "It's a lot of stuff," conceded White House Press Secretary Jay Carney on Friday, adding, "but it's important."¶ Indeed, outside forces have conspired in recent months to place three of the most polarizing political issues front and center for the president. Since Hurricane Sandy pummeled the East Coast, Obama has made repeated rhetorical nods — including prominent placement in his second inaugural address — toward addressing climate change; he's making a push to act on gun control while the nation's memories of the Sandy Hook shooting are still fresh; and with many Republicans suddenly eager to find a solution to the immigration issue, Obama will deliver a speech in Las Vegas Tuesday with the intention of jump-starting reform efforts.¶ To date, the White House has pushed ahead on all three fronts simultaneously, something likely to change by the State of the Union on Feb. 12. Democrats familiar with the administration's thinking believe immigration will move to the forefront, with the others dependent on a successful outcome.¶ "Obama needs to get something passed without poisoning the well, and immigration is where he has to start before anything else will get done," said one Democratic operative close to the White House.

#### Winners lose specifically for Obama’s second term

Walsh 12 Ken covers the White House and politics for U.S. News. “Setting Clear Priorities Will Be Key for Obama,” 12/20, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/12/20/setting-clear-priorities-will-be-key-for-obama

And there is an axiom in Washington: Congress, the bureaucracy, the media, and other power centers can do justice to only one or two issues at a time. Phil Schiliro, Obama's former liaison to Congress, said Obama has "always had a personal commitment" to gun control, for example.¶ But Schiliro told the New York Times, "Given the crisis he faced when he first took office, there's only so much capacity in the system to move his agenda." So Obama might be wise to limit his goals now and avoid overburdening the system, or he could face major setbacks that would limit his power and credibility for the remainder of his presidency.

#### Dickinson concludes neg

Dickinson 9 (Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College. He taught previously at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D., working under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, We All Want a Revolution: Neustadt, New Institutionalism, and the Future of Presidency Research, Presidential Studies Quarterly 39 no4 736-70 D 2009)

Small wonder, then, that initial efforts to find evidence of presidential power centered on explaining legislative outcomes in Congress. Because scholars found it difficult to directly and systematically measure presidential influence or "skill," however, they often tried to estimate it indirectly, after first establishing a baseline model that explained these outcomes on other factors, including party strength in Congress, members of Congress's ideology, the president's electoral support and/or popular approval, and various control variables related to time in office and political and economic context. With the baseline established, one could then presumably see how much of the unexplained variance might be attributed to presidents, and whether individual presidents did better or worse than the model predicted. Despite differences in modeling assumptions and measurements, however, these studies came to remarkably similar conclusions: individual presidents did not seem to matter very much in explaining legislators' voting behavior or lawmaking outcomes (but see Lockerbie and Borrelli 1989, 97-106). As Richard Fleisher, Jon Bond, and B. Dan Wood summarized, "[S]tudies that compare presidential success to some baseline fail to find evidence that perceptions of skill have systematic effects" (2008, 197; see also Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996, 127; Edwards 1989, 212). To some scholars, these results indicate that Neustadt's "president-centered" perspective is incorrect (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 221-23). In fact, the aggregate results reinforce Neustadt's recurring refrain that presidents are weak and that, when dealing with Congress, a president's power is "comparably limited" (Neustadt 1990, 184). The misinterpretation of the findings as they relate to PP stems in part from scholars' difficulty in defining and operationalizing presidential influence (Cameron 2000b; Dietz 2002, 105-6; Edwards 2000, 12; Shull and Shaw 1999). But it is also that case that scholars often misconstrue Neustadt's analytic perspective; his description of what presidents must do to influence policy making does not mean that he believes presidents are the dominant influence on that process. Neustadt writes from the president's perspective, but without adopting a president-centered explanation of power. Nonetheless, if Neustadt clearly recognizes that a president's influence in Congress is exercised mostly, as George Edwards (1989) puts it, "at the margins," his case studies in PP also suggest that, within this limited bound, presidents do strive to influence legislative outcomes. But how? Scholars often argue that a president's most direct means of influence is to directly lobby certain members of Congress, often through quid pro quo exchanges, at critical junctures during the lawmaking sequence. Spatial models of legislative voting suggest that these lobbying efforts are most effective when presidents target the median, veto, and filibuster "pivots" within Congress. This logic finds empirical support in vote-switching studies that indicate that presidents do direct lobbying efforts at these pivotal voters, and with positive legislative results. Keith Krehbiel analyzes successive votes by legislators in the context of a presidential veto an d finds "modest support for the sometimes doubted stylized fact of presidential power as persuasion" (1998,153-54). Similarly, David Brady and Craig Volden look at vote switching by members of Congress in successive Congresses on nearly identical legislation and also conclude that presidents *do influence* the votes of at least some legislators (1998, 125-36). In his study of presidential lobbying on key votes on important domestic legislation during the 83rd (1953-54) through 108th (2003-04) Congresses, MatthewBeckman shows that in addition to these pivotal voters, presidents also lobby leaders in both congressional parties in order to control what legislative alternatives make it onto the congressional agenda (more on this later). These lobbying efforts are correlated with a greater likelihood that a president's legislative preferences will come to a vote (Beckmann 2008, n.d.). In one of the most concerted efforts to model how bargaining takes place at the individual level, Terry Sullivan examines presidential archives containing administrative headcounts to identify instances in which members of Congress switched positions during legislative debate, from initially opposing the president to supporting him in the final roll call (Sullivan 1988,1990,1991). Sullivan shows that in a bargaining game with incomplete information regarding the preferences of the president and members of Congress, there are a number of possible bargaining outcomes for a given distribution of legislative and presidential policy preferences. These outcomes depend in part on legislators' success in bartering their potential support for the president's policy for additional concessions from the president. In threatening to withhold support, however, members of Congress run the risk that the president will call their bluff and turn elsewhere for the necessary votes. By capitalizing on members' uncertainty regarding whether their support is necessary to form a winning coalition, Sullivan theorizes that presidents can reduce members of Congress's penchant for strategic bluffing and increase the likelihood of a legislative outcome closer to the president's preference. "Hence, the skill to bargain successfully becomes a foundation for presidential power even within the context of electorally determined opportunities," Sullivan concludes (1991, 1188). Most of these studies infer presidential influence, rather than measuring it directly (Bond, Fleisher, and Krutz 1996,128-29; see also Edwards 1991). Interestingly, however, although the vote "buying" approach is certainly consistent with Neustadt's bargaining model, none of his case studies in PP show presidents employing this tactic. The reason may be that Neustadt concentrates his analysis on the strategic level: "Strategically the question is not how he masters Congress in a peculiar instance, but what he does to boost his mastery in any instance" (Neustadt 1990, 4). For Neustadt, whether a president's lobbying efforts bear fruit in any particular circumstance depends in large part on the broader pattern created by a president's prior actions when dealing with members of Congress (and "Washingtonians" more generally). These previous interactions determine a president's professional reputation--the "residual impressions of [a president's] tenacity and skill" that accumulate in Washingtonians' minds, helping to "heighten or diminish" a president's bargaining advantages. "Reputation, of itself, does not persuade, but it can make persuasions easier, or harder, or impossible" (Neustadt 1990, 54).

#### CIR’s key to Latin American relations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The **inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the U**nited **S**tates **and** nearly **every other country in the Americas**. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Relations are key to solve a laundry list of existential threats---the brink is now

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such **global matters as climate change**, nuclear **non-proliferation,** and **democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.
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#### Obama will prioritize immigration over sequester

Wernick 1/25 Allan is a writer for the New York Daily News. “A look at where key Congressional players stand on immigration indicates reform could come soon,” 2013, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/citizenship-now/immigration-chances-good-sweeping-immigration-reform-article-1.1245988

As expected, President Obama confirmed his support for immigration reform in his inaugural address. It was one of the few specific issues mentioned by the President in setting the program for his coming four years in office. In the last few weeks, some pundits have argued that the debate over debt and budget issues or gun control will sidetrack the President from his commitment to immigrants. That analysis ignores the expectations of Latino voters and their allies. **Obama and both parties have no choice but to make immigration reform a priority in the coming year**. The doubters are wrong. I am more optimistic than ever that we will see reform this year. To understand why, lets take a look at what some key players on the immigration reform debate have been saying and doing this year:

#### Sequestration will happen---but not for months so no thumper

Hicks 1/24 Josh is a writer @ The Washington Post. “Party leaders predict temporary sequestration cuts are likely,” 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/federal-eye/wp/2013/01/24/party-leaders-predict-temporary-sequestration-cuts-are-likely-2/

Leaders from both political parties predicted Wednesday that sequestration would take place at least temporarily while lawmakers try to come up with a **longer-term** plan for reining in the national debt, according to an article by Lori Montgomery and Rosalind S. Helderman in Thursday’s Washington Post.¶ Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) reportedly said, “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.” He added that the White House is considering options for blunting the impacts on government services and the federal workforce, according to Thursday’s article.¶ So what does that mean for federal agencies?¶ A Jan. 10 report from the Congressional Research Service said sequestration would entail “largely across-the-board spending reductions.” The operative word there is “largely,” meaning some programs — but not the federal workforce — would be shielded.¶ A host of so-called “mandatory” programs would be exempt from cuts, including Social Security, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Additional Child Tax Credit, and low-income programs such as Medicaid, the Children’s Health Insurance Program and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance, according to the report.¶ Federal agencies would see across-the-board budget cuts of between 8 percent and 10 percent.¶ The government would have until Sept. 30 to make the required reductions, giving lawmakers time to forge a deal for less-painful cuts. In the meantime, agencies would absorb the impacts slowly, which is what Durbin was referring to when he said “I think we are committed to some form of sequestration spending cut.”¶ The idea is that lawmakers might be willing to let sequestration run its course for awhile to reduce spending **without having to choose where the trimming occurs.**

#### Fiscal debates won’t derail CIR

Foley and Stein 1/2 Elise and Sam are writers for the Huffington Post. “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html

WASHINGTON -- Despite a bruising fiscal cliff battle that managed to set the stage for an even more heated showdown that will likely take place in a matter of months, President Barack Obama is planning to move full steam ahead with the rest of his domestic policy agenda.¶ 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.¶ The timeframe is likely to be cheered by Democrats and immigration reform advocates alike, who have privately expressed fears that Obama's second term will be drowned out in seemingly unending showdowns between parties. The just-completed fiscal cliff deal is giving way to a two-month deadline to resolve delayed sequestration cuts, an expiring continuing resolution to fund the government and a debt ceiling that will soon be hit.¶ With those bitter battles ahead, the possibility of passing other complicated legislation would seem diminished.¶ "The negative effect of this fiscal cliff fiasco is that every time we become engaged in one of these fights, there's no oxygen for anything else," said a Senate Democratic aide, who asked for anonymity to speak candidly. "It's not like you can be multi-tasking -- with something like this, Congress just comes to a complete standstill."¶ It remains unclear what type of immigration policies the White House plans to push in January, but turning them into law could be a long process. Aides expect it will take about two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House. While many Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the push.¶ Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.¶ Advocates have vowed to keep pushing for reform. As part of their efforts, they plan to remind Republican members of Congress about their presidential nominee's defeat among Latino and Asian voters, a majority of whom support a fix to the immigration system.¶ "They can procrastinate as long as they want, but they're going to have a serious day of reckoning next election cycle," said Angela Kelley, vice president for immigration policy and advocacy at the Center for American Progress. "We're going to have a lot of near-death experiences with this issue, but I'm pretty confident it's never going to go completely to a flatline."¶ Good news for immigration advocates may have come Tuesday night, when Boehner broke the so-called "Hastert Rule" and allowed the fiscal cliff bill to come for a vote without support from a majority of his Republican conference. Given opposition to immigration reform by many Tea Party Republicans, the proof that Boehner is willing to bypass them on major legislation is a good sign, the Democratic aide said.¶ "If something is of such importance that the GOP establishment [is] telling Boehner, 'You must do this. You need to get this off the table soon,'" the Democratic aide said, the speaker could break the Hastert Rule again.¶ "He already did it with this fiscal issue, so I would not be surprised if when it came down to it he puts up a bill that he just allows to go through with a combination of Democratic and Republican votes, without worrying about a majority of the majority," the aide continued.¶ Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-immigration reform group America's Voice, also said he thinks the House could pass an immigration bill in the same way it did last night, relying on support from both parties. He's hopeful that the fiscal cliff fight could even make them happy to work out legislation in a more standard way.¶ "I never thought I'd say this, but after bruising battles over the future of the American and world economy, the chance to legislate through regular order on immigration reform might have leaders in both parties working together and singing 'Kumbaya,'" Sharry said.

#### No same sex push by Obama

Hunter 2/7 Kathleen, 2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-07/white-house-to-wait-on-same-sex-immigration-biden-says.html

Vice President Joe Biden said the White House will “wait and see” what the Senate comes up with before determining whether to insist that equal treatment for same-sex couples be included in a rewrite of immigration laws.¶ “We’re going to wait and see what the Senate bill and the bipartisan group presents, and we’ll make our judgments,” Biden said in an interview today as he was leaving the Capitol in Washington. “We made it clear what we think should be done, and we’ll see.”

#### The tide is turning---all parts of bill will be passed

Weakland 2/7 Bryan is a writer for MSNBC. “Phoenix Mayor: Tide is turning on immigration reform,” 2013, http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/02/07/phoenix-mayor-tide-is-turning-on-immigration-reform/

A mayor on the front lines of immigration reform says **the tide is turning on finally getting legislation passed.**¶“We’re at a unique time in our nation’s history where good public policy, passage of the DREAM Act, and comprehensive immigration reform and good politics seem to be coming together at the right time,” Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton said on Jansing & Co. Thursday.¶ Mayor Stanton says immigration reform must include a path to citizenship, but “not an easy path. You’ve got to go to the back of the line and of course pay a fine…We know that border security has to be an element of it as well. And the DREAM Act has to be a part of it,” Stanton said.¶ A new Quinnipiac University poll shows a majority of Americans say illegal immigrants should be allowed to stay in the United States and apply for citizenship, another 30% say illegal immigrants should be required to leave the country.¶ “I’m optimistic that the right thing is going to occur. And certainly if it does occur, it’s going to help us here in Arizona, in my city of Phoenix, a great deal,” Mayor Stanton told MSNBC’s Chris Jansing.¶ At the same time, President Obama’s political PAC, Organizing for Action, has sent out a new email asking undocumented workers to share their personal stories with the public. It’s the latest strategic move in its campaign to build public support for immigration reform.

# States CP
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#### The fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase funding for Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory fusion energy generation.

#### The United States federal government should allow the states to fund Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory fusion energy generation.

#### States can empirically fund energy research at national labs

Kay Corditz, 3-15-2010, “State Grant to Fund Advanced Battery Materials Partnership,” Brookhaven National Lab, http://www.bnl.gov/newsroom/news.php?a=21663

Funded by a $550,000 grant from the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), Brookhaven National Laboratory will partner with battery materials researchers from leading New York State universities to explore new chemistries and synthesize new materials for long-lasting batteries. The Laboratory will partner with SUNY’s University at Buffalo and Binghamton University on three projects to develop improved batteries for use in stationary grid-scale energy storage applications, including lithium-air, lithium-ion, and lithium-titanate batteries. The Brookhaven effort, led by Brookhaven materials scientist Jason Graetz, will focus on the development and synthesis of new materials, and application of advanced experimental techniques to characterize these materials using Brookhaven’s National Synchrotron Light Source (NSLS). The SUNY-Buffalo lead is Esther S. Takeuchi, and the Binghamton University lead is M. Stanley Whittingham. “This partnership among Brookhaven and two leading SUNY schools will capitalize on the research strengths of each, and our materials characterization capabilities will be a key element of the project,” said James Misewich, Brookhaven’s Associate Laboratory Director for Basic Energy Sciences. The collaboration grew out of a workshop sponsored by Brookhaven and Stony Brook University’s Joint Photon Sciences Institute (JPSI) last spring. Chi-Chang Kao, NSLS Chair and Founding Director of JPSI, coordinated the collaboration’s successful proposal. “It is an excellent example of how universities, industries, and national laboratories can work together to address an important scientific challenge with major societal impact,” said Kao. Said Graetz: “NYSERDA’s funding of this program will give us the opportunity to expand our energy storage research to large-scale stationary energy storage systems, which are crucial for integrating intermittent renewable generation sources such as wind and solar. In the past, the vast majority of battery research investment has focused on the important problem of electrical energy storage for transportation. However, a different set of criteria exist for stationary systems, and this project will allow us to explore new electrode materials, like lithium titanate, that meet those criteria.”

# Fusion Adv
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#### ITER will succeed now – most likely chance for successful fusion

Andrew C. Revkin, 11-19-2012, “In Defense of Sustained Research on Fusion,” NYT, http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/19/in-defense-of-sustained-research-on-fusion/

The next major experimental step in magnetic fusion is ITER – the international experiment that will generate 500 megawatts of fusion power, at a physical scale of a power plant. Under construction in France, ITER will begin operation within ten years. It involves participation of the entire developed world, with the ITER partners representing the governments of half the world’s population. The scientific basis for ITER was separately scrutinized and approved by scientific panels in each of these nations. ITER is large, complex, and full of challenges. But, the likelihood of scientific success is high. Most nations involved in ITER have robust fusion research programs that are essential to tackle other key scientific and technical issues. With these accompanying programs, we would be ready to operate a demonstration fusion power plant following ITER about 25 years from today. The charge by some that both inertial and magnetic fusion have been beset with failure is unwarranted. These include remarks in a commentary by Dr. Burton Richter in the Oct. 18 Dot Earth blog: “Both approaches have gone from failure to ever larger failure, but each time a great deal has been learned…” In fairness, the comment is preceded by brief, informative technical capsules. As a fusion-knowledgeable scientist who does not work in fusion energy research, Dr. Richter includes some supportive comments for the fusion program, tempered by discerning skepticism. But, for fusion scientists, Dr. Richter’s comments on failure are difficult to understand. We are unaware of any major project failures in magnetic fusion research. Quite the opposite: One of the key reasons that ITER was funded across the world is that a series of ever larger experiments have been so successful as to provide confidence that the yet larger ITER will be similarly successful. Other commentary has appeared, offering incorrect information. In a separate Dot Earth commentary concerning magnetic fusion on Oct. 19, Dr. Robert Hirsch, an administrator of the fusion energy program at the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in the 1970s, offers views reflecting the state of the field at the time of his departure from the AEC some 35 years ago. His view is framed by stating that fusion must be made practical, which means economically and technologically attractive. This is certainly correct and indeed, the criteria for such practicality have provided significant guidance to fusion research for decades. Dr. Hirsch cites a series of challenges that he thinks are roadblocks, but are not. He worries that the energy stored by superconducting magnets poses a serious threat and regulatory burden. This is not so. ITER has proven otherwise. France’s strict nuclear regulatory authorities have concluded the magnets pose no radiological safety concerns for the public. Dr. Hirsch states that the radioactive materials of a fusion reactor will be a major problem. This also is not so. The amount and toxicity is orders of magnitude less than for fission. Dr. Hirsch would be interested to learn that the rigorous French licensing regime is very successfully nearing completion. Licensing, although requiring significant efforts, will not be a barrier to fusion. Some, like Dr Hirsch, have suggested that fusion machines are so large and complex that they will never be cost competitive. No one knows the ultimate costs, but our best engineering analyses indicate that, with some luck, fusion can indeed be cost- competitive. As an alternative to the mainline approaches to fusion energy, Dr. Hirsch puts forth his research idea from the 1970s of inertial electrostatic confinement (IEC). I agree that the fusion program very much needs to pursue multiple approaches, even within magnetic fusion. But extensive peer review has found IEC far more difficult to achieve than the ITER and related approaches in magnetic fusion.

#### Sandia’s MagLif laser solves fusion and commercialization

Daniel Clery, Science Now, 9-19-2012, “Fusion Energy: One Step Closer to Breaking Even,” Wired, http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2012/09/fusion-energy-breaking-even/

In the high-stakes race to realize fusion energy, a smaller lab may be putting the squeeze on the big boys. Worldwide efforts to harness fusion—the power source of the sun and stars—for energy on Earth currently focus on two multibillion dollar facilities: the ITER fusion reactor in France and the National Ignition Facility (NIF) in California. But other, cheaper approaches exist—and one of them may have a chance to be the first to reach “break-even,” a key milestone in which a process produces more energy than needed to trigger the fusion reaction. Researchers at the Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico, will announce in a Physical Review Letters (PRL) paper accepted for publication that their process, known as magnetized liner inertial fusion (MagLIF) and first proposed 2 years ago, has passed the first of three tests, putting it on track for an attempt at the coveted break-even. Tests of the remaining components of the process will continue next year, and the team expects to take its first shot at fusion before the end of 2013. Fusion reactors heat and squeeze a plasma—an ionized gas—composed of the hydrogen isotopes deuterium and tritium, compressing the isotopes until their nuclei overcome their mutual repulsion and fuse together. Out of this pressure-cooker emerge helium nuclei, neutrons, and a lot of energy. The temperature required for fusion is more than 100 million°C—so you have to put a lot of energy in before you start to get anything out. ITER and NIF are planning to attack this problem in different ways. ITER, which will be finished in 2019 or 2020, will attempt fusion by containing a plasma with enormous magnetic fields and heating it with particle beams and radio waves. NIF, in contrast, takes a tiny capsule filled with hydrogen fuel and crushes it with a powerful laser pulse. NIF has been operating for a few years but has yet to achieve break-even. Sandia’s MagLIF technique is similar to NIF’s in that it rapidly crushes its fuel—a process known as inertial confinement fusion. But to do it, MagLIF uses a magnetic pulse rather than lasers. The target in MagLIF is a tiny cylinder about 7 millimeters in diameter; it’s made of beryllium and filled with deuterium and tritium. The cylinder, known as a liner, is connected to Sandia’s vast electrical pulse generator (called the Z machine), which can deliver 26 million amps in a pulse lasting milliseconds or less. That much current passing down the walls of the cylinder creates a magnetic field that exerts an inward force on the liner’s walls, instantly crushing it—and compressing and heating the fusion fuel. Researchers have known about this technique of crushing a liner to heat the fusion fuel for some time. But the MagLIF-Z machine setup on its own didn’t produce quite enough heat; something extra was needed to make the process capable of reaching break-even. Sandia researcher Steve Slutz led a team that investigated various enhancements through computer simulations of the process. In a paper published in Physics of Plasmas in 2010, the team predicted that break-even could be reached with three enhancements. First, they needed to apply the current pulse much more quickly, in just 100 nanoseconds, to increase the implosion velocity. They would also preheat the hydrogen fuel inside the liner with a laser pulse just before the Z machine kicks in. And finally, they would position two electrical coils around the liner, one at each end. These coils produce a magnetic field that links the two coils, wrapping the liner in a magnetic blanket. The magnetic blanket prevents charged particles, such as electrons and helium nuclei, from escaping and cooling the plasma—so the temperature stays hot. Sandia plasma physicist Ryan McBride is leading the effort to see if the simulations are correct. The first item on the list is testing the rapid compression of the liner. One critical parameter is the thickness of the liner wall: The thinner the wall, the faster it will be accelerated by the magnetic pulse. But the wall material also starts to evaporate away during the pulse, and if it breaks up too early, it will spoil the compression. On the other hand, if the wall is too thick, it won’t reach a high enough velocity. “There’s a sweet spot in the middle where it stays intact and you still get a pretty good implosion velocity,” McBride says. To test the predicted sweet spot, McBride and his team set up an elaborate imaging system that involved blasting a sample of manganese with a high-powered laser (actually a NIF prototype moved to Sandia) to produce x-rays. By shining the x-rays through the liner at various stages in its implosion, the researchers could image what was going on. They found that at the sweet-spot thickness, the liner held its shape right through the implosion. “It performed as predicted,” McBride says. The team aims to test the other two enhancements—the laser preheating and the magnetic blanket—in the coming year, and then put it all together to take a shot at break-even before the end of 2013. Earlier this year, Slutz and his team published other simulations in PRL that showed that if a more powerful pulse generator was built to produce higher currents—say, 60 million amps—the system could achieve not just break-even, but high gain. In other words, the MagLIF could produce the kind of energy needed for a commercial fusion power plant. “I am excited about Sandia discovering that magnetized target fusion … is a pathway to significant gain on the Z machine. We agree, and hope that their experiments get a chance to try it out,” says Glen Wurden, the magnetized plasma team leader at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.

#### Status quo NIF approach will solve ignition and weapons research

Geoff Brumfiel, 11-7-12, “Laser lab shifts focus to warheads,” Nature, http://www.nature.com/news/laser-lab-shifts-focus-to-warheads-1.11745

After an unsuccessful campaign to demonstrate the principles of a futuristic fusion power plant, the world’s most powerful laser facility is set to change course and emphasize its nuclear weapons research. For the past six years, scientists and engineers at the US National Ignition Facility (NIF) have been working flat out to focus 192 laser beams on a gold-lined ‘hohlraum’ capsule, just a few milli­metres long, containing a pellet of hydrogen isotopes. As 500 terawatts of laser power hits the capsule, it generates X-rays that blast into the pellet, causing the atoms of deuterium and tritium inside to fuse. The fusion converts a tiny amount of their mass into a burst of energy (see ‘The NIF’s fusion strategy’). The goal of the National Ignition Campaign (NIC) is reflected in its name: ‘ignition’, in which the fusion reaction generates as much energy as the lasers supply. Success, NIF officials say, could pave the way to developing a power plant that would implode nearly 1,000 pellets a minute (see Nature 483, 133–134; 2012). But unexpected technical problems left the NIF well short of its goal when the campaign finally ended in September. Now federal officials and the US Congress are preparing to set a new direction for the US$3.5-billion facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. A series of reports commissioned by the government, Congress and the University of California, which administers the lab, are all due later this month. They are expected to outline plans to cut its time for ignition research from 80% to 50% and to give the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which is responsible for maintaining the US nuclear arsenal, a more central role in determining the NIF’s priorities. The NNSA is planning to emphasize experiments that mimic conditions inside nuclear weapons, generating data to validate the computer codes used to check that the nation’s warheads remain viable — essential work, given the voluntary moratorium on underground testing that began in 1992. Nobody has given up on ignition, declares Donald Cook, deputy administrator for defence programmes at the NNSA. But a new programme for generating net energy will take a slower, more methodical approach. “We’re now going to get right into the science of what issues are preventing ignition and work through them,” he says. “But we believe that’s going to take a fair amount of work.” Significant progress has already been made towards ignition, according to physicist Robert Byer at Stanford University in California, who is leading the University of California’s review of the NIF. “The laser itself has been quite remarkable,” he says. One shot can deliver 1.85 megajoules of energy, roughly what the lab originally promised. The instruments used to study the pellet are also performing well, he says. Yet on the basis of data obtained from the imploding pellets, researchers think that they are still far from reaching the conditions necessary for ignition. One problem seems to be that too much of the laser light is scattering back out of the capsule. Another is that the pellet is being squeezed asymmetrically, which lowers the pressure at its centre. The asymmetry also causes the isotopes to mix unevenly, lowering the temperature in the pellet. “Nature pushes back: that’s my shorthand version of what’s going on,” Byer says. Nature isn’t the only one pushing back — the NIF’s funders in Congress also want answers. “We’re disappointed,” says one congressional staff member, who spoke to Nature only on condition on anonymity. Critics say that the lab’s enthusiastic promotion of the idea that laser fusion could generate electrical power led many in Congress to believe that they were funding an energy project, when in fact laser fusion is decades from producing electricity. “The lab overemphasized and oversold the energy aspect of the NIF, at the expense of the very important and successful work it was doing in stockpile stewardship and basic science,” says a senior scientist familiar with the NIF programme. The NIF’s current director Ed Moses bridles at accusations that ignition was over­emphasized. “I don’t think it was oversold or undersold. It just was.” Moses insists that “remarkable progress” has been made in the past 16 months, since the NIF began working with hydrogen-pellet targets. “The goal was to do the initial exploration of the ignition conditions and see where we were, which is what we’ve done.” But there is likely to be less time for ignition experiments in the coming year, says Cook. Livermore will still control the programme’s day-to-day operation, but the NNSA’s headquarters in Washington DC will set priorities as the facility expands its stockpile stewardship work. Already, the NIF has been able to address crucial questions about how energy passes from the fission stage of a nuclear weapon to its much more powerful fusion stage. Future research will assess the ‘boost phase’ of the weapon — during which a small quantity of deuterium and tritium at the centre of the first stage is used to boost the initial fission phase of the explosion.

#### No further spinoffs --- they would’ve been discovered

Manheimer 98 WALLACE M. MANHEIMER Back to the Future: The Historical, Scientific, Naval, and Environmental Case for Fission Fusion Code 6707 Plasma Physics Division April 2, 1998 Naval Research Laboratory, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA347302>

Finally, there is now an effort to find an intermediate milestone for fusion research, so as to give our sponsors something useful in a more reasonable time. There has recently been at least one study of spinoffs [6],(using some particular algorithm to evaluate each), ranging from pollution abatement to remote sensing to medical applications to lithography. In a sense, this paper, advocating fission fusion is a search for a spin off. It would certainly be wonderful if these other spinoffs did exist, but it is unlikely that they do. The problem is that **fusion has been a well funded, well publicized program for decades now**. **If it had another application, we probably would have known about it long ago.** Furthermore, if after decades of promising an inexhaustible energy supply, we suddenly started selling say the 'medical tokamak', we would be accused of bait and switch big time. No, for better or worse, magnetic **fusion is almost certainly tied to energy supply.**

#### Spinoffs don’t justify fusion funding—not an opp cost

Smith 8 C.H. Llewellyn Smith- former Director-General of CERN 2008, “ The use of basic science: Benefits of basic science” http://public.web.cern.ch/public/en/about/BasicScience3-en.html#b3

People sometimes seem to think that presenting this long list of spin-offs from particle physics is enough to justify expenditure on our subject. However, making such a justification is not easy. First it would be necessary to quantify the economic benefits. Second, **one would need to analyse what would have been the result of spending the money** that has been put into particle physics **in other ways**, i.e. work out the so-called opportunity cost. It is not surprising that the **large expenditure** at CERN **produces spin-offs**: on the contrary, it would be very surprising if it did not, and **expenditure of similar sums on other high-tech activities would also produce spin-offs.**

#### Spin-offs can’t be proven and would occur anyway

Spudis 9 Dr. Paul D. Spudis - American geologist and lunar scientist. — January 28, 2009 <http://blogs.airspacemag.com/moon/2009/01/what-apollo-was-and-wasnt/>

I don’t disagree that Apollo produced a lot of technical innovation, much of which has produced enormous wealth. **The problem with the spin-off argument is that you can never prove that a given development wouldn’t have happened anyway in the absence** of the Apollo program. Thus, the spin-off line of reasoning has no power as a convincing **argument in favor of large, government** space **programs**. I could easily argue that much of the spin-off benefits claimed for Apollo were actually produced by military R&D during the Cold War (e.g., integrated circuit chips). Of course, such a distinction is meaningless as both were part of the same effort, but that fact lessens its value as an argument for space.

#### Spinoffs fail

NRC 92 National Research Council, “Japans Growing Technological Capability” September 28, 1992, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA257842

Closely related to this mode of thought is the widespread belief in the

United States in the efficacy of what is referred to as "scientific spin-off." **This particular idea is most often invoked in connection with very large government research programs**. It is epitomized in a newspaper headline that appeared a few years ago that read, "Europeans eager to share in the rich bonanza of technology that will flow from the SDI program." Again there is the belief that there exists a simple seamless link between research (even research on distant and completely unrelated topics) and a direct technological benefit. This same spin-off argument is also behind a variety of recent government initiatives that seek to make research results from federal and national laboratories more easily accessible to U.S. industry **The clear implication is that the only thing that stands in the way of the "technological bonanza" is that industry is simply unaware of the scientific results.** Again the technology transfer idea.

Many variants of the preceding scenarios exist, but enough has been said to indicate the nature of what is perceived to be the problem, namely, the coupling of fundamental research into useful technological products of broad benefit to society. However, it is argued here that this view is false. This follows not only from the history of such things as the Engineering Research Centers but also from the no more than marginal results of the heroic efforts of the national and federal labs to "transfer" their technology to the marketplace. Certainly **there have been some individual successes**, **but it certainly cannot be argued that this approach is the key to anything very significant in view of the unabated U.S. economic slide. In any case, it is not at all clear that this approach is correct in view of such things as the actual history of major technologies as outlined above.**

**No Pakistani collapse**

**AP 10** (Pakistan's stability, leadership under spotlight after floods and double dealing accusations, 6 August 2010, http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/08/06/pakistans-stability-leadership-spotlight-floods-double-dealing-accusations/)

Not for the first time, Pakistan appears to be teetering on the edge with a government unable to cope. Floods are ravaging a country at war with al-Qaida and the Taliban. Riots, slayings and arson are gripping the largest city. Suggestions are flying that the intelligence agency is aiding Afghan insurgents. The crises raise questions about a nation crucial to U.S. hopes of success in Afghanistan and to the global campaign against Islamist militancy. Despite the recent headlines, few here see Pakistan in danger of collapse or being overrun by militants — a fear that had been expressed before the army fought back against insurgents advancing from their base in the Swat Valley early last year. From its birth in 1947, Pakistan has been dogged by military coups, corrupt and inefficient leaders, natural disasters, assassinations and civil unrest. Through it all, Pakistan has not prospered — but it survives. “There is plenty to be worried about, but also indications that when push comes to shove the state is able to respond," said Mosharraf Zaidi, an analyst and writer who has advised foreign governments on aid missions to Pakistan. "The military has many weaknesses, but it has done a reasonable job in relief efforts. There have been gaps in the response. But this is a developing a country, right?" The recent flooding came at a sensitive time for Pakistan, with Western doubts over its loyalty heightened by the leaking of U.S. military documents that strengthened suspicions the security establishment was supporting Afghan insurgents while receiving billions in Western aid. With few easy choices, the United States has made it clear it intends to stick with Pakistan. Indeed, it has used the floods to demonstrate its commitment to the country, rushing emergency assistance and dispatching helicopters to ferry the goods. The Pakistani government's response to the floods has been sharply criticized at home, especially since President Asif Ali Zardari departed for a European tour. With so many Pakistanis suffering, the trip has left the already weak and unpopular leader even more vulnerable politically. The flooding was triggered by what meteorologists said were "once-in-a-century" rains. The worst affected area is the northwest, a stronghold for Islamist militants. Parts of the northwest have seen army offensives over the last two years. Unless the people are helped quickly and the region is rebuilt, anger at the government could translate into support for the militants. At least one charity with suspected links to a militant outfit has established relief camps there. The extremism threat was highlighted by a suicide bombing in the main northwestern town of Peshawar on Wednesday. The bomber killed the head of the Frontier Constabulary, a paramilitary force in the northwest at the forefront of the terror fight. With authorities concentrating on flood relief, some officials have expressed concern that militants could regroup. The city of Karachi has seen militant violence and is rumored to be a hiding place for top Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. It has also been plagued by regular bouts of political and ethnic bloodletting since the 1980s, though it has been calmer in recent years. The latest violence erupted after the assassination of a leading member of the city's ruling party. More than 70 people have been killed in revenge attacks since then, paralyzing parts of the city of 16 million people. While serious, the unrest does not yet pose an immediate threat to the stability of the country. Although the U.S. is unpopular, there is little public support for the hardline Islamist rule espoused by the Taliban and their allies. Their small movement has been unable to control any Pakistani territory beyond the northwest, home to only about 20 million of the country's 175 million people.

#### No impact

Tepperman 9—Deputy Editor at Newsweek. Frmr Deputy Managing Editor, Foreign Affairs. LLM, i-law, NYU. MA, jurisprudence, Oxford. (Jonathan, Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb, http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome\_files/nukes\_Final.pdf)

Note – Michael Desch = prof, polsci, Notre Dame

As for Pakistan, it has taken numerous precautions to ensure that its own weapons are insulated from the country’s chaos, installing complicated firing mechanisms to prevent a launch by lone radicals, for example, and instituting special training and screening for its nuclear personnel to ensure they’re not infiltrated by extremists. Even if the Pakistani state did collapse entirely—the nightmare scenario— the chance of a Taliban bomb would still be remote. Desch argues that the idea that terrorists “could use these weapons radically underestimates the difficulty of actually operating a modern nuclear arsenal. These things need constant maintenance and they’re very easy to disable. So the idea that these things could be stuffed into a gunnysack and smuggled across the Rio Grande is preposterous.”

#### China rise doesn’t cause conflict

Joseph S. Nye 10/9/12, University Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government, "Fear Factor: The Illusion of American Decline," World Politics Review, www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12396/fear-factor-the-illusion-of-american-decline

Some analysts predict that this will similarly be the story of power in the 21st century: The rise in power of China will create fear in the United States, which will lead to a great conflict, but that is bad history and a poor understanding of power for our century. By 1900, Germany had already passed Britain in industrial strength. In other words, the U.S. has more time than Britain had, and it does not have to be as fearful. If we are too fearful, both sides may overreact. The Chinese, thinking America is in decline, may push too hard, and Americans, fearing the rise of China, may overreact. That is the danger we face in power transition, and the best way to avoid it is by having a very clear-eyed view of all dimensions of power and how it is changing, while remembering that we do not have to be so fearful.

#### US and China can coexist

Kissinger 12 – Chair of Kissinger Associates and a former U.S. Secretary of State and National Security Adviser (Henry A., “The Future of U.S.-Chinese Relations: Conflict Is a Choice, Not a Necessity,” March/April, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 2, Proquest)

Is there, then, a point in the quest for a cooperative U.S.-Chinese relationship and in policies designed to achieve it? To be sure, the rise of powers has historically often led to conflict with established countries. But conditions have changed. It is doubtful that the leaders who went so blithely into a world war in 1914 would have done so had they known what the world would be like at its end. Contemporary leaders can have no such illusions. A major war between developed nuclear countries must bring casualties and upheavals impossible to relate to calculable objectives. Preemption is all but excluded, especially for a pluralistic democracy such as the United States.

#### Fusion is impossible and even the best case is 60 years – obstacles are enormous

Chris Rhodes, Sussex University, Physical Chemistry Professor, 6/10/2012, The Progress made in the Different Fields of Nuclear Fusion, oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/The-Progress-made-in-the-Different-Fields-of-Nuclear-Fusion.html

When I was about 10, I recall hearing that nuclear fusion power would become a reality "in about thirty years". The estimate has increased steadily since then, and now, forty odd years on, we hear that fusion power will come on-stream "in about fifty years". So, what is the real likelihood of fusion-based power stations coming to our aid in averting the imminent energy crisis? Getting two nuclei to fuse is not easy, since both carry a positive charge and hence their natural propensity is to repel one another. Therefore, a lot of energy is required to force them together so that they can fuse. To achieve this, suitable conditions of extremely high temperature, comparable to those found in stars, must be met. A specific temperature must be reached in order for particular nuclei to fuse with one another. This is termed the "critical ignition temperature", and is around 400 million degrees centigrade for two deuterium nuclei to fuse, while a more modest 100 million degrees is sufficient for a deuterium nucleus to fuse with a tritium nucleus. For this reason, it is deuterium-tritium fusion that is most sought after, since it should be most easily achieved and sustained. One disadvantage of tritium is that it is radioactive and decays with a half-life of about 12 years, and consequently, it exists naturally in only negligible amounts. However, tritium may be "bred" from lithium using neutrons produced in an initial deuterium-tritium fusion. Ideally, the process would become self-sustaining, with lithium fuel being burned via conversion to tritium, which then fuses with deuterium, releasing more neutrons. While not unlimited, there are sufficient known resources of lithium to fire a global fusion programme for about a thousand years, mindful that there are many other uses for lithium, ranging for various types of battery to medication for schizophrenics. The supply would be effectively limitless if lithium could be extracted from the oceans. In a working scenario, some of the energy produced by fusion would be required to maintain the high temperature of the fuel such that the fusion process becomes continuous. At the temperature of around 100 - 300 million degrees, the deuterium/lithium/tritium mixture will exist in the form of a plasma, in which the nuclei are naked (having lost their initial atomic electron clouds) and are hence exposed to fuse with one another. The main difficulty which bedevils maintaining a working fusion reactor which might be used to fire a power station is containing the plasma, a process usually referred to as "confinement" and the process overall as “magnetic confinement fusion” (MCF). Essentially, the plasma is confined in a magnetic bottle, since its component charged nuclei and electrons tend to follow the field of magnetic force, which can be so arranged that the lines of force occupy a prescribed region and are thus centralised to a particular volume. However, the plasma is a "complex" system that readily becomes unstable and leaks away. Unlike a star, the plasma is highly rarefied (a low pressure gas), so that the proton-proton cycle that powers the sun could not be thus achieved on earth, as it is only the intensely high density of nuclei in the sun's core that allows the process to occur sustainably, and that the plasma is contained within its own gravitational mass, and isolated within the cold vacuum of space. In June 2005, the EU, France, Japan, South Korea, China and the U.S. agreed to spend $12 billion to build an experimental fusion apparatus (called ITER) by 2014. It is planned that ITER will function as a research instrument for the following 20 years, and the knowledge gained will provide the basis for building a more advanced research machine. After another 30 years, if all goes well, the first commercial fusion powered electricity might come on-stream. The Joint European Torus (JET) I attended a fascinating event recently - a Cafe' Scientifique meeting held in the town of Reading in South East England. I have also performed in this arena, talking about "What Happens When the Oil Runs Out?", which remains a pertinent question. This time it was the turn of Dr Chris Warrick from the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy based near Abingdon in Oxfordshire, which hosts both the MAST (Mega Amp Spherical Tokamak) and the better known JET (Joint European Torus) experiments. In the audience was a veteran engineer/physicist who had worked on the pioneering ZETA4 experiment in the late 1950s, from which neutrons were detected leading to what proved later to be false claims that fusion had occurred, their true source being different versions of the same instability processes that had beset earlier machines. Nonetheless, his comment was salient: "In the late 50s, we were told that fusion power was 20 years away and now, 50-odd years later it is maybe 60 years away." Indeed, JET has yet to produce a positive ratio of output power/input energy, and instability of the plasma is still a problem. Dr Warrick explained that while much of the plasma physics is now sorted-out, minor aberrations in the magnetic field allow some of the plasma to leak out, and if it touches the far colder walls of the confinement chamber, it simply "dies". In JET it is fusion of nuclei of the two hydrogen isotopes, deuterium and tritium that is being undertaken, a process that as noted earlier, requires a "temperature" of 100 million degrees. I say "temperature" because the plasma is a rarefied (very low pressure) gas, and hence the collisions between particles are not sufficiently rapid that the term means the same distribution of energy as occurs under conditions of thermal equilibrium. It is much the same as the temperatures that may be quoted for molecules in the atmospheric region known as the thermosphere which lies some 80 kilometres above the surface of the Earth. Here too, the atmosphere is highly rarefied and thus derived temperatures refer to translational motion of molecules and are more usefully expressed as velocities. However expressed, at 100 million degrees centigrade, the nuclei of tritium and deuterium have sufficient translational velocity (have enough energy) that they can overcome the mutual repulsion arising from their positive charges and come close enough that they are drawn together by attractive nuclear forces and fuse, releasing vast amounts of energy in the process. JET is not a small device, at 18 metres high, but bigger machines will be necessary before the technology is likely to give out more energy than it consumes. Despite the considerable volume of the chamber, it contains perhaps only one hundredth of a gram of gas, hence its very low pressure. There is another matter and that is how long the plasma and hence energy emission can be sustained. Presently it is fractions of a second but a serious "power station" would need to run for some hours. There is also the problem of getting useful energy from the plasma to convert into electricity even if the aforementioned and considerable problems can be overcome and a sustainable, large-scale plasma maintained. The plan is to surround the chamber with a "blanket" of lithium with pipes running through it and some heat-exchanger fluid passing through them. The heated fluid would then pass on its heat to water and drive a steam-turbine, in the time-honoured fashion used for fossil fuel fired and nuclear power plants. Now my understanding is that this would not be lithium metal but some oxide material. The heat would be delivered in the form of very high energy neutrons that would be slowed-down as they encounter lithium nuclei on passing through the blanket. In principle this is a very neat trick, since absorption of a neutron by a lithium nucleus converts it to tritium, which could be fed back into the plasma as a fuel. Unlike deuterium, tritium does not exist is nature, being radioactive with a half-life of about 12 years. However produced, either separately or in the blanket, lithium is the ultimate fuel source, not tritium per se. Deuterium does exist in nature but only to the extent of one part in about two thousand of ordinary hydrogen (protium) and hence the energy costs of its separation are not inconsiderable. The neutron flux produced by the plasma is very high, and to enhance the overall breeding efficiency of lithium to tritium the reactor would be surrounded with a “lithium” blanket about three feet thick. The intense neutron flux will render the material used to construct the reactor highly radioactive, to the extent that it would not be feasible for operators to enter its vicinity for routine maintenance. The radioactive material will need to be disposed of similarly to the requirements for nuclear waste generated by nuclear fission, and hence fusion is not as "clean" as is often claimed. Exposure to radiation of many potential materials necessary to make the reactor, blanket, and other components such as the heat-exchanger pipes would render them brittle, and so compromise their structural integrity. There is also the possibility that the lithium blanket around the reactor might be replaced by uranium, so enabling the option of breeding plutonium for use in nuclear weapons. Providing a fairly intense magnetic field to confine the plasma (maybe Tesla - similar to that in a hospital MRI scanner) needs power (dc not ac as switching the polarity of the field would cause the plasma to collapse) and large power-supply units containing a lot of metals including rare earths which are mined and processed using fossil fuels. The issue of rare earths is troublesome already, and whether enough of them can be recovered to meet existing planned wind and electric car projects is debatable, let alone that additional pressure should be placed upon an already fragile resource to build a first generation of fusion power stations. World supplies of lithium are also already stressed, and hence getting enough of it not only to make blankets for fusion reactors and tritium production but also for the millions-scale fleet of electric vehicles needed to divert our transportation energy demand away from oil is probably a bridge too far, unless we try getting it from seawater, which takes far more energy than mining lithium minerals. The engineering requirements too will be formidable, however, most likely forcing the need to confront problems as yet unknown, and even according to the most favourable predictions of the experts, fusion power is still 60 years away, if it will arrive at all. Given that the energy crisis will hit hard long before then, I suggest we look to more immediate solutions, mainly in terms of energy efficiency, for which there is ample scope. To quote again the ZETA veteran, "I wonder if maybe man is not intended to have nuclear fusion," and all in all, other than from solar energy I wonder if he is right. At any rate, garnering real electrical power from fusion is so far distant as to have no impact on the more immediately pressing fossil fuels crisis, particularly for oil and natural gas. Fusion Power is a long-range "holy grail" and part of the illusion that humankind can continue in perpetuity to use energy on the scale that it presently does. Efficiency and conservation are the only real means to attenuate the impending crisis in energy and resources.

## 1NR

#### No chance that Pakistan will collapse

Bandow 09- Senior Fellow @ Cato, former special assistant to Reagan (11/31/09, Doug, “Recognizing the Limits of American Power in Afghanistan,” Huffington Post, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=10924)

From Pakistan's perspective, limiting the war on almost any terms would be better than prosecuting it for years, even to "victory," whatever that would mean. In fact, the least likely outcome is a takeover by widely unpopular Pakistani militants. The Pakistan military is the nation's strongest institution; while the army might not be able to rule alone, it can prevent any other force from ruling. Indeed, Bennett Ramberg made the important point: "Pakistan, Iran and the former Soviet republics to the north have demonstrated a brutal capacity to suppress political violence to ensure survival. This suggests that even were Afghanistan to become a terrorist haven, the neighborhood can adapt and resist." The results might not be pretty, but the region would not descend into chaos. In contrast, warned Bacevich: "To risk the stability of that nuclear-armed state in the vain hope of salvaging Afghanistan would be a terrible mistake."

#### China solves

APP, 10 (Associated Press of Pakistan, “Pak-China friendship factor of peace, stability for region: PM”, 6/9/10, Lexis)

Prime Minister Syed Yusuf Raza Gilani said Pakistan values its relations with China based on complete trust, mutual understanding and convergence of views on all bilateral, regional and international issues. He further said Pakistan-China friendship is a factor of peace and stability for the region and welcomed the Chinese support for peace and stability in South Asia. During one-on-one meeting with the Chinese Vice Premier Mr. Zhang Dejiang prior to bilateral talks here this evening at PMs House, the Prime Minister thanked China for its stead fast support and solidarity. The Prime Minister said Pakistan will never allow any extraneous factors to affect this vital relationship. He appreciated the Chinese assistance in construction of infrastructure projects particularly extension of credit in setting up of Chashma Nuclear Power Plants to overcome energy shortage. He hoped that this cooperation will further expand.

# PPPL Adv
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#### PPPL can still do solar storm research, despite budget cuts for general fusion – new collaboration with Germany solves, and international research is inevitable

John Greenwald, 3-30-12, “Princeton, Max Planck Society launch new research center for plasma physics,” Princeton News, <http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S33/31/16S10/index.xml?section=topstories>

Princeton University and the Max Planck Society of Germany have joined forces in a scientific collaboration that is designed to accelerate progress in cutting-edge research ranging from harnessing fusion to understanding solar storms. Princeton President Shirley M. Tilghman and President of the Max Planck Society Peter Gruss participated Thursday, March 29, in a signing ceremony in Whig Hall on the Princeton campus to officially start the Max Planck Princeton Research Center for Plasma Physics. The center will be a virtual facility in which researchers will work cooperatively on projects from their current locations. "This collaboration with Germany's distinguished Max Planck Society is certain to enhance our common excellence in fusion and plasma astrophysical research and, more broadly, to advance the development of clean and abundant energy," Tilghman said. Such cooperation is coming at precisely the right time, according to Gruss. "It is essential that we pool our strengths and knowledge in the field of fusion research, in particular, so that we can develop nuclear fusion into something the world urgently needs for the years and decades to come: safe, clean and abundant energy technology," Gruss said. The new center will combine the research capabilities of Princeton's Department of Astrophysical Sciences and the U.S. Department of Energy's Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory (PPPL) with the Max Planck Society's institutes for plasma physics, astrophysics and solar system research. The selected topics will focus on issues that are crucial to both fusion and astrophysical plasmas. Such plasmas consist of superhot and electrically charged gases whose fusion powers the sun and stars. A. J. Stewart Smith, Princeton's dean for research and the Class of 1909 Professor of Physics, served as master of ceremonies and welcomed the guests from Germany in remarks delivered in German. Turning to the new research center, Smith said that "this new partnership with the Max Planck Society will establish a world-leading effort to link the studies of plasmas and fusion in the universe and on Earth. This will continue the grand vision of Princeton astrophysics giant Lyman Spitzer, who more than 50 years ago initiated the Hubble Space Telescope and founded PPPL." Smith delivered a statement from William Brinkman, director of the DOE's Office of Science, who was unable to attend. Brinkman noted that the DOE "welcomes the creation of this new center in such an exciting field as plasma astrophysics. From questions of the dynamics of accretion disks surrounding black holes, to the plasma dynamo processes that create interstellar magnetic fields, to the anomalous heating of the solar corona — these questions are challenges that need to be addressed and we are looking forward to the interaction with the institutes of the Max Planck Society on them." James Van Dam, director of the research division of the DOE's Office of Fusion Science, pointed out, "We have had years of excellent collaboration with German scientists, and this brings it to a new level. The interconnectedness of plasma physics is just amazing, and we really appreciate that this new center is involved in the whole field." The collaboration will benefit from the complementary strengths and research tools of this trans-Atlantic partnership. Both PPPL and the Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics (IPP) operate major experimental fusion facilities, for example. "There is wonderful synergy between PPPL and the Max Planck IPP," said PPPL Director Stewart Prager. "We are very enthused to combine the capabilities of the two labs to make otherwise unattainable advances in key problems in fusion and astrophysics." Insights gained from the study of astrophysical and laboratory plasmas are expected to be mutually reinforcing. "What is most exciting about the center to me is the focus on basic physical processes that are important in a diverse range of astrophysical systems," said James Stone, a Princeton professor of astrophysical sciences and applied and computational mathematics who will oversee the U.S. side of the venture related to his own discipline. "I know the astrophysicists are going to learn a lot from their plasma physics colleagues, and I think the reverse is going to be true as well." The field of plasma astrophysics is growing in interest among researchers around the world. PPPL scientists are studying such astrophysical phenomena as the source of violent space weather and the formation of stars. This research is conducted on PPPL devices called the Magnetic Reconnection Experiment and the Magnetorotational Instability experiment, respectively. Prager from PPPL, Stone from astrophysical sciences and Sibylle Günter, director of the Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics, will form the new center's leading team. "The aim of the cooperation is to make greater use of the synergies between fusion research and the work carried out by the astrophysicists," Günter said. Among other German guests attending the ceremony were Sami Solanki, director of the Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research, and Busso von Alvensleben, consul general of the Federal Republic of Germany in New York. The formation of the center will enhance already strong research collaborations between the groups, scientists said. For example, scientists at the Max Planck Institute for Plasma Physics in Greifswald, Germany, are building the Wendelstein 7-X Stellarator, which will confine plasma with a magnetic field that is shaped like a cruller — a spiral wrapped around a circle. The stellarator device, also called W7X, is designed as one of two major configurations for experimental fusion facilities. Researchers at PPPL also plan to conduct experiments on W7X. In addition, PPPL is providing components for W7X known as "trim coils." The barn door-size coils, being manufactured by Everson Tesla Inc. of Nazareth, Pa., will fine-tune the shape of the magnetic "bottle" confining the hot ionized gas studied in fusion. There are shared interests that could spark new partnerships, too. PPPL, for example, is currently involved in implementing a $94 million upgrade on its largest research machine, the National Spherical Torus Experiment, and carries out laboratory experiments on general plasma physics. Max Planck scientists working in Greifswald are also researching this topic. Eight postdoctoral fellows from PPPL and the Department of Astrophysical Sciences will staff the center, along with 13 postdoctoral fellows from the Max Planck institutes. These researchers will work with senior scientists on both sides of the Atlantic who will oversee the fellows as part of the scientists' regular duties. Financial support for the center will come from the United States and Germany. Funding for the Princeton side will come from the DOE, the National Science Foundation and Princeton University. The Max Planck Society will fund its institutes' collaborative activities.

#### Plasma research for solar storms is distinct from fusion research – their author

Patricia Wieser, lead info officer @ PPPL, 1-3-11, “The Role of the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory,” Daily Energy Report,

http://www.dailyenergyreport.com/role-of-the-princeton-plasma-physics-laboratory/

In addition to studying plasmas for fusion energy, PPPL scientists conduct research in plasma science and technology, and educate the next generation of plasma and fusion scientists.¶ “We study plasma-based propulsion systems for space vehicles, how plasma processes affect the accretion of matter onto black holes, and how plasmas give rise to flares on the surface of stars,” Prager said. “We also develop spinoff technologies, from a small nuclear material detection system to a plasma treatment method that could lead to artificial muscles.” With about 400 employees and students, PPPL has extensive capabilities for the experimental and theoretical study of fusion and nonfusion plasmas and for the design, fabrication and operation of experimental plasma facilities of all types. The University provides the institutional framework for a broad laboratory-based program of education in plasma physics and related science and technology.

#### Tons of space weather research going on – fusion isn’t key – their author

Ian O’Neill, space science producer for Discovery News, 5-10-12, “Should we really worry about solar storms?” Aljazeera, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/04/201244123922360473.html

The solar corona is of the order of millions of Kelvin (or degrees Celsius), whereas the photosphere (colloquially known as the "solar surface") is only 6,000 Kelvin. And therein lays the mystery: how is the Sun's atmosphere so radically heated? Although evidence is mounting for the presence of powerful magnetohydronamic waves (specifically Alfven waves) propagating along magnetic field-lines from the solar interior to the corona, interacting with the plasma and heating it to astonishing temperatures, we won't know for certain until we can send a probe deep into the corona. Plans are afoot to do just that, and NASA's Solar Probe Plus is expected to be launched in 2018. But why are we so interested in the corona? Well, the lower solar atmosphere is where flares and CMEs are spawned, so it would be nice if we can fully understand its mysteries - like the coronal heating phenomenon - so we may eventually arrive at more sophisticated means of predicting the onset of adverse space weather. The corona is one of the first links of the space weather chain that can ultimately influence our planet - if we master the corona, we can get a handle on space weather prediction. Solar tornadoes So, we may not have a direct means of measuring the conditions inside the corona (until 2018 at least), but we do have an increasingly sophisticated suite of solar sentries constantly watching the solar disk and sampling the solar wind - the constant stream of particles that bathe the entire Solar System. One such mission is NASA's Solar Dynamics Observatory (SDO) that has been observing the Sun from Earth orbit since 2009. What makes this observatory different is its high-definition view of the Sun. Previously unseen small-scale features are being spotted and rapid coronal processes can now be tracked. With the help of the SDO, a brand new magnetic feature was recently spotted ripping through the lower corona. On March 28, researchers from Aberystwyth University in Wales announced the discovery of a huge solar tornado - composed of twisting magnetic fields measuring up to five Earths across - dragging plasma from the lower corona to high altitudes, accelerating the material up to a blistering 300,000 kilometres per hour. Although this phenomenon may have been photographed in the past, it's only with the help of the SDO's rapid image acquisition technology that the researchers could watch the tornado evolve and identify it as such. But how does this research fit with our quest to better predict space weather? "These tornadoes may help to produce favourable conditions for CMEs to occur," said Xing Li, solar physicist at Aberystwyth and co-discoverer of the tornadoes. Whether or not this phenomenon triggers the eruption of CMEs remains to be seen - although, coincidentally, a tornado was spotted at the base of a CME prior to one eruption during the observations - but they are certainly another piece to add to the puzzle of the solar corona. When the sun attacks Solar researchers and space weather experts are intently looking at every aspect of the Sun, from the internal dynamics of the solar body to the impact of the solar wind on our planet's magnetosphere. But should the Sun hurl a massive CME toward us - a possibility that is becoming increasingly likely as the Sun picks up in activity toward the maximum in its 11-year cycle, peaking around 2013 - what's the worst that could happen?

#### Their “predictions key” card is about status quo experiments, not the plan

Richard A. Lovett, PhD, 3-8-2012, “Solar Flare: What If Biggest Known Sun Storm Hit Today?” http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2012/03/120308-solar-flare-storm-sun-space-weather-science-aurora/

Another answer is better forecasting. Scientists using NASA's Solar Dynamics Observatory spacecraft are hoping to get a better understanding of how the sun behaves as it moves deeper into its next maximum and begins generating bigger storms. (See some of SDO's first sun pictures.) These studies may help scientists predict when and where solar flares might appear and whether a given storm is pointed at Earth. "Improved predictions will provide more accurate forecasts, so [officials] can take mitigating actions," said Rodney Viereck, a physicist at the Space Weather Prediction Center. Even now, the center's Bogdan said, the most damaging emissions from big storms travel slowly enough to be detected by sun-watching satellites well before the particles strike Earth. "That gives us [about] 20 hours to determine what actions we need to take," Viereck said. (Related pictures: "Multicolored Auroras Sparked by Double Sun Blast" [August 2011].) In a pinch, power companies could protect valuable transformers by taking them offline before the storm strikes. That would produce local blackouts, but they wouldn't last for long. "The good news is that these storms tend to pass after a couple of hours," Bogdan added. Meanwhile, scientists are scrambling to learn everything they can about the sun in an effort to produce even longer-range forecasts.

#### Solar flares decreasing

Wall 11 (Mike, Space.com Staff Writer, " Epic Sun Storm Dry Spell Ahead? Not Necessarily, New Study Says," 11/17, http://www.space.com/13660-solar-activity-cycle-grand-minimum.html, )

A new "Maunder minimum?" Solar activity waxes and wanes on an 11-year cycle, but it also displays broader patterns over longer time scales. The sun's rumblings are of interest to us on Earth, as solar flares and CMEs can knock out satellites and temporarily disrupt communications systems and power grids. Scientists have been tracking solar activity for about 300 years by noting the comings and goings of sunspots, temporary dark patches on the solar surface that often give rise to powerful flares and CMEs. These records show that virtually no sunspots were observed from 1645 to 1715 — a period of prolonged solar quiescence now known as the Maunder minimum. The sun recently came out of a 70-year-long "grand maximum" of high activity, and some astronomers have suggested that our star could now be transitioning toward another Maunder-like minimum.

#### Solar flares can't cause extinction - atmosphere solves

O’Neill 8 (Ian, Universe Today Writer, “2012: No Killer Solar Flare,” June 21, <http://www.universetoday.com/14645/2012-no-killer-solar-flare/>)

Can Our Sun Produce a Killer Flare? The short answer to this is “no”. The longer answer is a little more involved. Whilst a solar flare from out Sun, aimed directly at us, could cause secondary problems such as satellite damage and injury to unprotected astronauts and blackouts, the flare itself is not powerful enough to destroy Earth, certainly not in 2012. I dare say, in the far future when the Sun begins to run out of fuel and swell into a red giant, it might be a bad era for life on Earth, but we have a few billion years to wait for that to happen. There could even be the possibility of several X-class flares being launched and by pure bad luck we may get hit by a series of CMEs and X-ray bursts, but none will be powerful to overcome our magnetosphere, ionosphere and thick atmosphere below. “Killer” solar flares have been observed on other stars. In 2006, NASA’s Swift observatory saw the largest stellar flare ever observed 135 light-years away. Estimated to have unleashed an energy of 50 million trillion atomic bombs, the II Pegasi flare will have wiped out most life on Earth if our Sun fired X-rays from a flare of that energy at us. However, our Sun is not II Pegasi. II Pegasi is a violent red giant star with a binary partner in a very close orbit. It is believed the gravitational interaction with its binary partner and the fact II Pegasi is a red giant is the root cause behind this energetic flare event. Doomsayers point to the Sun as a possible Earth-killer source, but the fact remains that our Sun is a very stable star. It does not have a binary partner (like II Pegasi), it has a predictable cycle (of approximately 11 years) and there is no evidence that our Sun contributed to any mass extinction event in the past via a huge Earth-directed flare. Very large solar flares have been observed (such as the 1859 Carrington white light flare)… but we are still here.

#### Grids resilient – backup solves

Wood, Business Roundtable senior communications advisor, 2012

(Carter, “The grid: After India, America? No, but still…”, 8-2, <http://businessroundtable.org/blog/the-grid-after-india-america-no-but-still/>, DOA: 10-12-12, ldg)

A blackout of such scale could not happen in the United States. For one thing, we don't have 600 million people. And America's electrical grid is certainly much more resilient than the one in India, a still-developing country with ineffective governments. Still, as The Washington Post reports today, "Aging power grid on overload as U.S. demands more electricity." At CNBC, Jim Cramer asked Thomas F. Farrell II, Chairman, President & CEO of Dominion Resources, about India. Could the same thing happen in the United States? Farrell responded: Our system has a lot more rigor to it and partly because we have reserve margins, meaning we have more power stations than we need to run at any particular moment in time, so that if a power station goes out, there's a back-up to help keep the grid stable. They don't have that much excess power in India, and when they get to the root cause, they'll probably find that was somewhere in there.

#### No deaths from nuclear meltdowns

Drum 11 Kevin, political blogger for Mother Jones, "Nukes and the Free Market", March 14, www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/nukes-and-free-market

We’re currently told that the death toll in Japan will be at least 10,000 people of whom approximately zero seem to have perished in nuclear accidents. What happens when a tsunami hits an offshore drilling platform or a natural gas pipeline? What happens to a coal mine in an earthquake? How much environmental damage is playing out in Japan right now because of gasoline from cars pushed around? The main lesson is “try not to put critical infrastructure near a fault line” but Japan is an earthquakey country, so what are they really supposed to do about this?¶ This is a good point: energy sources of all kind cause problems. Sometimes the problems create screaming headlines (nuke meltdowns, offshore oil explosions, mining disasters) and sometimes they don't (increased particulate pollution, global warming, devastation of salmon runs). But the dangers are there for virtually every type of energy production.¶ Still, it's worth pointing out that the problem with nuclear power isn't so much its immediate capacity to kill people. As Matt points out, no one has died in Japan from the partial meltdowns at its damaged nuclear plants, and it's unlikely anyone ever will. The control rods are in place, and even in the worst case the containment vessels will almost certainly restrict the worst damage.

#### Agriculture resilient

PW 9 [Property Wire, “Farmland shows resilience to recession,” 2/10, http://www.propertywire.com/news/company-news/farmland-resilience-recession-200902102589.html]

Farmland has outperformed most alternative assets during the past three years recording total annual returns of more than 20% as well as being a good hedge in times of economic uncertainty. Last year, according to the latest edition of Savills Agricultural Land Market Survey investment was cited as the primary reason for buying in 29% of all transactions, up from 16% in 2007. This additional interest from investors helped to push average arable land values up by 15.5% and average pasture values up to 28.4% although most of this growth was confined to the first half of the year. Ian Bailey Savills research comments, "The period of exceptional growth in values appears to have stalled for the time being but historically farmland has remained fairly resilient to recession with any fall in values limited". Forecasts for 2009 We expect average values to stabilise this year, dipping during the first half by up to 5% and regaining lost ground in the second half. Debt, as a reason to sell, is unlikely to be a significant factor; interest rates are likely to stay low and although profitability may dip it should remain above 2006 levels. A more distinct two-tier market is expected with good quality, well equipped, well located and commercially viable farms commanding the higher prices. We see no reason for the supply of farmland to change significantly from the volumes recorded during the past few years; an average of 186,000 acres have been publicly marketed each year for the past three years, though we expect a later market. Overseas buyers will continue to be a significant and important source of demand. Their presence in the market this year will be further enhanced by the weak performance of sterling against other currencies.¶ Christopher Miles comments, "In the East we have kicked off the New Year with renewed interest in farms from UK and overseas investors but with very little land available compared to this time last year demand is building. I remain positive for the outlook for prices of good arable and with the prospect of a late market it may be a case of the early bird catching the worm".

#### No Middle East impact

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265, AG)

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, **the region has** also **developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.**

#### Demonstration of fusion would spark pure fusion weaponization and arms racing

Makhijani 98 Arjun, Ph.D. and Pres. Inst. for Energy and Environmental Research, and Hisham Zerriffi, Project Scientist, 7-15, “Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest: The Potential of Explosive Fusion Research for the Development of Pure Fusion Weapons,” IEER, http://ieer.org/resource/reports/dangerous-thermonuclear-quest/

In the long term, facilities such as the National Ignition Facility and MTF facilities pose even greater threats to both the CTBT and the disarmament process. As discussed above, if ignition is demonstrated in the laboratory, the weapons labs and the DOE would likely exert considerable pressure to continue investigations and to engage in preliminary design activities for a new generation of nuclear weapons (even if it is just to keep the designers interested and occupied). Ignition would also boost political support and make large-scale funding of such activities more likely. Even without the construction of actual weapons, these activities could put the CTBT in serious jeopardy from forces both internal and external to the United States. Internally, those same pressures, which could lead to the resumption of testing of current generation weapons, could also lead to the testing of new weapons (to replace older, less safe or less reliable weapons). Externally, the knowledge that the United States or other weapons states were engaging in new fusion weapons design activities could lead other states to view this as a reversal of their treaty commitments. Comparable pressures to develop pure fusion weapons would be likely to mount in several countries. This would have severe negative repercussions for both non-proliferation and complete nuclear disarmament. The time to stop this dangerous thermonuclear quest for explosive ignition is now, before its scientific feasibility is established.

#### Nuclear war

Cohen and Douglass 2 Sam, nuclear weapons analyst and Joe, national security analyst, both members of the Los Alamos Tactical Nuclear Weapons panel, 3-11, “Nuclear Threat That Deesn’t Exist – Or Does It?” Rense, http://rense.com/general35/doex.htm

The comparison of a pure-fusion warhead with a normal fission warhead is even more stark. The lethal area to military troops of a 10 ton (high explosive equivalent yield) pure-fusion device would be approximately the same as the lethal area of a fission warhead several hundred times larger; that is, one in the kiloton range! The cost of a pure-fusion warhead is also reduced. In terms of the precious nuclear material that is required, namely, tritium and deuterium, pure-fusion devices are extremely cheap. Because the pure-fusion warhead does not need active nuclear material, such as plutonium, to "trigger" the deuterium-tritium burn, they can be made for a fraction of the cost of one fission-fusion neutron bomb of the 1980s. The inherent consequences of a pure-fusion device go far beyond low cost and greatly reduced explosive yield. Most significant, pure-fusion warheads, in contrast to warheads that use fissionable material, are not covered by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Any country can, in terms of international law, legally possess and even sell such weapons and not be in violation of the NPT. Also, deuterium-tritium fuel can be purchased openly on the international market. The spirit of the NPT may be in violation, but not the letter. Still further, because there is no fissionable component and because the explosive yield is so small, full operational tests of a pure-fusion device could be conducted in any country and not be detected by systems set up to monitor nuclear weapons tests. If tests were conducted underground at a moderate depth, say 50 to 100 meters, even the local inhabitants would suspect nothing. These consequences drive a stake through the heart of U.S. non-proliferation policies. These policies are based on preventing those who want to "go nuclear" from having access to the active nuclear material. A warhead or "device" that does not use active nuclear material (uranium or plutonium) is not prohibited. To make matters worse, in no sense can they be termed weapons of "mass destruction." Indeed, the pure-fusion devices are even more discriminant than the neutron bomb because there is, in comparison, negligible physical damage and a total absence of fission by-products and related contaminating fallout. Because of this, the pure-fusion device represents the worst fear of those whose personal crusade is to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and preserve the fire break in a hope that this will prevent a nuclear war. The pure-fusion device is less destructive than most conventional bombs, is reasonably cheap, and can be tested with impunity. It produces no fission radioactive by-products or fallout of serious concern. That is, the pure-fusion device renders the unthinkable thinkable. This is why officials do not want to discuss the possibility of pure-fusion warheads and, as will be seen, will do their best to deny their possible existence.

## 1NR

#### Chernobyl proves meltdowns don’t cause lasting damage

Bosselman 7 (Professor of Law Emeritus, Chicago-Kent College of Law. Fred, “THE NEW POWER GENERATION: ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND ELECTRICITY INNOVATION: COLLOQUIUM ARTICLE: THE ECOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER,” 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2007)

C. "But What About Chernobyl?" In 1986, an explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine caused the release of large amounts of radiation into the atmosphere. [247](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n247) Initially, the Soviet government released little information about the explosion and tried to play down its seriousness, but this secrecy caused great nervousness throughout Europe, and fed the public's fears of nuclear power all over the  [\*46]  world. [248](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n248) Now a **comprehensive analysis** of the event and its aftermath has been made: In 2005, a consortium of United Nations agencies called the Chernobyl Forum released its analysis of the long-term effects of the Chernobyl explosion. [249](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n249) The U.N. agencies' study found that the explosion caused fewer deaths than had been expected. [250](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n250) Although the Chernobyl reactor was poorly designed and badly operated [251](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n251) and lacked the basic safety protections found outside the Soviet Union, [252](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n252) fewer than seventy deaths so far have been attributed to the explosion, mostly plant employees and firefighters who suffered acute radiation sickness. [253](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n253) The Chernobyl reactor, like many Soviet reactors, was in the open rather than in an American type of pressurizable containment structure, which would have prevented the release of radiation to the environment if a similar accident had occurred. [254](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n254)  [\*47]  Perhaps the most surprising finding of the U.N. agencies' study was that "**the ecosystems around the Chernobyl site are now flourishing.** The [Chernobyl exclusion zone] has become a wildlife sanctuary, and it looks like the nature park it has become." [255](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n255) Jeffrey McNeely, the chief scientist of the World Conservation Union, has made similar observations: Chernobyl has now become the world's first radioactive nature reserve... . 200 wolves are now living in the nature reserve, which has also begun to support populations of reindeer, lynx and European bison, species that previously were not found in the region. While the impact on humans was strongly negative, the wildlife is adapting and even thriving on the site of one of the 20th century's worst environmental disasters. [256](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n256) Mary Mycio, the Kiev correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, has written a fascinating book based on her many visits to the exclusion zone and interviews with people in the area. [257](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=4a9f74e9d68358dde5b1da7c76fcc08d&docnum=49&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAB&_md5=b940f69f179ebb657dc94d1baf8c0fbd#n257) She notes that the fear that radiation would produce permanent deformities in animal species has not been borne out after twenty years; the population and diversity of animals in even some of the most heavily radiated parts of the exclusion zone is similar to comparable places that are less radioactive.

#### Both magnetic and ICF fusion would spark weaponization

Arjun Makhijani, Ph.D. and Pres. Inst. for Energy and Environmental Research, and Hisham Zerriffi, Project Scientist, 7-15-1998, “Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest: The Potential of Explosive Fusion Research for the Development of Pure Fusion Weapons,” IEER, http://ieer.org/resource/reports/dangerous-thermonuclear-quest/

There are currently two approaches to fusion being researched that could lead to pure fusion weapons, or more broadly, to nuclear weapons that do not require a fission trigger. They are inertial confinement fusion (ICF) and fusion driven by various combinations of electrical, electromagnetic and chemical compression of plasmas, such as Magnetized Target Fusion (MTF). Neither of these technologies is sufficiently developed to demonstrate the scientific feasibility of these weapons. But the research paths and the stated goals for both of them are such that, if successful, the prognosis for such weapons could change dramatically. None of the projects have the development of pure fusion weapons as their officially stated goal. In view of the many commitments that the nuclear weapons states have made to stop developing new nuclear weapons, most recently as part of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, these same states could hardly announce that they are developing radically new nuclear weapons. The questions then revolve not around stated intentions, but around the technical capabilities that the pursuit of high power ICF and MTF programs will give the nuclear weapons states, and in particular the United States, France, and Russia. If the technical potential for building these weapons is developed, or even if their scientific feasibility is established, the pressures to build them, especially in times of crisis, would be immense.

#### Both MCF and ICF research causes prolif

Andre Gsponer and Jean-Pierre Hurni, Physics PhDs, Indep. Scientific Research Inst., 1-23-2004, “ITER:The International ThermonuclearExperimental Reactorand theNuclear Weapons Proliferation Implicationsof Thermonuclear-Fusion Energy Systems,” <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/707446/files/0401110.ps.gz?version=1>

Both magnetic confinement fusion (MCF) reactors such as ITER, and iner-tial confinement fusion reactors (ICF), such as the GEKKO XII laser facilityof the Institute of Laser Engineering at Osaka University in Japan, have nuclear-weapon-materials proliferation implications due to their use of tri-tium (see Sec.5). However, ICF facilities have the additional proliferation problem that they enable the physics of thermonuclear weapons to be stud-ied in the laboratory (see Sec.6). As a result, it is well known by nuclear proliferation experts that Japan has not only the capability to build boosted nuclear weapons, but also the potential to build two-stage thermonuclear weapons that are likely to work first-time without testing.10 Today, the main impediment that would prevent Japan from building such second-generation nuclear weapons on short notice is the unavailability of sufficient amountsof tritium.• Any future commercial fusion reactor (based on the either the MCF orICF principle) poses the problem of tritium proliferation because during operation each such reactor will contain several tens of kilograms of tritium,i.e., enough for an arsenal of several hundreds or thousands of boosted nuclear and thermonuclear weapons (see Sec.5.2).

#### Fusion research causes pure fusion weapon development – shatters the nuclear firebreak

Arjun Makhijani, Pres. Inst. For Energy and Env. Research, 7-15-1998, “Statement Before the National Press Club,” <http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/1998/07/dtq-statement-arjun.pdf>

The current period is comparable to the late 1940s and early 1950s, when decisions regarding fission-triggered thermonuclear weapons were being made. Once the feasibility of such weapons was established by a 1952 US test, which was not of a deliverable weapon, the pressure to develop huge arsenals of thermonuclear weapons in the United States and the Soviet Union became inexorable. We must prevent these new highly dangerous and destructive nuclear weapons from being developed. The time to do so is now, before their feasibility is established. Once feasibility is demonstrated, the pressures from nuclear weapons laboratories as well as the military establishment to design and build them will be immense. We have one advantage over the time when fission-triggered thermonuclear weapons were developed in the 1950s. We have a CTBT that bans all nuclear explosions. Besides the nuclear dangers that pure fusion weapons would pose, there is an immediate question of the legality of some of the research. Unlike the NPT, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) of 1996, which about 150 countries have signed (including the five nuclear weapons NPT signatory states), bans all nuclear explosions. Article I of the CTBT also requires parties to prevent nuclear explosions. However, the CTBT does not define such explosions and there is as yet no official ruling regarding which fusion explosions, if any, might be regarded as legal. As my colleague Hisham Zerriffi will explain, the negotiating record regarding fission explosions as well as considerations relating to the fusion process have allowed us to come to the technical conclusion that certain laboratory nuclear fusion explosions -- those that achieve thermonuclear ignition -- would be illegal. Such illegal explosive experiments are planned for the US National Ignition Facility (NIF) and the French Laser Mégajoule (LMJ). These experiments, and hence the NIF and LMJ, appear to be illegal under the CTBT. By the same criterion, some planned joint US-Russian magnetized target fusion experiments (MTF) at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico are also illegal. It is therefore essential to stop the construction of NIF and LMJ and cancel certain MTF experiments at Los Alamos. Laser and other similarly large devices are not themselves weaponisable, but could work in combination with other approaches, like MTF, to create usable weapons. Laser fusion would be useful in establishing scientific feasibility of pure fusion weapons and for designing the fuel pellets. We should note that most current fusion research activities are legal under the CTBT, including all non-explosive magnetic fusion research and research on existing laser fusion machines, like NOVA in Livermore and GEKKO XII in Japan. No country has actually announced the goal of building pure fusion weapons. Given the insistent international calls for nuclear disarmament and the requirement of the thirty-year-old Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) that nuclear powers end the nuclear arms race at an "early date," those powers could hardly announce an explicit goal for developing pure fusion weapons. Pure fusion weapons have long been a dream for nuclear weapons designers. Present-day thermonuclear weapons need plutonium or highly enriched uranium to set off the hydrogenbomb part. But pure fusion weapons would not need either of these fissile materials. As a result, they would produce little fallout. They could be made very small or very huge. And the research involves interesting scientific challenges. Finally, the lethal area per unit of explosive power of relatively small pure fusion weapons would be much larger than today's nuclear weapons. Pure fusion weapons would present far greater nuclear proliferation dangers since the acquisition of highly enriched uranium or plutonium is currently the main obstacle to proliferation. By contrast, deuterium and tritium, the forms of hydrogen used in fusion research and weapons, are less difficult to make. Verification would also be more difficult. Most importantly, fusion weapons would likely lower the threshold for nuclear weapons use, because of their smaller individual size and relative lack of fall-out.

# Non Fusion CP
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#### The United States federal government should substantially increase funding for all non-fusion related research at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, including research for solar storms and development of technology for electromagnetic aircraft launchers

#### The United States federal government should ban funding for fusion research in the United States.

## 2NC

#### Their author is an internet crazy – disregard this scenario

Witzsche 6 Rolf A. F. Witzsche, “Nuclear Fusion Power”, June 3, 2006, http://peace.rolf-witzsche.com/global/canada/nuclear\_fusion.html

Rolf A. F. Witzsche, is an independent researcher, publisher, and author of eleven novels. The novels are focused on exploring the Principle of Universal Love, the principle that is reflected to some degree in every bright period throughout history with the added challenge for today to give our universal love an active expression in a type of 'Universal Kiss' for all mankind.

#### Squo fusion solves

#### Ice Age is a long way off – status quo CO2 is enough to prevent it

Reuters, 3-9-2012, “Next ice age not likely before 1,500 years, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/09/us-ice-age-emissions-idUSTRE80814T20120109>, da 8-31-2012

High levels of carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere mean the next ice age is unlikely to begin for at least 1,500 years, an article in the journal Nature Geoscience said on Monday. Concentrations of the main gases blamed for global warming reached record levels in 2010 and will linger in the atmosphere for decades even if the world stopped pumping out emissions today, a

ccording to the U.N.'s weather agency. An ice age is a period when there is a long-term reduction in the earth's surface and atmospheric temperature, which leads to the growth of ice sheets and glaciers. There have been at least five ice ages on earth. During ice ages there are cycles of glaciation with ice sheets both advancing and retreating. Officially, the earth has been in an interglacial, or warmer period, for the last 10,000 to 15,000 years, and estimates vary on how long such periods last. "(Analysis) suggests that the end of the current interglacial (period) would occur within the next 1,500 years, if atmospheric CO2 concentrations do not exceed (around) 240 parts per million by volume (ppmv)," the study said. However, the current carbon dioxide concentration is of 390 ppmv, and at that level an increase in the volume of ice sheets would not be possible, it added. The study based on variations in the earth's orbit and rock samples was conducted by academics at Cambridge University, University College London, the University of Florida and Norway's University of Bergen. The causes of ice ages are not fully understood but concentrations of methane and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, changes in the earth's orbit around the sun, and the movement of tectonic plates are all thought to contribute. The world is forecast to grow hotter as greenhouse gases continue to rise, increasing threats such as extreme weather events and sea level rise. Scientists have warned that global temperature rise should be limited to within 2 degrees Celsius to avoid the worst effects of climate change but delays in curbing emissions growth are putting the planet at risk.

#### Ice Age doesn’t cause extinction

Zbigniew Jaworowski, M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc., Winter 2004, “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate,” 21st Century Science and Technology, <http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global_warming.pdf>, da 8-31-2012

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.

# T
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#### R&D isn’t T

#### Violates Energy production---it’s pre-production

Koplow 4 Doug Koplow is the founder of Earth Track in Cambridge, MA. He has worked on natural resource subsidy issues for 20 years, primarily in the energy sector "Subsidies to Energy Industries" Encyclopedia of Energy Vol 5 2004www.earthtrack.net/files/Energy%20Encyclopedia,%20wv.pdf

3. SUBSIDIES THROUGH THE FUEL CYCLE

Because no two fuel cycles are exactly the same, examining subsidies through the context of a generic fuel cycle is instructive in providing an overall framework from which to understand how common subsidization policies work. Subsidies are grouped into preproduction (e.g., R&D, resource location), production (e.g., extraction, conversion/generation, distribution, accident risks), consumption, postproduction (e.g., decommissioning, reclamation), and externalities (e.g., energy security, environmental, health and safety).

3.1 Preproduction

Preproduction activities include research into new technologies, improving existing technologies, and market assessments to identify the location and quality of energy resources.

3.1.1 Research and Development

R&D subsidies to energy are common worldwide, generally through government-funded research or tax breaks. Proponents of R&D subsidies argue that because a portion of the financial returns from successful innovations cannot be captured by the innovator, the private sector will spend less than is appropriate given the aggregate returns to society. Empirical data assembled by Margolis and Kammen supported this claim, suggesting average social returns on R&D of 50% versus private returns of only 20 to 30%.

However, the general concept masks several potential concerns regarding energy R&D. First, ideas near commercialization have much lower spillover than does basic research, making subsidies harder to justify. Second, politics is often an important factor in R&D choices, especially regarding how the research plans are structured and the support for follow-on funding for existing projects.

Allocation bias is also a concern. Historical data on energy R&D (Table III) demonstrate that R&D spending has heavily favored nuclear and fossil energy across many countries. Although efficiency, renewables, and conservation have captured a higher share of public funds during recent years, the overall support remains skewed to a degree that may well have influenced the relative competitiveness of energy technologies. Extensive public support for energy R&D may also reduce the incentive for firms to invest themselves. U.S. company spending on R&D for the petroleum refining and extraction sector was roughly one-third the multi-industry average during the 1956-1998 period based on survey data from the U.S. National Science Foundation. For the electric, gas, and sanitary services sector, the value was one-twentieth, albeit during the more limited 1995-1998 period.

3.1.2 Resource Location

Governments frequently conduct surveys to identify the location and composition of energy resources. Although these have addressed wind or geothermal resources on occasion, they most often involve oil and gas. Plant siting is another area where public funds are used, primarily to assess risks from natural disasters such as earthquakes for large hydroelectric or nuclear installations. Survey information can be important to evaluate energy security risks and to support mineral leasing auctions, especially when bidders do not operate competitively. However, costs should be offset from lease sale revenues when evaluating the public return on these sales. Similarly, the costs of siting studies should be recovered from the beneficiary industries.

3.2 Production

Energy production includes all stages from the point of resource location through distribution to the final consumers. Specific items examined here include resource extraction, resource conversion (including electricity), the various distribution links to bring the energy resource to the point of final use, and accident risks.

#### Violates incentives---they have to provide money to the private sector---r&D is distinct

CCES 9 Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (also called c2es) “Buildings and Emissions: Making the Connection” No specific date dated, most recent citation from 2009 www.c2es.org/technology/overview/buildings

Policy Options to Promote Climate-Friendly Buildings

The mosaic of current policies affecting the building sector is complex and dynamic involving voluntary and mandatory programs implemented at all levels of government, from local to federal. Government efforts to reduce the overall environmental impact of buildings have resulted in numerous innovative policies at the state and local levels. Non-governmental organizations, utilities, and other private actors also play a role in shaping GHG emissions from buildings through third-party “green building” certification, energy efficiency programs, and other efforts.

Various taxonomies have been used to describe the policy instruments that govern buildings, typically distinguishing between regulations, financial incentives, information and education, management of government energy use, and subsidies for research and development (R&D). Each of these is broadly described below.

-Standards and codes

Regulatory policies include building and zoning codes, appliance energy efficiency standards, clean energy portfolio standards, and electricity interconnection standards for distributed generation equipment. Building codes can require a minimum level of energy efficiency for new buildings, thus mandating reductions at the construction stage, where there is the most opportunity to integrate efficiency measures. Zoning codes can provide incentives to developers to achieve higher performance. Because of regional differences in such factors as climatic conditions and building practices, and because building and zoning codes are implemented by states and localities, the codes vary considerably across the country. While substantial progress has been made over the past decade, opportunities to strengthen code requirements and compliance remain.

Appliance and equipment standards require minimum efficiencies to be met by all regulated products sold; they thereby eliminate the least efficient products from the market. Federal standards exist for many residential and commercial appliances, and several states have implemented standards for appliances not covered by federal standards (see Appliance Efficiency Standards).

-Financial incentives

Financial incentives can best induce energy-efficient behavior where relatively few barriers limit information and decision-making opportunities (e.g., in owner-occupied buildings). Financial incentives include tax credits, rebates, low-interest loans, energy-efficient mortgages, and innovative financing, all of which address the barrier of first costs. Many utilities also offer individual incentive programs, because reducing demand, especially peak demand, can enhance the utility’s system-wide performance.

-Information and education

While many businesses and homeowners express interest in making energy-efficiency improvements for their own buildings and homes, they often do not know which products or services to ask for, who supplies them in their areas, or whether the energy savings realized will live up to claims. Requiring providers to furnish good information to consumers on the performance of appliances, equipment and even entire buildings is a powerful tool for promoting energy efficiency by enabling intelligent consumer choices.

-Lead-by-example programs

A variety of mechanisms are available to ensure that government agencies lead by example in the effort to build and manage more energy-efficient buildings and reduce GHG emissions. For example, several cities and states, and federal agencies (including the General Services Administration), have mandated LEED or LEED-equivalent certification for public buildings, and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 includes provisions for reduced energy use and energy efficiency improvements in federal buildings.

-Research and development (R&D)

In the long run, the opportunities for a low-greenhouse gas energy future depend critically on new and emerging technologies. Some technological improvements are incremental and have a high probability of commercial introduction over the next decade (such as low-cost compact fluorescents). Other technology advances will require considerable R&D before they can become commercially feasible (such as solid-state lighting). The fragmented and highly competitive market structure of the building sector and the small size of most building companies discourage private R&D, on both individual components and the interactive performance of components in whole buildings.

Building Technologies Center. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory’s Buildings Technology Center was established by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and performs research into issues including heating and cooling equipment, thermal engineering, weatherization, building design and performance, envelope systems and materials, and power systems.

Emerging Technologies. This U.S. DOE-sponsored program develops technology that would reduce energy use in residential and commercial buildings by 60-70 percent. Technologies are in fields including solid-state lighting, space conditioning and refrigeration, building envelopes, and analysis tools and design strategies that would facilitate the development of energy efficient buildings through software and computer-based building analysis.

#### At best they’re indirect which means they’re FX---this cards draws a predictable limit and brightline

GSWH 11 Global Solar Water Heating Market Transformation and Strengthening Initiative, This publication is the result of a joint effort from the following contributors: The European Solar ThermalIndustry Federation (ESTIF), the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) through its Division ofTechnology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) and the Global Environment Fund (GEF). "Guidelines for policy and framework conditions" No Specific Date Cited, Most Recent Citations From 2011 www.solarthermalworld.org/files/policy\_framework.pdf?download

8 Non financial incentives for solar thermal

Non Financial Incentives include all public policies that support the creation of public good, even when providing an indirect financial advantage to the solar thermal market. For instance: an awareness raising campaign financed from public money or a programme to subsidise craftsmen training or R&D, etc. Obviously, all these instruments create an indirect financial advantage for companies involved in the market and this benefit is then passed on to the users.

8.1 Solar thermal obligations

• What is a Solar Thermal Obligation (STO)?

STO are legal provisions making mandatory the installation of solar thermal systems in buildings. The obligation mainly applies to new buildings and those undergoing major refurbishment. The owner must then install a solar thermal system meeting legal requirements. Most of the existing STOs are connected to national or regional energy laws and implemented through the municipal building codes. A growing number of European municipalities, regions and countries have adopted solar thermal obligations. Already today, more than 150 million people live in regions covered by a STO.

• Benefits

A major benefit of solar thermal ordinances is their effectiveness combined with low costs and limited administrative overheads for public authorities. As part of the building permit process, the inspection with regard to the renewable energy requirement is simple and thus does not strain public finances.

The introduction of a solar thermal ordinance prevents market fluctuation caused by inconsistent incentive programmes. It provides a stable planning environment for market actors and investors, encouraging local economic growth and creating new jobs in this sector.

• Unwanted effects and flanking measures

Solar obligations have a profound effect on the solar thermal market's structure. Therefore, to maximise their benefits, they require flanking measures.

In a market where solar thermal becomes mandatory, promoters and customers will tend to question the solar systems' operation and react more negatively than in a voluntary market.

Ends users and the construction sector will often go for the cheapest possible solution, while building owners will try to circumvent the obligation through exemptions. The real impact of any regulation strongly depends on its technical parameters and control procedures.

It is vital, therefore, that the regulations adopted ensure state-of-the-art quality assurance, products, planning, installation and maintenance of the system, guaranteeing the same high level of customer satisfaction as in the current voluntary market. Poor performance of "mandatory" systems would not only undermine public acceptance of the obligation, but also, possibly, of the solar thermal technology in general.

Israel, 30 years of experience with solar thermal ordinances

Thirty years ago, Israel was the first country to pass legislation on solar thermal installations. With the second oil crisis at the end of the 1970s, members of parliament examined ways to make their country less dependent on imported energy. The result was a law, which made solar water heaters mandatory in new buildings such as residential housing, hotels, guest houses and old people's homes up to 27 metres high. The legislation entered into force in 1980.

Nowadays over 80% of Israel's households get their domestic hot water from solar rooftop heaters. A typical domestic unit consists of a 150 litre insulated storage tank and a 2 m2 collector. These hot water heaters save the country the need to import about 4% of its energy needs, and replace about 9% of the electricity production.

The law has now become redundant. More than 90% of the solar systems are installed on a voluntary basis, i.e. they are installed in existing buildings, or the systems are larger than required by the obligation.

Source: PROSTO project

8.2 Quality, standards and certification policy

The need and methods to ensure quality in the market are so important for solar thermal, that a complete guide is dedicated to this topic in the framework of the GSWH project.

Why do we need standards?

The objective of standardisation and quality assurance is to guarantee product safety and quality, as well as lower prices. At every stage of market development, the capacity of solar thermal systems to deliver the expected level of performance is a key factor. In the early stage of the market, quality issues have had long lasting devastating effects. The existence of standards is the cornerstone of quality assurance.

The actors of standards and certification

Standardisation and quality for solar thermal should be the result of a joint effort from public authorities (market regulation), the industry, the technical community and, when they are adequately organised, the end users.

• Public authorities have a key role to play in imposing stringent quality requirements and in initiating, facilitating and controlling the standardisation process.

• The industry must provide product and technical expertise. It must understand the benefits

of ensuring standardised level of quality. Public authorities should guarantee that the standards are neutral and do not favour certain products or companies.

• I t is essential to be able to rely on independent testing facilities and certification bodies. If the private initiative is not adequate, then public authorities should actively support the creation of such structures.

• Consumer organisations can bring a useful contribution to the process. Quality installation for quality products

Solar thermal products usually need to be installed. This operation can be simple to the extent that it might not require the intervention of a specialist, e.g. some termosiphons systems, but on average it should be undertaken by a professional. To guarantee performance, the quality of the installation is as important as the quality of the system. Minimum requirements in terms of training and qualification of installers should be implemented in parallel with product requirements. Public authorities should regulate in the absence of initiatives from trade and industry.

Performance and quality for a sustainable market

Performance and quality measures do not constitute flanking or accompanying measures. Framework and regulations should be developed, and relevant bodies involved from the beginning, even if this has to be imposed to the market to some extent.

The market tends to be shortsighted; industry will naturally prefer to avoid costs and regulations. The benefits of high quality regulations and market surveillance will emerge eventually and guarantee a sustainable market. Public authorities should ensure that incentives and promotion endorse quality.

8.3 Research and development, demonstration projects (definition, importance, recommendations, examples)

Solar thermal is a simple and mature technology; however, research and development are necessary to guarantee that performance will continue to improve and costs to decrease. Research and development can also contribute to adapt the technical features of products to local needs, e.g. improve water tightness in tropical areas, resistance to frost in mountainous regions. Research and development cannot proceed only from public initiative but, through public universities and public research centres, public authorities have a leading role to play.

Building up centres of technical excellence

Applied research, engineering education, development, product innovation, standardisation, testing are closely linked and there are a lot of synergies between those fields. Most of the time, the same persons will be likely to teach, test and lead research projects. A sustainable market will always require relying on a high level engineering community. Public authorities should encourage the creation of multi disciplinary technical facilities for solar thermal engineering and encourage or even impose on the industry to participate in this effort.

Importance of demonstration projects

For both promotion and technical (experimental) reasons demonstrations projects are extremely useful. Projects implementing technologies that are not market ready, but which have an important potential, will allow testing and improving the solution, gather data, monitor functioning and finally demonstrate the feasibility to the general public and the industry in order to prepare the introduction on the market.

9 Financial incentives (direct, indirect, tax incentives, low interest loans): definition, importance, recommendations, examples

Financial Incentives include any public policy giving a financial advantage to those who install a solar thermal system or that use solar thermal energy.

#### Voting issue for limits and ground---creates an unmanageable topic of new speculative tech via government research that doesn’t interact with the market

**Dyson et al, 3** - International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (Megan, Flow: The Essentials of Environmental Flows, p. 67-68)

Understanding of the term ‘incentives’ varies and economists have produced numerous typologies. A brief characterization of incentives is therefore warranted. First, the term is understood by economists as incorporating both positive and negative aspects, for example a tax that leads a consumer to give up an activity that is an incentive, not a disincentive or negative incentive. Second, although incentives are also construed purely in economic terms, incentives refer to more than just financial rewards and penalties. They are the “positive and negative changes in outcomes that individuals perceive as likely to result from particular actions taken within a set of rules in a particular physical and social context.”80 Third, it is possible to distinguish between direct and indirect incentives, with direct incentives referring to **financial** or other inducements and indirect incentives referring to both variable and **enabling incentives**.81 Finally, incentives of any kind may be called ‘perverse’ where they work against their purported aims or have significant adverse side effects. ¶ Direct incentives lead people, groups and organisations to take particular action or inaction. In the case of environmental flows these are the same as the net gains and losses that different stakeholders experience. The key challenge is to ensure that the incentives are consistent with the achievement of environmental flows. This implies the need to compensate those that incur additional costs by providing them with the appropriate payment or other compensation. Thus, farmers asked to give up irrigation water to which they have an established property or use right are likely to require a payment for ceding this right. The question, of course, is how to obtain the financing necessary to cover the costs of developing such transactions and the transaction itself. ¶ Variable incentives are policy instruments that affect the relative costs and benefits of different economic activities. As such, they can be manipulated to affect the behaviour of the producer or consumer. For example, a government subsidy on farm inputs will increase the relative profitability of agricultural products, hence probably increasing the demand for irrigation water. Variable incentives therefore have the ability to greatly increase or reduce the demand for out-of-stream, as well as in-stream, uses of water. The number of these incentives within the realm of economic and fiscal policy is practically **limitless.**

## 2NC

#### Nuclear production must be for the purpose of energy generation

**IAEA ‘7** (International Atomic Energy Agency 7 <http://www-ub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/Pub1290_web.pdf>

Under the terms of Article III of its Statute, the IAEA is authorized to establish or adopt standards of safety for protection of health and minimization of danger to life and property, and to provide for the application of these standards. The publications by means of which the IAEA establishes standards are issued in the IAEA Safety Standards Series. This series covers nuclear safety, radiation safety, transport safety and waste safety, and also general safety (i.e. all these areas of safety). The publication categories in the series are Safety Fundamentals, Safety Requirements and Safety Guides.

The process of inducing radioactivity.􀁌 Most commonly used to refer to the induction of radioactivity in moderators, coolants, and structural and shielding materials, caused by irradiation with neutrons.􀁌 The BSS definition — “The production of radionuclides by irradiation.” [1] —is technically adequate; however, the term ‘production’ gives a connotation that this is being done intentionally rather than, as is normally the case,incidentally.

#### All research plants gets class 104 licenses – that’s not energy production

**Matuzan and Walker 85**  Controlling the Atom: The Beginnings of Nuclear Regulation, 1946-1962 George T. Mazuzan is Assistant Professor of History at State University of New York at Geneseo. University of Vermont awarded him his B.S. and M.A., and his Ph.D. was conferred by Kent State University. He has published several articles.

Sections of the 1954 act reflected the state of the technology by establishing two classes of licenses for atomic facilities. One section authorized the AEC to issue commercial or "class 103" licenses (after the section number in the law) whenever it had determined that a facility had been "sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes." Since the agency and the Joint Committee interpreted "practical value" to mean that atomic facilities had to be judged eco- nomically competitive with other energy sources, issuance of class-103 licenses was postponed until the industry had passed through its research and development phase.33 Instead, early power reactor facilities received "class-104" licenses un- der the terms of section 104. Reactors used in medical therapy, university research, and power demonstration came under this category. A key phrase authorized reactor licenses that would lead to the "demonstra- tion of the practical value . . . for industrial or commercial purposes." Class-104 licenses, then, covered all power reactors used during the developmental period until the industry could find a design that would eventually meet the "practical value" criterion of a class-103 commercial license. Furthermore, section 104 specifically instructed the AEC to im- pose the minimum amount of regulation on a licensee consistent with the public health and safety. In other words, a class-104 license indicated that the government wanted to encourage the new industry to undertake research and development under minimum regulation that would lead to major advances in power-reactor technology.34

# K

#### The aff enframes the world to limit out any ontological questioning and ensures a violent monopoly on truth that results in endless warfare

Burke 7—Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations in the University of New South Wales (Anthony, *Theory & Event*, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2007, “Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason,” Project MUSE)

This essay develops a theory about the causes of war -- and thus aims to generate lines of action and critique for peace -- that cuts beneath analyses based either on a given sequence of events, threats, insecurities and political manipulation, or the play of institutional, economic or political interests (the 'military-industrial complex'). Such factors are important to be sure, and should not be discounted, but they flow over a deeper **bedrock of modern reason** that has not only come to form a powerful structure of common sense but **the apparently solid ground of the real itself**. In this light, the two 'existential' and 'rationalist' discourses of war-making and justification mobilised in the Lebanon war are more than merely arguments, rhetorics or even discourses. Certainly **they mobilise forms of knowledge and power together; providing political leaderships, media, citizens, bureaucracies and military forces with organising systems of belief, action, analysis and rationale**. But they run deeper than that. They are truth-systems of the most powerful and fundamental kind that we have in modernity: **ontologies, statements about truth and being which claim a rarefied privilege to state what is and how it must be maintained** as it is.

I am thinking of ontology in both its senses: ontology as both a statement about the nature and ideality of being (in this case political being, that of the nation-state), and as a statement of epistemological truth and certainty, of methods and processes of arriving at certainty (in this case, the development and application of strategic knowledge for the use **of armed force**, and the creation and maintenance of geopolitical order, security and national survival). These derive from the classical idea of ontology as a speculative or positivistic inquiry into the fundamental nature of truth, of being, or of some phenomenon; the desire for a solid metaphysical account of things inaugurated by Aristotle, an account of 'being qua being and its essential attributes'.17 In contrast, drawing on Foucauldian theorising about truth and power, I see ontology as a particularly powerful claim to truth itself: a claim to the status of an underlying systemic foundation for truth, identity, existence and action; one that is not essential or timeless, but is thoroughly historical and contingent, that is deployed and mobilised in a fraught and conflictual socio-political context of some kind. In short, ontology is the 'politics of truth'18 in its most sweeping and powerful form.

I see such a drive for ontological certainty and completion as particularly problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, when it takes the form of the existential and rationalist ontologies of war, it amounts to a hard and exclusivist claim: **a drive for ideational** hegemony and closure that limits debate and questioning, **that confines it within the boundaries of a particular, closed system of logic, one that is grounded in the truth of being**, in the truth of truth as such. The second is its intimate relation with violence: the dual ontologies represent a simultaneously social and conceptual structure that generates violence. Here **we are witness to an epistemology of violence (strategy) joined to an ontology of violence (the national security state)**. When we consider their relation to war, the two ontologies are especially dangerous because each alone (and doubly in combination) tends both to **quicken the resort to war and to lead to its escalation** either in scale and duration, or in unintended effects. In such a context **violence is not so much a tool that can be picked up and used on occasion**, at limited cost and with limited impact -- **it permeates being.**

This essay describes firstly the ontology of the national security state (by way of the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, Carl Schmitt and G. W. F. Hegel) and secondly the rationalist ontology of strategy (by way of the geopolitical thought of Henry Kissinger), showing how they crystallise into a mutually reinforcing system of support and justification, especially in the thought of Clausewitz. This creates both a profound ethical and pragmatic problem. The ethical problem arises because of their militaristic force -- they embody and reinforce a norm of war -- and because they enact what Martin Heidegger calls an 'enframing' image of technology and being in which **humans are merely utilitarian instruments** for use, control and destruction, and force -- in the words of one famous Cold War strategist -- can be thought of as a 'power to hurt'.19 The pragmatic problem arises because force so often produces neither the linear system of effects imagined in strategic theory nor anything we could meaningfully call security, but rather **turns in upon itself in a nihilistic spiral of pain and destruction**. In the era of a 'war on terror' dominantly conceived in Schmittian and Clausewitzian terms,20 the arguments of Hannah Arendt (that violence collapses ends into means) and Emmanuel Levinas (that 'every war employs arms that turn against those that wield them') take on added significance. Neither, however, explored what occurs when war and being are made to coincide, other than Levinas' intriguing comment that in war persons 'play roles in which they no longer recognises themselves, making them betray not only commitments but their own substance'. 21

#### The alt is to engage in meditative reflection and ask the question of Being

Swazo 2 Norman is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Alaska. “Crisis Theory and World Order: Heideggerian Reflections,” p. 12-14

In line with the above thought, I have noted that world order scholars are genuinely concerned about the manifold dimensions of planetary crisis­: war, both conventional war and the post-Cold War threat of thermonuclear war; social and economic injustice, especially between the industrialized North and the developing South of the globe; conditions of extreme poverty, especially in Africa, the subcontinent of Asia, and Latin America; and esca­lating ecological decay across the face of the planet. I submit that this "prag­matic" concern is really a manifestation of an existential anxiety in the face of a prospect of death through global catastrophe issuing from one or a combi­nation of these global problems. Such anxiety in the face of death is fully con­sonant with Heidegger's concern for the human way to be during the global reign of technology, that way in which modernity in its extreme configura­tion determines human life for better and for worse. With this in mind, it is not sufficient merely to contrapose the logic of world order to the logic of statecraft in the manner of straightforward nor­mative disputation. It is necessary, rather, that this existential anxiety be experienced in an essential way; i.e., such that all ethical and political logic and thinking come into question, and such that we come to see that even the logic of world order can have hidden prejudices that must be put into ques­tion. This "putting into question" is not a nihilistic move, such that we would come away from this questioning justifying anything or nothing at all. Rather, the fragility of our inherited and then transmitted justifications within the Western valuation comes into clear relief against the background of the human way to be that Heidegger seeks to clarify. We must remember, after all, as Charles Scott observes, that ... anything has been justified in our history by appeal to universal values and meanings, including the most severe repressions, torture, violent cru­elty, war, and the morbid enslaving and destructive segregation of vast groups of people. The proliferation of `universal' norms whereby we justify certain values and contend against other values mirrors our fear of what the world would be like if we lacked an adequate basis for justifying our values and realizing the best possibilities of ourselves.... The tension in Heidegger's thought ... puts in question the combina­tion of axioms, authorizing disclosure and judgment, as well as the belief that with a proper normative basis for our values we can hope to overcome the destructive proliferation of violently opposing ways of life."