## 2AC

### Incentives

**We meet – we give the industry money and tax credits**

**Epa.gov 12** [“Solar Power Purchase Agreements,” May 24th, <http://www.epa.gov/greenpower/buygp/solarpower.htm>]

A Solar Power Purchase Agreement (SPPA) is a financial arrangement in which a third-party developer owns, operates, and maintains the photovoltaic (PV) system, and a host customer agrees to site the system on its roof or elsewhere on its property and purchases the system’s electric output from the solar services provider for a predetermined period. This financial arrangement allows the host customer to receive stable, and sometimes lower cost electricity, while the solar services provider or another party acquires valuable financial benefits such as tax credits and income generated from the sale of electricity to the host customer.

**DoE says we’re T**

**Waxman 98 –** Solicitor General of the US (Seth, Brief for the United States in Opposition for the US Supreme Court case HARBERT/LUMMUS AGRIFUELS PROJECTS, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, http://www.justice.gov/osg/briefs/1998/0responses/98-0697.resp.opp.pdf)

2 On November 15, 1986, Keefe was delegated “the authority, with respect to actions valued at $50 million or less, to approve, execute, enter into, modify, administer, closeout, terminate and take any other necessary and appropriate action (collectively, ‘Actions’) with respect to Financial Incentive awards.” Pet. App. 68, 111-112. Citing DOE Order No. 5700.5 (Jan. 12, 1981), the delegation defines “Financial Incentives” as the authorized financial incentive programs of DOE, “including direct loans, loan guarantees, purchase agreements, price supports, guaranteed market agreements and any others which may evolve.” The delegation proceeds to state, “[h]owever, a separate prior written approval of any such action must be given by or concurred in by Keefe to accompany the action.” The delegation also states that its exercise “shall be governed by the rules and regulations of [DOE] and policies and procedures prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate(s).” Pet. App. 111-113.

**Interpretation – incentives are the disbursement of public funds**

**Gielecki 1**, Mark, economist with the Energy Information Administration, Fred Mayes, Senior Technical Advisor for the coal, nuclear, and renewables program within the EIA, Lawrence Prete, retired from the EIA, [“Incentives, Mandates, and Government Programs for Promoting Renewable Energy,” February, <http://lobby.la.psu.edu/_107th/128_PURPA/Agency_Activities/EIA/Incentive_Mandates_and_Government.htm>]

Over the years, incentives and mandates for renewable energy have been used to advance different energy policies, such as ensuring energy security or promoting environmentally benign energy sources. Renewable energy has beneficial attributes, such as low emissions and replenishable energy supply, that are not fully reflected in the market price. Accordingly, governments have used a variety of programs to promote renewable energy resources, technologies, and renewable-based transportation fuels. (1) This paper discusses: (1) financial incentives and regulatory mandates used by Federal and State governments and Federal research and development (R&D), (2), (3) and (2) their effectiveness in promoting renewables. A financial incentive is defined in this report as providing one or more of the following benefits: A transfer of economic resources by the Government to the buyer or seller of a good or service that has the effect of reducing the price paid, or, increasing the price received, respectively; Reducing the cost of production of the good or service; or, Creating or expanding a market for producers. The intended effect of a financial incentive is to increase the production or consumption of the good or service over what it otherwise would have been without the incentive. Examples of financial incentives are: tax credits, production payments, trust funds, and low-cost loans. Research and development is included as a support program because its effect is to decrease cost, thus enhancing the commercial viability of the good(s) provided. (4)

**Aff ground – they destroy nuclear affs which are the heart of the topic – outweighs because it’s a prerequisite to clash**

**Good is good enough – competing interpretations forces a race to the bottom and judge intervention – this is no less arbitrary than deciding limits are key**

### NG

#### SMR key to help nuclear beat-out natural gas

Lamonica 12—Tech Review Writer. 20 years of experience covering technology and business (8/9/12, Martin, A Glut of Natural Gas Leaves Nuclear Power Stalled, [www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/](http://www.technologyreview.com/news/428737/a-glut-of-natural-gas-leaves-nuclear-power/))

The nuclear renaissance is in danger of petering out before it has even begun, but not for the reasons most people once thought. Forget safety concerns, or the problem of where to store nuclear waste—the issue is simply cheap, abundant natural gas.¶ General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt caused a stir last month when he told the Financial Times that it's "hard to justify nuclear" in light of low natural gas prices. Since GE sells all manner of power generation equipment, including components for nuclear plants, Immelt's comments hold a lot of weight.¶ Cheap natural gas has become the fuel of choice with electric utilities, making building expensive new nuclear plants an increasingly tough sell. The United States is awash in natural gas largely thanks to horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking" technology, which allows drillers to extract gas from shale deposits once considered too difficult to reach. In 2008, gas prices were approaching $13 per million BTUs; prices have now dropped to around $3. ¶ When gas prices were climbing, there were about 30 nuclear plant projects in various stages of planning in the United States. Now the Nuclear Energy Institute estimates that, at most, five plants will be built by 2020, and those will only be built thanks to favorable financing terms and the ability to pay for construction from consumers' current utility bills. Two reactors now under construction in Georgia, for example, moved ahead with the aid of an $8.33 billion loan guarantee from the U.S. Department of Energy. ¶ What happens after those planned projects is hard to predict. "The question is whether we'll see any new nuclear," says Revis James, the director of generation research and development at the Electric Power Research Institute. "The prospects are not good."¶ Outside the United States, it's a different story. Unconventional sources of natural gas also threaten the expansion of nuclear, although the potential impact is less clear-cut. Around the world, there are 70 plants now under construction, but shale gas also looms as a key factor in planning for the future. Prices for natural gas are already higher in Asia and Europe, and shale gas resources are not as fully developed as they are the United States.¶ Some countries are also blocking the development of new natural gas resources. France, for instance, which has a strong commitment to nuclear, has banned fracking in shale gas exploration because of concerns over the environmental impact.¶ Fast-growing China, meanwhile, needs all the energy sources available and is building nuclear power plants as fast as possible.¶ Even in United States, of course, super cheap natural gas will not last forever. With supply exceeding demand, some drillers are said to be losing money on natural gas, which could push prices back up. Prices will also be pushed upward by utilities, as they come to rely on more natural gas for power generation, says James.¶ Ali Azad, the chief business development officer at energy company Babcock & Wilcox, thinks the answer is making nuclear power smaller, cheaper, and faster. His is one of a handful of companies developing small modular reactors that can be built in three years, rather than 10 or more, for a fraction of the cost of gigawatt-size reactors. Although this technology is not yet commercially proven, the company has a customer in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which expects to have its first unit online in 2021 (see "A Preassembled Nuclear Reactor").¶ "When we arrive, we will have a level cost of energy on the grid, which competes favorably with a brand-new combined-cycle natural gas plants when gas prices are between $6 to $8," said Azad. He sees strong demand in power-hungry China and places such as Saudia Arabia, where power is needed for desalination.¶ Even if natural gas remains cheaper, utilities don't want to find themselves with an overreliance on gas, which has been volatile on price in the past, so nuclear power will still contribute to the energy mix. "[Utilities] still continue [with nuclear] but with a lower level of enthusiasm—it's a hedging strategy," says Hans-Holger Rogner from the Planning and Economics Studies section of the International Atomic Energy Agency. "They don't want to pull all their eggs in one basket because of the new kid on the block called shale gas."

### Grid

#### Grid is fragile – Cyber attacks coming

Kellermann 1/10/13 – Tom is a Commissioner on The Commission on Cyber Security for the 44th Presidency and serves as a Special Advisor to the International Cyber Security Protection Alliance (ICSPA), *2013’s Pandoras Box*, http://www.simplysecurity.com/2013/01/10/2013-pandoras-box-vulnerable-cyber-attac/

We have entered a brave new world in cyberspace where we are ever more dependent upon cyberspace and our electrical grid. At the same time, the energy sector is becoming more vulnerable to cyber-attack. The energy sector’s history of vulnerability began with the Blackout of August 2003. The sector responded to that blackout by following the financial sector’s resiliency model to ensure business continuity. In their effort to defend against kinetic events like blackouts they exacerbated their cybersecurity posture. The increase of remote access and Internet facing SCADA/ICS systems opened up a proverbial “Pandora’s box” of increased risks and threats to these systems. The situational awareness of our cyber adversaries has been greatly enhanced sometime using nothing more than publicly available tools. Now targeting of exposed SCADA systems can be achieved via Google-fu to identify embedded systems that are exposed to the Internet. In addition there a disturbing trend that is starting to pop up on Pastebin whose posts expose SCADA/ICS devices, their IP addresses, and other identifying information for sale. Not only are these systems increasingly connected and accessible: it’s increasingly easy to find them. The risks of accessibility and discoverability are exacerbated by the advent of Stuxnet and Flame. Stuxnet ushered in a new era of weaponized code. (See:<http://blog.trendmicro.com/trendlabs-security-intelligence/stuxnet-used-in-blackhat-seo-campaign/> ). But governments no longer have a monopoly on cyber weapons of war: in some cases they’ve lost control of the weapons they built only to see them fall into the hands of criminals and others. The arms bazaars of Eastern Europe and South America have now distributed asymmetric capabilities like DuQu to non-state actors. In 2013- the non-state actor community will begin to attack the energy sector for political, theological and financial purposes. It is imperative that the energy sector learn from the gaps in cybersecurity which exist in the financial and government sectors. An over-reliance on perimeter defenses and encryption will not manage the exposures or the targeted attacks employed by our adversaries. I believe the SANS and the NSA Twenty Critical Security Controls represent a good starting point to begin to allow offense to inform defense. (See: <http://www.sans.org/critical-security-controls>). The energy sector is embracing SCADA/ICS and smart grid technologies. These technologies allow for greater resiliency and efficiency but they do manifest greater operational and systemic risk of integrity attacks. This added risk must be managed thoughtfully. In order to close Pandora’s Box we must move beyond the energy sector’s use of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation’s (NECR) Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) security standards (See:<http://www.nerc.com/files/CIP-002-4.pdf> ) and embrace advanced threat protection technologies, virtual patching and file integrity monitoring.

### AQIM = Threat

#### AQIM is a existential threat

Pantucci 1/21/13 – Raffaello is Senior Research Fellow at Royal United Services Institute, Analysis: How serious is Sahara terror threat? http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-21126533

UK Prime Minister David Cameron has said that Islamist extremists in North Africa pose a "large and existential threat" - a comment he made following the siege of a gas facility in Algeria, where dozens of people, nearly all of them foreigners, were killed. "It will require a response that is about years, even decades, rather than months," Mr Cameron said. "What we face is an extremist, Islamist, al-Qaeda-linked terrorist group. Just as we had to deal with that in Pakistan and in Afghanistan so the world needs to come together to deal with this threat in north Africa." The group responsible for the incident in In Amenas in Algeria appears to have been led by Mokhtar Belmokhtar, a local jihadist-criminal who had been a commander of al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). He left or was asked to leave AQIM late last year. Branching out, he founded an independent faction called the Signed-in-Blood Battalion that seems to have operated out of territory controlled by the Movement for Unity and Jihad in West Africa (Mujao) in northern Mali. Belmokhtar's faction claims that the assault in Algeria was conducted to avenge the French decision to attack northern Mali. But, with his organisation reportedly having agents within the compound, it seems likely that this was a longer-term plot that was brought forward in response to the French assault. It was in fact Belmokhtar's close companion, Omar Ould Hamaha, a leader in Mujao, who declared in response to the French intervention in Mali that France "has opened the gates of hell [and] has fallen into a trap much more dangerous than Iraq, Afghanistan or Somalia".

### AT: Can’t get weapons

#### AQIM is likely to get Libyan weapons

**Ennahar Online 11**

[“Libya, a potential arsenal for AQIM”, 5-24-2011, http://www.ennaharonline.com/en/international/6618.html]

Libya could become an arsenal for Al Qaeda in Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and a place of attraction for the international anti-Western jihad, warned Tuesday the coordinator of the fight against terrorism in the EU. "We have several subjects of concerns," said Gilles de Kerchove during a speech to the European Parliament meeting in committees in Brussels. "Libya and Yemen, became very weak state, tribal, could become failed states and places of attraction for international jihad," he said. "**The weapons looted in the Libya arsenals, and some are very sophisticated, are likely to fall in the hands of AQIM**," he added. Gilles de Kerchove has also mentioned the dismantling of the intelligence services in Tunisia and Egypt "because they were the arms of repression" and "release of jihadists who have remained active.

### K

**Our approach to the 1AC is valid**

**Owen ‘2**

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

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

**Permutation do both – Double bind- either a) the alternative should overcome any residual link or b) the alt isn’t strong enough to overcome the status quo**

#### No root cause – war causes their impacts

Goldstein ‘1—Professor of International Relations at American University, 2001 (Joshua S., War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice”. Then if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influences wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.  So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gener and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression/” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

**Reject the alt—**

1. **Floating PIKs bad—steals the entirety of the Aff and excludes an assumption, which is inherently blurry and difficult to pin down.**
2. **Vague alts bad—alt is vague in implementation, means it’ll morph in the block to dodge 2AC offense.**

#### Government action necessary to break out of the consumerist drive – only government signals like the plan legitimizing sustainability make a widespread psychic break with consumerism possible

**Jackson**, 20**12** (Tim, Fairly bright guy, *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet*, Kindle Locations 2803-2854)

The downshifting movement now has a surprising allegiance across a number of developed economies. A recent survey on downshifting in Australia found that 23 per cent of respondents had engaged in some form of downshifting in the five years prior to the study. A staggering 83 per cent felt that Australians are too materialistic. An earlier study in the US found that 28 per cent had taken some steps to simplify and 62 per cent expressed a willingness to do so. Very similar results have been found in Europe.23 Research on the success of these initiatives is quite limited. But the findings from studies that do exist are interesting. In the first place, the evidence confirms that ‘simplifiers’ appear to be happier. Consuming less, voluntarily, can improve subjective well-being – completely contrary to the conventional model.24 At the same time, intentional communities remain marginal. The spiritual basis for them doesn’t appeal to everyone, and the secular versions seem less resistant to the incursions of consumerism. Some of these initiatives depend heavily on having sufficient personal assets to provide the economic security needed to pursue a simpler lifestyle. More importantly, even those in the vanguard of social change turn out to be haunted by conflict – internal and external.25 These conflicts arise because people find themselves at odds with their own social world. Participation in the life of society becomes a challenge in its own right. People are trying to live, quite literally, in opposition to the structures and values that dominate society. In the normal course of events, these structures and values shape and constrain how people behave. They have a profound influence on how easy or hard it is to behave sustainably.26 The Role of Structural Change Examples of the perverse effect of dominant structures are legion: private transport is incentivized over public transport; motorists are prioritized over pedestrians; energy supply is subsidized and protected, while demand management is often chaotic and expensive; waste disposal is cheap, economically and behaviourally; recycling demands time and effort: ‘bring centres’ are few and far between and often overflowing with waste. Equally important are the subtle but damaging signals sent by government, regulatory frameworks, financial institutions, the media and our education systems: business salaries are higher than those in the public sector, particularly at the top; nurses and those in the caring professions are consistently less well paid; private investment is written down at high discount rates making longterm costs invisible; success is counted in terms of material status (salary, house size and so on); children are brought up as a ‘shopping generation’ – hooked on brand, celebrity and status.27 Policy and media messages about the recession underline this point. Opening a huge new shopping centre at the height of the financial crisis in October 2008, Mayor of London Boris Johnson spoke of persuading people to come out and spend their money, despite the credit crunch. Londoners had made a ‘prudent decision to give Thursday morning a miss and come shopping’, he said of the huge crowds who attended the opening.28 George W. Bush’s infamous call for people to ‘go out shopping’ in the wake of the 9/11 disaster is one of the most staggering examples of the same phenomenon. Little wonder that people trying to live more sustainably find themselves in conflict with the social world around them. These kinds of asymmetry represent a culture of consumption that sends all the wrong signals, penalizing pro-environmental behaviour, and making it all but impossible even for highly motivated people to act sustainably without personal sacrifice. It’s important to take this evidence seriously. As laboratories for social change, intentional households and communities are vital in pointing to the possibilities for flourishing within ecological limits. But they are also critical in highlighting the limits of voluntarism. Simplistic exhortations for people to resist consumerism are destined to failure. Particularly when the messages flowing from government are so painfully inconsistent. People readily identify this inconsistency and perceive it as hypocrisy. Or something worse. Under current conditions, it’s tantamount to asking people to give up key capabilities and freedoms as social beings. Far from being irrational to resist these demands, it would be irrational not to, in our society. Several lessons flow from this. The first is the obvious need for government to get its message straight. Urging people to Act on CO2, to insulate their homes, turn down their thermostat, put on a jumper, drive a little less, walk a little more, holiday at home, buy locally produced goods (and so on) will either go unheard or be rejected as manipulation for as long as all the messages about high-street consumption point in the opposite direction.29 Equally, it’s clear that changing the social logic of consumption cannot simply be relegated to the realm of individual choice. In spite of a growing desire for change, it’s almost impossible for people to simply choose sustainable lifestyles, however much they’d like to. Even highly-motivated individuals experience conflict as they attempt to escape consumerism. And the chances of extending this behaviour across society are negligible without changes in the social structure.

**Fear of war prevents nuclear war from actually being started.**

**Futterman '94** Dr. J. A. H. Futterman, tech at Lawrence Livermore National Lab, "Meditations on the Morality of Nuclear Weapons Work, Obscenity and Peace, 1994, http://www.dogchurch.org/scriptorium/nuke.html

But the inhibitory effect of reliable nuclear weapons goes deeper than Shirer's deterrence of adventurer-conquerors. It changes the way we think individually and culturally, preparing us for a future we cannot now imagine. Jungian psychiatrist Anthony J. Stevens states, [15] "History would indicate that people cannot rise above their narrow sectarian concerns without some overwhelming paroxysm. It took the War of Independence and the Civil War to forge the United States, World War I to create the League of Nations, World War II to create the United Nations Organization and the European Economic Community. Only catastrophe, it seems, forces people to take the wider view. Or what about fear? Can the horror which we all experience when we contemplate the possibility of nuclear extinction mobilize in us sufficient libidinal energy to resist the archetypes of war? Certainly, the moment we become blasé about the possibility of holocaust we are lost. As long as horror of nuclear exchange remains uppermost we can recognize that nothing is worth it. War becomes the impossible option. Perhaps horror, the experience of horror, the consciousness of horror, is our only hope. Perhaps horror alone will enable us to overcome the otherwise invincible attraction of war." Thus I also continue engaging in nuclear weapons work to help fire that world-historical warning shot I mentioned above, namely, that as our beneficial technologies become more powerful, so will our weapons technologies, unless genuine peace precludes it. We must build a future more peaceful than our past, if we are to have a future at all, with or without nuclear weapons — a fact we had better learn before worse things than nuclear weapons are invented. If you're a philosopher, this means that I regard the nature of humankind as mutable rather than fixed, but that I think most people welcome change in their personalities and cultures with all the enthusiasm that they welcome death — thus, the fear of nuclear annihilation of ourselves and all our values may be what we require in order to become peaceful enough to survive our future technological breakthroughs.[16]

**Realism is true and inevitable – a shift away Threats are real**

**Schweller 4** [Randall L. Schweller, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University, “Unanswered Threats A Neoclassical RealistTheory of Underbalancing,” International Security 29.2 (2004) 159-201, Muse]

Despite the historical frequency of underbalancing, little has been written on the subject. Indeed, Geoffrey Blainey's memorable observation that for "every thousand pages published on the causes of wars there is less than one page directly on the causes of peace" could have been made with equal veracity about overreactions to threats as opposed to underreactions to them.92 Library shelves are filled with books on the causes and dangers of exaggerating threats, ranging from studies of domestic politics to bureaucratic politics, to political psychology, to organization theory. By comparison, there have been few studies at any level of analysis or from any theoretical perspective that directly explain why states have with some, if not equal, **regularity underestimated dangers to their survival**. There may be some cognitive or normative bias at work here. Consider, for instance, that there is a commonly used word, paranoia, for the unwarranted fear that people are, in some way, "out to get you" or are planning to do oneharm. I suspect that just as many people are afflicted with the opposite psychosis: the delusion that everyone loves you when, in fact, they do not even like you. Yet, we do not have a familiar word for this phenomenon. Indeed, I am unaware of any word that describes this pathology (hubris and overconfidence come close, but they plainly define something other than what I have described). That noted, international relations theory does have a frequently used phrase for the pathology of states' underestimation of threats to their survival, the so-called Munich analogy. The term is used, however, in a disparaging way by theorists to ridicule those who employ it. The central claim is that the naïveté associated with Munich and the outbreak of World War II has become an overused and inappropriate analogy because few leaders are as evil and unappeasable as Adolf Hitler. Thus, the analogy either mistakenly causes leaders [End Page 198] to adopt hawkish and overly competitive policies or is deliberately used by leaders to justify such policies and mislead the public. A more compelling explanation for the paucity of studies on underreactions to threats, however, is the tendency of theories to reflect contemporary issues as well as the desire of theorists and journals to provide society with policy- relevant theories that may help resolve or manage urgent security problems. Thus, born in the atomic age with its new balance of terror and an ongoing Cold War, the field of security studies has naturally produced theories of and prescriptions for national security that have had little to say about—and are, in fact, heavily biased against warnings of—the dangers of underreacting to or underestimating threats. After all, the nuclear revolution was not about overkill but, as Thomas Schelling pointed out, speed of kill and mutual kill.93 Given the apocalyptic consequences of miscalculation, accidents, or inadvertent nuclear war, small wonder that theorists were more concerned about overreacting to threats than underresponding to them. At a time when all of humankind could be wiped out in less than twenty-five minutes, theorists may be excused for stressing the benefits of caution under conditions of uncertainty and erring on the side of inferring from ambiguous actions overly benign assessments of the opponent's intentions. The overwhelming fear was that a crisis "might unleash forces of an essentially military nature that overwhelm the political process and bring on a war thatnobody wants. Many important conclusions about the risk of nuclear war, and thus about the political meaning of nuclear forces, rest on this fundamental idea."94 Now that the Cold War is over, we can begin to redress these biases in the literature. In that spirit, I have offered a domestic politics model to explain why threatened states often fail to adjust in a prudent and coherent way to dangerous changes in their strategic environment. The model fits nicely with recent realist studies on imperial under- and overstretch. Specifically, it is consistent with Fareed Zakaria's analysis of U.S. foreign policy from 1865 to 1889, when, he claims, the United States had the national power and opportunity to expand but failed to do so because it lacked sufficient state power (i.e., the state was weak relative to society).95 Zakaria claims that the United States did [End Page 199] not take advantage of opportunities in its environment to expand because it lacked the institutional state strength to harness resources from society that were needed to do so. I am making a similar argument with respect to balancing rather than expansion: incoherent, fragmented states are unwilling and unable to balance against potentially dangerous threats because elites view the domestic risks as too high, and they are unable to mobilize the required resources from a divided society. The arguments presented here also suggest that elite fragmentation and disagreement within a competitive political process, which Jack Snyder cites as an explanation for overexpansionist policies, are more likely to produce underbalancing than overbalancing behavior among threatened incoherent states.96 This is because a balancing strategy carries certain political costs and risks with few, if any, compensating short-term political gains, and because the strategic environment is always somewhat uncertain. Consequently, logrolling among fragmented elites within threatened states is more likely to generate overly cautious responses to threats than overreactions to them. This dynamic captures the underreaction of democratic states to the rise of Nazi Germany during the interwar period.97 In addition to elite fragmentation, I have suggested some basic domestic-level variables that regularly intervene to thwart balance of power predictions

### 2AC States CP

**DOD say no - empirically does not implement energy policy recommendations**

**DSB 8**

Defense Science Board Task Force on DoD Energy Strategy, Feb 2008, More Figh -Less Fuel, www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/ADA477619.pdf

Finding #1: The recommendations from the 2001 Defense Science Board Task Force Report “More Capable Warfighting Through Reduced Fuel Burden” have not been implemented.

The principal finding of the 2001 DSB report was that DoD systematically underestimates the cost of fuel to its tactical forces by failing to recognize the costs of the support structure and the protection necessary to bring that fuel to the systems that use it. As a consequence, significant warfighting, logistics and monetary benefits are available from making weapons systems more fuel-efficient, but those benefits are not valued or emphasized in DoD’s requirements and acquisition processes. The report found that the requirements process does not require energy efficiency in deployed systems, the acquisition process does not value it, so the PPBES process cannot not provide it visibility when considering investment decisions.

These findings remain valid today. Few of the recommendations of that study have been implemented to date. Those that have begun; making energy efficiency a selective Key Performance Parameter in system design, and using the fully burdened cost of fuel in life cycle costing of alternative systems; are in their early stages of implementation. Focused leadership will be required to complete the recommendations of the 2001 study and similar recommendations made herein.

**Turn- the States would get rocked by the NRC- the military is key to speed through liscening- that’s Andres and Breetz**

**More evidence**

**King et. al. ’11** (Marcus King , LaVar Huntzinger , Thoi Nguyen, CNA Think Tank, Environment and Energy Team, “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations”, March 31, 2011, LEQ)

Certification and licensing issues The most basic licensing issue relates to whether NRC will have jurisdiction over potential nuclear reactor sites or whether DoD could be **self-regulating**. Our conversations with NRC indicate it is the only possible licensing authority for reactors that supply power to the com- mercial grid. However, DOE and **DoD are authorized to regulate mission critical nuclear facilities under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act**. **There is some historical precedent for DoD exercising this authority.** For example, the Army Nuclear Program was granted exception under this rule with regard to the reactor that operated aboard the Sturgis barge in the 1960s and 1970s.

### 2AC immigration

#### Won’t pass.

Porter 2-7. [Eduardo, economics reporter, "2nd chance to overhaul immigration" International Herald Tribune -- lexis]

Despite the strong case for an overhaul, however, changing the United States' immigration laws may be tougher than the president appears to believe. While the administration may have overcome some of the same obstacles as in 2007, the proposed changes will probably face deep-seated opposition from many Americans - including most conservative Republicans - to what they will view as a potentially large expansion of welfare.¶ Mr. Obama's proposal is based on principles similar to those of the 2007 attempt: a path to citizenship for millions of illegal immigrants already in the United States, a legal channel for future immigrant workers and their families and a plan to better secure borders and enforce immigration laws.¶ Yet the necessary changes in immigration rules today are quite different from 2007. Notably, the elements needed to stop the flow of illegal immigrants north are much less important to the enterprise. The Obama administration has already spent huge amounts of money on border enforcement. And deportations have soared. What is more, illegal immigration has slowed to a trickle as the Mexican economy has grown more robustly than that of the United States. The illegal immigrant population has even been shrinking in the last few years. And it may continue to do so as the Mexican population of prime migration-age people stops growing.¶ Also, many employers have already gotten some of what they wanted: The number of workers entering the United States on temporary visas for low-end jobs in agriculture and other industries has increased sharply.¶ ''The discussion is in a different environment,'' said Gordon H. Hanson, an expert on the economics of immigration at the University of California, San Diego. ''The flow of new immigrants is not the story anymore.''¶ That might help the cause of change in some ways. It could allow the discussion about work visas to focus on the highly educated workers coveted by technology companies and pre-empt the kind of argument between business and labor over visas for cheap immigrant workers that sank the bill in 2007. The A.F.L.-C.I.O., for instance, has heartily embraced Mr. Obama's plan.¶ But what supporters of an overhaul of immigration law seem to be overlooking is that those very changes could also make it more difficult to build a coalition across the political divide. If change is mainly about granting citizenship to 11 million mostly poor illegal immigrants with relatively little education, it is going to land squarely in the cross hairs of the epic battle over taxes, entitlements and the role of government in American society.¶ It is hard to say with precision what effect offering citizenship would have on the budget, but the chances are good that it would cost the government money. Half to three-quarters of illegal immigrants pay taxes, according to studies reviewed in a 2007 report by the Congressional Budget Office. And they are relatively inexpensive, compared with Americans of similar incomes. Their children can attend public schools at government expense - putting a burden on state and local budgets. But they are barred from receiving U.S. government benefits like the earned-income tax credit, which benefits lower-income people; food stamps, a food subsidy program; and Medicaid, a health insurance program for the poor. Only their American-born children can get those.¶ Government revenue might not change much with legalization. Most illegal immigrants who do not pay taxes probably work in the cash economy - as nannies or gardeners - where tax compliance among citizens is also low. Costs, of course, would increase. Once they became citizens, immigrants would be entitled to the same array of government benefits as other Americans. Just for Social Security, which provides benefits to retirees and disabled people, and Medicare, a health insurance program for the elderly, offering citizenship to illegal immigrants would mean losing a subsidy worth several billion dollars a year in payroll taxes from immigrants who cannot collect benefits in old age.¶ The White House and other backers of an overhaul have made much of a 2007 analysis by the Congressional Budget Office concluding that the failed immigration bill would have increased government revenue by $48 billion over a decade while adding only $23 billion to direct spending on entitlements and other programs. But the report also said that with the costs of carrying out the new law, it would have actually increased the budget deficit by $18 billion over the decade and several billion a year after that. What is more, it noted that most of the expected new tax revenue would have come from new immigrant workers, not from the population of those with newly legal status.¶ History suggests the United States could have much to gain by turning illegal immigrants into citizens and putting an end to unauthorized immigration. The last time the United States permitted illegal immigrants to gain legal status, in 1986, incomes jumped for those who took advantage of the opportunity. Their children became more proficient in English and completed more years of school - becoming more productive and paying more taxes over their lifetimes.¶ But the same history underscores how immigration sets off fears about further sharing of government resources. Ten years after the immigration overhaul of 1986, reeling from public anger, Congress passed a law barring legal immigrants from means-tested government services. The issue is likely to be a major flash point again. Dr. Hanson, of the University of California, San Diego, pointed to ''the older white man who sees his entitlements at risk because of the demands placed by legalization on our fiscal resources.''¶ Conservative Republicans set on cutting government spending share those concerns. And for all their reasons to reach out to Hispanics, they might not find giving illegal immigrants legal status politically advantageous. On Tuesday, Republicans in the House argued against granting citizenship to illegal immigrants at all.¶ Hispanics are more liberal than the general population on economic matters, polls suggest, and more supportive of Big Government initiatives. Granting them citizenship would give them the vote.¶ As Steven A. Camarota, director of research at the Center for Immigration Studies, an advocacy group in Washington that favors more limits on immigration, said, ''They will see legalization as a voter registration drive for Democrats.''

**Obama isn’t using political capital, and if he did it would fail**

**Rothman ‘1-29** (Obama Says Nothing In Presser, Saves Immigration Reform by Noah Rothman, political analyst and journalist, analyst with Mediaite.com, a news and opinion blog covering politics and entertainment in the media industry as well as other issues. It is the flagship blog of Abrams Media, a ring of blogs run by ABC legal analyst Dan Abrams 5:23 pm, January 29th, 2013

CNN reported on Monday that the Congressional Hispanic Caucus specifically **requested the White House to stand down** and allow Republican Senators and Congressmen, **warming to** the possibility of **a major deal** on immigration reform, to entertain the proposals put forward **by the Gang of Eight**. “It’s a tricky thing. We want him to lead, but Republicans are in a difficult position,” one unnamed Democratic source told CNN. This time, **the president complied**. **This is a major**, though **underreported**, **development. It may have preserved the political will** that seems to exist in Congress for a broad reform package that includes a pathway to citizenship for many illegal immigrants while strengthening border security: My fears that the president did not truly want progress on immigration reform, but would rather seek to isolate his opponents and preserve their opposition to comprehensive reform as a political cudgel for his party’s electoral purposes, were not unfounded. Obama has set dubious **precedent after precedent of wrenching legislative defeat from the jaws of victory**. On July 25, 2011, **with just days to go before the debt ceiling limit** was reached on August 2 of that year, President Barack Obama delivered a prime time address to the nation warning of the consequences of the House Republican plan to avert the catastrophe of default on the nation’s debt. The president did not offer a concrete plan of his own to avert the crisis, but endorsed Sen. Harry Reid’s (D-NV) proposal which he knew was unpalatable to Republicans. The president’s speech **hardened the positions of partisan members** of Congress. The framework of a bipartisan deal **was scuttled**. What was ultimately passed was not favorable to the White House and amounted to a Republican victory – one that Obama’s supporters on the left were roiled over. The episode amounted to the most significant defeat of Obama’s presidency to date: The president had learned his lesson.

**No link – plan doesn’t cost money**

**DOE 11,**

“Funding Federal Energy and Water Projects”, July, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/52085.pdf>

On-site renewable PPAs allow Federal agencies to fund on-site renewable energy projects with no upfront capital costs incurred. A developer installs a renewable energy system on agency property under an agreement that the agency will purchase the power generated by the system. The agency pays for the system through these power purchase payments over the life of the contract. After installation, the developer owns, operates, and maintains the system for the life of the contract. The PPA price is typically determined through a competitive procurement process.

#### Turn- SMR’s are popular in Congress

Sullivan, Stenger, and Roma ’10 (Mary Anne Sullivan is a partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C. Congress, Daniel F. Stenger is a partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Amy C. Roma is a senior associate in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., “Are Small Reactors the Next Big Thing in Nuclear?”, [www.pennenergy.com/index/power/display/3288852302/articles/electric-light-power/volume-88/issue-6/sections/are-small-reactors-the-next-big-thing-in-nuclear.html](http://www.pennenergy.com/index/power/display/3288852302/articles/electric-light-power/volume-88/issue-6/sections/are-small-reactors-the-next-big-thing-in-nuclear.html), November 2010, LEQ)

#### SMRs have enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress. The House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have approved similar legislation designed to promote the development and deployment of SMRs along the lines the DOE has proposed. Promoting SMR development in legislation has its price. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the Senate bill would cost $407 million over the next five years to support cost-sharing programs with private companies for the development of two standard SMR designs. Costs for the out-years were not included in the estimate, but the bill would require the DOE to obtain NRC design certifications for the reactors by 2018 and to secure combined construction and operating licenses by Jan. 1, 2021. If Congress can pass an energy bill, it seems likely the bill will support SMRs. Even in the absence of new authorizing legislation, however, appropriations bills that must be passed to keep the government running almost certainly will contain strong support for the DOE's research and development program for SMRs.

#### PC theory is wrong- winners win

*-add green highlighting for immigration*

Hirsh, 2-7 – National Journal chief correspondent, citing various political scientists

[Michael, former Newsweek senior correspondent, "There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital," National Journal, 2-9-13, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207, accessed 2-8-13, mss]

**There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital**

The idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get itwrong. On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of **this** talk **will have no bearing on what actually happens** over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The **political tectonics** have **shift**ed **dramatically in very little time**. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, **political capital** is a concept that **misleads** far more than it enlightens. **It is** **distortionary**. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “**Winning wins.”** In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some **political scientists** **who study** the elusive calculus of **how to pass legislation** and run successful presidencies **say** that **political capital is**, at best, **an empty concept**, and that **almost nothing in** the **academic literature** successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning** on one issue often **changes the** **calculation** for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where **the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants**, and [they]he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the **other actors**” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may **change positions to get on the winning side**. **It’s a bandwagon effect**.” ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because [they’re]he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.)

[Matt note: gender paraphrased]

#### Can’t solve the economy – CIR will cost trillions

Daily Caller 1/31 (<http://dailycaller.com/2013/01/31/expert-bipartisan-immigration-reform-bill-will-cost-trillions/#ixzz2JcReWOIx>)

Robert Rector, a senior research fellow with the Heritage Foundation, expects the bipartisan immigration reform proposal, which includes a path to citizenship, will end up costing taxpayers more overtime than the trillion-dollar calculations he testified to during debate over the 2007 immigration reform bill.

¶ “[The proposal] seems to be virtually identical to the 2007 bill and would be extremely costly to the U.S. taxpayers,” Rector told The Daily Caller in a Wednesday interview. “Granting amnesty or legal status to illegals will generate costs in Medicare and Social Security alone of $2.5 trillion above any taxes paid in.”¶ ¶ According to Rector, the majority of the undocumented immigrants who would eventually be legalized by the legislation are largely uneducated, and therefore more likely to be dependent on government assistance. Fifty to 60 percent of the new immigrants are high school dropouts, and 75-80 percent have no more than a high school degree. “It’s not like they pay in a lot when they are young, and they take it out when they’re old. They are in fiscal deficit every year of their lives,” Rector explained. “For example, the typical household headed by someone who does not have a high school degree, as I said in that paper in 2007, got back then $30,000 in benefits and paid $10,000 [in income and consumption taxes]. It’s a net cost of $20,000. **That would be significantly higher now.”**¶ ¶ Rector’s numbers, he noted, were from 2007, which means that now the cost will higher due to the increase in benefits programs and number of undocumented.

### Econ

#### Nuclear industry revival increases labor and manufacturing - boost the economy

Adams ’10 (Rod Adams. Naval War College diploma in National Policy and Strategy (with highest honors) May 2003 - GPA 4.0, Pro-nuclear advocate with small nuclear plant operating and design experience. Former submarine Engineer Officer. Founder, Adams Atomic Engines, Inc. Host and producer, The Atomic Show Podcast, “Nuclear Industry Can Lead a Revival in Skilled Labor and Manufacturing in the United States”, <http://atomicinsights.com/2010/11/nuclear-industry-can-lead-a-revival-in-skilled-labor-and-manufacturing-in-the-united-states.html>, November 15, 2010, LEQ)

The Nuclear Energy Institute, the American Nuclear Society and the North American Young Generation in Nuclear have been investing time and money into focused workforce development programs for several years. The people leading the effort are taking the action to ensure that there are educated and trained people who are ready to meet the challenge of continuing to reliably operate and maintain our existing fleet of 104 nuclear reactors at the same time that we are reestablishing our nuclear plant manufacturing and construction industry. In 1950 manufacturing accounted for more than 30 percent of all U.S. employment. These skilled labor careers provided an unprecedented standard of living for more than two decades following the end of World War II, allowing millions of Americans to purchase homes and autos and pay for their children to go to college. By 2006, manufacturing employment shrunk to a mere 10 percent of U.S. employment and with it the bulk of America’s well-paying skilled labor careers. Prognosticators predicted manufacturing’s ultimate demise as a significant driver of the American economy. But a look at the U.S. nuclear industry tells a different story: a narrative where job growth in the skilled trades is on an upward trend and the industry can serve as a role model for the revitalization of the U.S. manufacturing sector through the creation of new careers and economic expansion. In fact, it already has.

### 2AC Renewable Energy Trade-Off

#### Cross apply the thumpers- spending now triggers the disad

#### Link turn- SMR’s enable forward deployment of renewable electricity projects- reactors provide a stable fueling station- spurs development

Andres and Breetz ‘11 (Richard B. Andres is professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, Hanna L. Breetz is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications”, February 16, 2011, LEQ)

Operational Vulnerability. Operational energy use represents a second serious vulnerability for the U.S. military. In recent years, the military has become significantly more effective by making greater use of technology in the field. The price of this improvement has been a vast increase in energy use. Over the last 10 years, for instance, the Marine Corps has more than tripled its operational use of energy. Energy and water now make up 70 percent of the logistics burden for troops operating in forward locations in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. This burden represents a severe vulnerability and is costing lives. In 2006, troop losses from logistics convoys became so serious that Marine Corps Major General Rich- ard Zilmer sent the Pentagon a “Priority 1” request for renewable energy backup.11 This unprecedented request put fuel convoy issues on the national security agenda, triggering several high-level studies and leading to the establishment of the Power Surety Task Force, which fast-tracked energy innovations such as mobile power stations and super-insulating spray foam. Currently, the Marine Corps is considering a goal of producing all non- vehicle energy used at forward bases organically and substantially increasing the fuel efficiency of vehicles used in forward areas. Nevertheless, attempts to solve the current energy use problem with efficiency measures and renewable sources are unlikely to fully address this vulnerability. Wind, solar, and hydro generation along with tailored cuts of energy use in the field can reduce the number of convoys needed to supply troops, but these measures will quickly reach limits and have their own challenges, such as visibility, open exposure, and intermittency. Deploying vehicles with greater fuel efficiency will further reduce convoy vulnerability but will not solve the problem. A strong consensus has been building within planning circles that small reactors have the potential to significantly reduce liquid fuel use and, consequently, the need for convoys to supply power at forward locations. Just over 30 percent of operational fuel used in Afghanistan today goes to generating electricity. Small reactors could easily generate all electricity needed to run large forward operating bases. This innovation would, for in- stance, allow the Marine Corps to meet its goal of self- sufficient bases. Mobile reactors also have the potential to make the Corps significantly lighter and more mobile by reducing its logistics tail. Another way that small reactors could potentially be used in the field is to power hydrogen electrolysis units to generate hydrogen for vehicles.12 At forward locations, ground vehicles currently use around 22 percent imported fuel. Many ground transport vehicles can be converted to run on hydrogen, considerably reducing the need for fuel convoys. If the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are indicative of future operations, and fuel convoys remain a target for enemy action, using small reactors at forward locations has the potential to save hundreds or thousands of U.S. lives.

#### Warming doesn't cause extinction

**Lomborg ‘8** (Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>

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

#### Renewable energy alone is more costly for the DOD- triggers our budget internal- that’s due to dependence on conventional generation- plan solves

Thorning ’12 (Margo Thorning, Chief Economist, American Council for Capital Formation, “Smart Energy Keeps Military Strong”, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php>, May 24, 2012, LEQ)

The goal of the military should be to protect the United States. Asking it to switch to more use of renewable energy will raise the costs to U.S. taxpayers and do little for the environment or for energy security of supply. In addition, U.S. petroleum consumption has declined by 7.8% over the 2005-2010 period while domestic production has risen by 6.5% over the same period. For example, if the military uses more biofuels, the costs to the taxpayer will also rise since biofuels contain less energy per gallon than fossil fuel. Aviation fuel made with biofuels is substantially more expensive than convention fuel. Having the military switch to more use of renewable electricity will raise costs to taxpayers since renewable energy is more expensive and has to be backed up with conventional generation. See Tables 2 and 3 in my recent testimony for data on higher costs of renewable electricity. After the 2012 State of the Union, the Secretary of the Navy said the Navy would add 1GW of renewable electricity generation by 2020. ACCF estimates suggest this conversion to renewable electricity would cost the U.S. taxpayer a substantial amount each year. For example, if the Navy substituted wind for electricity produced by natural gas, the cost would be an additional $226 million per year. If solar were used, the additional cost would be over $1.0 billion per year.

#### Turn- alt energy actually hurts military effectiveness

Kreutzer ’12 (David Kreutzer, Research Fellow in Energy Economics and Climate Change, Heritage Foundation, “Military Biofoolishness”, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php>, May 21, 2012, LEQ)

Though the military has an impressive record for developing technologies to meet its frequently unique requirements, adopting biofuels is unlikely to help meet any mission other than earning political brownie points. There are three reasons offered for why the military should spend money on biofuel development: (1) reducing battlefield exposure for fuel transportation, (2) decreasing dependence on volatile petroleum markets, and (3) restricting funding for hostile regimes and terrorist organizations. However, conventional fuels offer superior solutions for all three goals. Switching to biofuels to reduce expensive and dangerous convoys makes no sense at all for one simple reason: Biofuels have lower energy density than conventional fuels and so will require more expensive and dangerous convoys. Biofuels are not produced at the battlefield. The problem with dependence on volatile commodity markets is that commodity prices sometimes spike upwards. But the biofuels are more costly than the petroleum-based fuels—even when petroleum prices are high. Switching to more costly substitutes is hardly a reasonable solution. The Air Force spends about $35 per gallon for its bio jet fuel—10 times the cost of conventional fuel. The entire U.S. military currently consumes about 360,000 barrels per day of petroleum-based fuel, with 175,000 barrels per day (or less) going to the Air Force’s jets. A single platform in the Gulf of Mexico (Thunderhorse) produces as much petroleum as these jets consume and at a much lower cost than the biofuel replacements. The Keystone XL Pipeline would bring enough petroleum from a very secure Canada to meet our total military consumption two or three times over. The same story holds for other potential sources of conventional petroleum, such as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Air Force’s target is to replace about 26,000 barrels per day with biofuels. Whatever energy security that may provide could be doubled by a single well in the Gulf of Mexico. As a strategic policy, switching the military to biofuels can only make our enemies think we are not serious. If the entire military consumption were switched away from petroleum, that would cut worldwide demand by 0.4 percent. This cut would reduce revenues to oil producers by about 1.5 percent. Let’s hope biofuels are not anti-terrorism Plan A. Though some energy technologies that are too expensive for general civilian use may make sense for the military, biofuels are not among them. The military needs to rethink its biofuels program.

### GW- Short

**SMR’s alone are sufficient to solve emissions- global spillover**

**Rosner, Goldberg, and Hezir ’11** (Robert Rosner, Robert Rosner is an astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago. He was the director of Argonne National Laboratory from 2005 to 2009, and Stephen Goldberg, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, Joseph S. Hezir, Principal, EOP Foundation, Inc., Many people have made generous and valuable contributions to this study. Professor Geoff Rothwell, Stanford University, provided the study team with the core and supplemental analyses and very timely and pragmatic advice. Dr. J’Tia Taylor, Argonne National Laboratory, supported Dr. Rothwell in these analyses. Deserving special mention is Allen Sanderson of the Economics Department at the University of Chicago, who provided insightful comments and suggested improvements to the study. Constructive suggestions have been received from Dr. Pete Lyons, DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; Dr. Pete Miller, former DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; John Kelly, DOE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Reactor Technologies; Matt Crozat, DOE Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Vic Reis, DOE Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary for Science; and Craig Welling, DOE Deputy Office Director, Advanced Reactor Concepts Office, as well as Tim Beville and the staff of DOE’s Advanced Reactor Concepts Office. The study team also would like to acknowledge the comments and useful suggestions the study team received during the peer review process from the nuclear industry, the utility sector, and the financial sector. Reviewers included the following: Rich Singer, VP Fuels, Emissions, and Transportation, MidAmerican Energy Co.; Jeff Kaman, Energy Manager, John Deere; Dorothy R. Davidson, VP Strategic Programs, AREVA; T. J. Kim, Director—Regulatory Affairs & Licensing, Generation mPower, Babcock & Wilcox; Amir Shahkarami, Senior Vice President, Generation, Exelon Corp.; Michael G. Anness, Small Modular Reactor Product Manager, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Matthew H. Kelley and Clark Mykoff, Decision Analysis, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; George A. Davis, Manager, New Plant Government Programs, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Christofer Mowry, President, Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Energy, Inc.; Ellen Lapson, Managing Director, Fitch Ratings; Stephen A. Byrne, Executive Vice President, Generation & Transmission Chief Operating Officer, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; Paul Longsworth, Vice President, New Ventures, Fluor; Ted Feigenbaum, Project Director, Bechtel Corp.; Kennette Benedict, Executive Director, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist; Bruce Landrey, CMO, NuScale; Dick Sandvik, NuScale; and Andrea Sterdis, Senior Manager of Strategic Nuclear Expansion, Tennessee Valley Authority. The authors especially would like to acknowledge the discerning comments from Marilyn Kray, Vice-President at Exelon, throughout the course of the study, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power”, <http://epic.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/SMRWhite_Paper_Dec.14.2011copy.pdf>, November 2011, LEQ)

As stated earlier, SMRs have the potential to achieve **significant greenhouse gas emission reductions**. They could provide alternative baseload power generation to facilitate the retirement of older, smaller, and less efficient coal generation plants that would, otherwise, not be good candidates for retrofitting carbon capture and storage technology. They could be deployed in regions of the U.S. and the world that have less potential for other forms of carbon-free electricity, such as solar or wind energy. There may be technical or market constraints, such as projected electricity demand growth and transmission capacity, which would support SMR deployment but not GW-scale LWRs. From the on-shore manufacturing perspective, a key point is that the manufacturing base needed for SMRs can be developed domestically. Thus, while the large commercial LWR industry is seeking to transplant portions of its supply chain from current foreign sources to the U.S., the SMR industry offers the potential to establish a large domestic manufacturing base building upon already existing U.S. manufacturing infrastructure and capability, including the Naval shipbuilding and underutilized domestic nuclear component and equipment plants. The study team learned that a number of sustainable domestic jobs could be created – that is, the full panoply of design, manufacturing, supplier, and construction activities – if the U.S. can establish itself as a credible and substantial designer and manufacturer of SMRs. While many SMR technologies are being studied around the world, a strong U.S. commercialization program can enable U.S. industry to be first to market SMRs, thereby serving as a fulcrum for export growth as well as a lever in influencing international decisions on deploying both nuclear reactor and nuclear fuel cycle technology. A viable U.S.-centric SMR industry would enable the U.S. to recapture technological leadership in commercial nuclear technology, which has been lost to suppliers in France, Japan, Korea, Russia, and, now rapidly emerging, China.

## 1AR

### SPR

#### SPR is misused; ineffective because Obama releases oil when prices are likely to rise

**Klimasinska, 12** (Katarzyna, Bloomberg, “Isaac Seen Making Release of U.S. Strategic Oil Likely”, Aug 28, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-28/isaac-seen-making-release-of-u-s-strategic-oil-likely.html)

Rising gasoline prices and production cuts tied to a storm named Isaac churning across the Gulf of Mexico have some energy analysts predicting the U.S. will announce a release from its Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Gasoline prices climbed yesterday to the highest level since May as Isaac, which became a hurricane today, caused evacuation of oil platforms, shutting 93 percent of the Gulf oil output and several refineries. An explosion and fatal fire at the largest refinery in Venezuela also has crimped supplies. The strategic petroleum reserve, kept in salt caverns along the Gulf of Mexico coast, can hold as much as 727 million barrels of crude oil. Source: Department of Energy 2:11 Aug. 28 (Bloomberg) -- President Barack Obama speaks at a news conference in Washington about Tropical Storm Isaac, which is nearing the Louisiana coast and hovering at the edge of hurricane strength. (Source: Bloomberg) “Isaac and the Venezuelan refinery explosion increase the chances that we will have a release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve,” Whitney Stanco, a Washington-based analyst with Guggenheim Securities LLC, said in a phone interview. The announcement “might happen this week or early next week,” she said. White House spokesmen have said the administration is monitoring oil markets and that a release is among the actions being considered if prices were to rise or supply was disrupted. “That option remains on the table,” press secretary Jay Carney told reporters traveling with President Barack Obama to a campaign event today in Iowa. “We have no announcement to make today.” $4 Gasoline Without a release, gasoline prices may approach $4 a gallon, making Obama vulnerable to attack when he faces his presumptive Republican challenger Mitt Romney during the presidential debates in October, according to Stephen Schork, president of The Schork Group Inc., an energy consulting firm based in Villanova, Pennsylvania. Obama will probably seek to avoid such criticism, he said. “And so the easiest way to do it, for everyone to see, would be releasing barrels” from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Schork said in a phone interview. “It has to happen, I think, within the next week.” Releasing oil from the stockpiles has proven no guarantee of lower prices at the pump over the past eight years. Gasoline went up in the week following the announcements in four out of six cases since 2004. In 2008 and 2011, tapping stockpiles brought down the cost of a fill-up, according to data from AAA. Pump prices increased 0.6 cent to $3.76 a gallon yesterday, the highest level since May 7, according to AAA, the largest U.S. motoring group. Obama Encouraged “Price increases at the pump are money immediately out of the pocket of consumers,” Representative Peter Welch, a Vermont Democrat, said today in a telephone interview. The oil reserve “is a short-term tool, and obviously doesn’t address long-term issues, but it’s proven to be effective in similar circumstances, and I encourage the president to use the authority he has.” Gasoline prices fell 2 percent in the week after Obama’s release of 30 million barrels last year, done in coordination with 27 other countries belonging to the International Energy Agency. Finance ministers from the Group of Seven nations issued a joint statement today calling on oil-producing countries to increase output and said they “stand ready to call upon the International Energy Agency to take appropriate action to ensure that the market is fully and timely supplied.” “We remain vigilant of the risks to the global economy,” the G-7 said. IEA Statement The oil market has enough supply and there is no need for the release of emergency inventories for the moment, the head of the IEA said prior to the G-7 statement. “We don’t have a serious disruption of supply,” Maria van der Hoeven, head of the Paris-based energy adviser, said today in an interview in Stavanger, Norway. “The market is sufficiently well supplied, and when there is the collective action needed as there was last year, it can only be when we are talking about a serious disruption of supply.” Gulf Coast refineries, including those owned by Exxon Mobil Corp. (XOM), Phillips 66 (PSX) and Valero Energy Corp. (VLO), were temporarily shut down as Isaac headed toward the Louisiana coast. The National Hurricane Center predicted that Isaac would make landfall in southern Louisiana late today or early tomorrow. The more powerful Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast on Aug. 29, 2005, causing levees to fail in New Orleans and killing more than 1,800 people. Republicans Opposed “The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is established for emergency purposes, related to national security,” John Hofmeister, an energy-policy writer and analyst who was president of Shell Oil Co. from 2005 to 2008, said in an interview. “It is not intended, nor it was never intended, as a buffer against high gasoline prices.” Republicans and the oil industry oppose the move, and Kenneth Medlock, an energy economist and adjunct professor in the Department of Economics at Rice University in Houston, said an announcement of a release is unlikely, given the criticism it is likely to trigger. “It creates a point of conflict in terms of politics of the election,” Medlock said in a phone interview yesterday. “You just open the possibility for the engagement of another topic. That won’t necessarily bode well for the administration.” Romney said that if elected, he would approve TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s Keystone XL pipeline and open Atlantic waters to oil exploration. “When you think about production platforms being evacuated, production being shut-in, you’re talking about a seven- to 10-day event,” said Medlock. “So any upward pressure on price that happens now, it’s going to subside anyway.” The U.S. reserve, kept in salt caverns along the Gulf of Mexico coast, holds as much as 727 million barrels of crude oil. It was established to counter supply disruptions after the Arab oil embargo of 1973-1974.

### AT: Aging

#### Increased immigration will not solve aging

CIS 2012 – Center for Immigration Studies is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit research organization. It is the nation's only think tank devoted exclusively to research and policy analysis of the economic, social, demographic, fiscal, and other impacts of immigration on the United States, [*Immigration Not a Fix for an Aging Population*](http://cis.org/projecting-immigrations-impact-on-the-size-and-age-structure-of-the-21st-century-american-population.)*, Study Projects 41% Increase in Population by 2050*. December 6th, http://us4.campaignarchive2.com/?u=11002b90be7384b380b467605&id=96632397d9&e=d44587eb7b

[Immigration Not a Fix for an Aging Population](http://cis.org/projecting-immigrations-impact-on-the-size-and-age-structure-of-the-21st-century-american-population.) Study Projects 41% Increase in Population by 2050 Washington, DC (December 6, 2012) – A new analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data by the Center for Immigration Studies projects the impact of immigration on the size and composition of the U.S. population. The findings reveal that immigration makes for a much larger overall population, while having only a minimal effect on slowing the aging of American society. Steven Camarota, the Center’s Director of Research, notes, “there is simply no question immigration makes for a much larger and more densely settled country, but it is not a cure for an aging society.” The complete study can be found at: <http://cis.org/projecting-immigrations-impact-on-the-size-and-age-structure-of-the-21st-century-american-population>. Among the findings: If net immigration (difference between those coming and going) unfolds as the Census Bureau estimated in the last set of projections, the nation’s population will increase from 309 million in 2010 to 436 million in 2050 — a 127 million (41 percent) increase. The projected increase of 127 million is larger than the combined populations of the U.K. and France. By itself future immigration will account for 96 million (75 percent) of future population growth. The immigrant (legal and illegal) share of the population will reach one in six U.S. residents by 2030, a new record, and nearly one in five residents by 2050. The Center for Immigration Studies, as well as other researchers, has found that immigration levels have fallen somewhat in recent years. While there is no way to know if the level will remain lower, this change can be incorporated into these projections: A one-third reduction in the Census Bureau’s level of net immigration over the next four decades (2010-2050) produces a total U.S. population of 404 million in 2050 — a 95 million increase over 2010. Even if immigration is half what the Census Bureau expects, the population will still grow 79 million by 2050, with immigration accounting for 61 percent of population growth. The underlying level of immigration is so high, even assuming a substantial reduction would still add tens of millions of new residents to the U.S. population and account for most of the population growth. Consistent with prior research, the projections show immigration only slightly increases the working-age (18 to 65) share of the population. Assuming the Census Bureau’s immigration level, 58 percent of the population will be of working-age in 2050, compared to 57 percent if there is no immigration. Raising the retirement age by one year would have a larger positive impact on the working-age share over the next 40 years then would the Census Bureau’s projected level of net immigration (68 million). While immigrants tend to arrive relatively young and have higher fertility than natives, immigrants age just like everyone else, and the differences with natives are not large enough to fundamentally increase the share of the population who are potential workers. Discussion While immigration is the primary driver of population growth, even without immigration, the population will increase by 31 million by 2050. The long term trend in immigration has been a steady increase, and this seems likely to continue once the U.S. economy recovers. But, even if immigration is half of what the Census Bureau expected in the 2008 projections, the U.S. population will still grow by 79 million by 2050, with immigration accounting for 61 percent of population growth. The fundamental question for the American public and policy makers is whether a much larger population and the resulting greater population density will add to or diminish the quality of life in the United States. Immigration is a discretionary policy of the government and can be changed. These projections show us one possible future. We must decide as a country if this is the future we want. Methodology The report contains a detailed explanation of the study’s methodology. In sum, the Center for Immigration and Decision Demographics of Arlington, Virginia developed the projections model used in this analysis. We first replicated the official 2008 Census Bureau projections, their last full set of projections, by race/ethnicity. This was possible because the Census Bureau Projections Branch was kind enough to share unpublished data that it used to generate its last major series of projections. In total, the Bureau’s net immigration projection is 68.3 million for the period 2010 to 2050. We vary this base level of immigration to discern its’ impact on population size and composition. These projections follow the Census Bureau’s assumptions about future levels of immigration and death and birth rates, including a decline in the birth rate for Hispanics.

### Plan Solve Wokrer Shortage

**Plan locks expertise in the US**

Andres and Breetz ‘11 (Richard B. Andres is professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for

National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, Hanna L. Breetz is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications”, February 16, 2011, LEQ)

DoD as first Mover Thus far, this paper has reviewed two of DOD’s most pressing energy vulnerabilities—grid insecurity and fuel convoys—and explored how they could be addressed by small reactors. We acknowledge that there are many un- certainties and risks associated with these reactors. On the other hand, failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD, which we review in this section: first, small reactors may fail to be commercialized in the United States; second, the designs that get locked in by the private market may not be optimal for DOD’s needs; and third, expertise on small reactors may become concentrated in foreign countries. By taking an early “first mover” role in the small reactor market, DOD could mitigate these risks and secure the long-term availability and appropriateness of these technologies for U.S. military applications. The “Valley of Death.” Given the promise that small reactors hold for military installations and mo- bility, DOD has a compelling interest in ensuring that they make the leap from paper to production. How- ever, if DOD does not provide an initial demonstration and market, there is a chance that the U.S. small reactor industry may never get off the ground. The leap from the laboratory to the marketplace is so difficult to bridge that it is widely referred to as the “Valley of Death.” Many promising technologies are never commercialized due to a variety of market failures— including technical and financial uncertainties, information asymmetries, capital market imperfections, transaction costs, and environmental and security externalities—that impede financing and early adoption and can lock innovative technologies out of the mar- ketplace.28 In such cases, the Government can help a worthy technology to bridge the Valley of Death by accepting the first mover costs and demonstrating the technology’s scientific and economic viability.29 Historically, nuclear power has been “the most clear-cut example . . . of an important general-purpose technology that in the absence of military and defense- related procurement would not have been developed at all.”30 Government involvement is likely to be crucial for innovative, next-generation nuclear technology as well. Despite the widespread revival of interest in nuclear energy, Daniel Ingersoll has argued that radically innovative designs face an uphill battle, as “the high capital cost of nuclear plants and the painful lessons learned during the first nuclear era have created a pre- vailing fear of first-of-a-kind designs.”31 In addition, Massachusetts Institute of Technology reports on the Future of Nuclear Power called for the Government to provide modest “first mover” assistance to the private sector due to several barriers that have hindered the nuclear renaissance, such as securing high up-front costs of site-banking, gaining NRC certification for new technologies, and demonstrating technical viability.32 It is possible, of course, that small reactors will achieve commercialization without DOD assistance. As discussed above, they have garnered increasing attention in the energy community. Several analysts have even ar- gued that small reactors could play a key role in the sec- ond nuclear era, given that they may be the only reactors within the means of many U.S. utilities and developing countries.33 However, given the tremendous regulatory hurdles and technical and financial uncertainties, it appears far from certain that the U.S. small reactor industry will take off. If DOD wants to ensure that small reactors are available in the future, then it should pursue a leadership role now. Technological Lock-in. A second risk is that if small reactors do reach the market without DOD assistance, the designs that succeed may not be optimal for DOD’s applications. Due to a variety of positive feedback and increasing returns to adoption (including demonstration effects, technological interdependence, net- work and learning effects, and economies of scale), the designs that are initially developed can become “locked in.”34 Competing designs—even if they are superior in some respects or better for certain market segments— can face barriers to entry that lock them out of the market. If DOD wants to ensure that its preferred designs are not locked out, then it should take a first mover role on small reactors. It is far too early to gauge whether the private market and DOD have aligned interests in reactor designs. On one hand, Matthew Bunn and Martin Malin argue that what the world needs is cheaper, safer, more secure, and more proliferation-resistant nuclear reactors; presumably, many of the same broad qualities would be favored by DOD.35 There are many varied market niches that could be filled by small reactors, because there are many different applications and settings in which they can be used, and it is quite possible that some of those niches will be compatible with DOD’s interests.36 On the other hand, DOD may have specific needs (transportability, for instance) that would not be a high priority for any other market segment. Moreover, while DOD has unique technical and organizational capabilities that could enable it to pursue more radically innovative reactor lines, DOE has indicated that it will focus its initial small reactor deployment efforts on LWR designs.37 If DOD wants to ensure that its preferred reactors are developed and available in the future, it should take a leadership role now. Taking a first mover role does not necessarily mean that DOD would be “picking a winner” among small reactors, as the market will probably pursue multiple types of small reactors. Nevertheless, DOD leadership would likely have a profound effect on the industry’s timeline and trajectory. Domestic Nuclear Expertise. From the perspective of larger national security issues, if DOD does not catalyze the small reactor industry, there is a risk that expertise in small reactors could become dominated by foreign companies//////. A 2008 Defense Intelligence Agency report warned that the United States will become totally dependent on foreign governments for future commercial nuclear power unless the military acts as the prime mover to reinvigorate this critical energy technology with small, distributed power reactors. 38 Several of the most prominent small reactor concepts rely on technologies perfected at Federally funded laboratories and research programs, including the Hyperion Power Module (Los Alamos National Laboratory), NuScale (DOE-sponsored research at Oregon State University), IRIS (initiated as a DOE-sponsored project), Small and Transportable Reactor (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), and Small, Sealed, Transportable, Autonomous Reactor (developed by a team including the Argonne, Lawrence Livermore, and Los Alamos National Laboratories). However, there are scores of competing designs under development from over a dozen countries. If DOD does not act early to support the U.S. small reactor industry, there is a chance that the industry could be dominated by foreign companies.

### Nimby

**Military renewables now**

**Kirshenbaum 12**, Warren, President and CEO of the Cherrytree Group “Military Renewable Energy Projects,” September 5th, http://www.cherrytree-group.com/\_blog/Cherrytree\_Group\_LLC\_Blog/post/Military\_Renewable\_Energy\_Projects/

The U.S. Department of Defense plans to open up 16 million acres of its land for renewable energy development, which it hopes will create a boom of solar, wind and geothermal projects and provide clean power to military bases. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and the Interior Secretary Ken Salazar signed a memorandum of understanding to work together on promoting renewable energy generation projects on public land that has historically been restricted for military uses. About 13 million of those 16 million acres are located in western U.S., where a lot of solar, wind and geothermal power development already has been taking place on private and other types of public land. The administration has been making a strong push for renewable energy development by funding both technology research and power generation projects. The administration wants to accomplish two goals by supporting renewable energy: creating jobs and finding alternative, cleaner and more abundant power sources domestically. Last month, Salazar unveiled a roadmap for speeding up solar power project development on 285,000 acres of public land in six western states. The government support for renewable energy has indeed propelled the development of advanced materials and equipment and the construction of some of the largest solar power plants in the country. The Monday announcement by the Defense and Interior departments involved not only land set aside for the military but also offshore locations near military installations. The goal is to promote onshore and offshore energy projects, such as erecting wind turbines in the sea. The military has been vocal about its support of renewable energy, from electricity to transportation fuels, that it says will help it become more self-sufficient and reduce its vulnerabilities in the battle fields. “Renewable energy will allow a military base to maintain critical operations for weeks or months if an electric power grid goes down,” she said. The military wants to attract developers and private investments for building solar, wind and other renewable electricity power projects on its land. It plans to lease the land to developers and buy some or all of the power from each project for its own use, and any unused power will be sold local utilities, Robyn said. Each of the military services plans on getting 1 gigawatt of renewable energy installed near its bases by 2025.

**wind triggers the link**

Salkin 9. [Patricia, Raymond and Ella Smith Distinguished Professor of Law, Associate Dean, Director, Govt Law Center @ Albany Law, “Cooperative Federalism and Wind: A New Framework for Achieving Sustainability” Legal Studies Research Paper Series -- Hofstra Law Review -- Volume 37]

With strong support at both the national and state levels, wind energy seems poised to continue its rapid growth. Yet, proposed wind energy projects sometimes falter at the local level, where land use decisions are typically made.12 In opposing wind energy projects, local residents raise a host of concerns involving aesthetics, noise, safety and impacts on surrounding property values, wildlife and the environment.13 Indeed, the intensity of local opposition has prompted one prominent energy siting consultant to remark that ―wind energy is fast becoming¶ ̳the mother of all NIMBY wars.‘‖14 NIMBY, an acronym for Not In My Backyard, is a term used to describe the reaction of local homeowners who object to further development within their community,15 fearing that such development might reduce the market value of their homes or change the character of the community.16