# 1NC

### T – Solar Power 1nc

**A. Definitions**

**Increase is from an already-existing policy**

Jeremiah Buckley et al, 06 (Founding partner of BUCKLEY KOLLAR LLP, serves as general counsel for Electronic Signatures and Records Association, and GOODWIN PROCTOR LLP, November 13, 2006, Supreme Court, http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme\_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf)

Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,”

Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an

initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “existing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy

**Only two types of current Solar Power – Photovoltaic and Solar Thermal anti-freeze**

Washington 11(Nikia, “Solar Technology Shatters the Old Glass City”, <http://blogs.bgsu.edu/blackswampjournal/2011/08/02/solar-technology-shatters-the-old-glass-city/>) What is Solar Energy Solar power, as defined by the [United States Environmental Protection Agency](http://www.epa.gov/region1/eco/energy/re_solar.html), is the energy received from the sun to create renewable energy. Two types of solar technologies currently exist in the market: photovoltaic, which collects energy from the sun to provide electricity, and concentrated solar energy (solar thermal), which magnifies the intensity of the sun to create heat. The solar thermal method uses the sun to warm an anti-freeze liquid in tubes called solar thermal collectors. The liquid is then transferred to a heating tank, commonly used for hot water and space heating. The photovoltaic method uses photovoltaic silicon cells, usually linked together to generate maximum power, to collect energy from the sun. A grid gathers the energy from the cells and then converts it to operational electricity.

**The topical version of the aff is to incentivize solar-boosters in SOTEC energy – OCEAN THERMAL is DISTINCT from SOLAR THERMAL**

Raju 10 (OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION SEMINAR REPORT Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Master of Technology in Civil Engineering (Environmental Engineering) of the University of Kerala) Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) is a power generation method that utilizes small temperature difference between the warm surface water and cold deep water of the ocean. The present case study at Kumejima Island in southern part of Japan describes the performance simulation results of an OTEC plant that utilizes not only ocean thermal energy but also solar thermal energy as a heat source. This power generation system was termed SOTEC (solar-boosted ocean thermal energy conversion). In SOTEC, the temperature of warm sea water was boosted by using a typical low-cost solar thermal collector. The results show that the proposed SOTEC plant can potentially enhance the annual mean net thermal efficiency up to a value that is approximately 1.5 times higher than that of the conventional OTEC plant if a single-glazed flat-plate solar collector of 5000-m2 effective area is installed to boost the temperature of warm sea water by 20 K. The objective of the study was to estimate the potential thermal efficiency and required effective area of a solar collector for a 100-kWe SOTEC plant, study was carried out under the ambient conditions at Kumejima Island in southern part of Japan.

**B. Violation – the affirmative does not increase direct incentives or reduce restrictions on Photovoltaics or Solar/Thermal – they violate both increase and SOLAR ENERGY**

**C. Prefer our Interpretation**

**1 – Limits – they justify OTEC, Thermal, biofuels, Ocean, Wave energy since the sun influences the tides or even HUMAN PRODUCTION since we need the Sun for Vitamin E – there are also a very large number of ways that solar can be deployed in the future**

**2 – Ground – They can have internal links to advantages that we cannot be prepared to debate because they used an unpredictable energy type.**

**3 – Extra Topicality is an independent voting issue – it proves the resolution alone is unsufficient to address the problem.**

**D. Topicality is a Voting Issue – If it were not the affirmative could run the same case year after year or unbeatable truths like ableism harms.**

### Politics

#### Will pass – top Democrats.

Reuters 2-3. ["Reid predicts Congress will pass immigration legislation" -- news.yahoo.com/reid-predicts-u-congress-pass-immigration-legislation-172812947.html]

The top Senate Democrat on Sunday predicted that Congress will pass and send to President Barack Obama legislation overhauling the U.S. immigration system, saying "things are looking really good."¶ Obama last week expressed hope Congress can get a deal done on immigration, possibly in the first half of the year.¶ The president is proposing to give the roughly 11 million U.S. illegal immigrants - most of whom are Hispanics - a pathway to citizenship, a step that many Republicans have long fought.¶ Obama's fellow Democrats control the Senate, but Republicans control the House of Representatives.¶ Appearing on the ABC program "This Week," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid was asked whether immigration legislation can win House passage.¶ "Well, it's certainly going to pass the Senate. And it would be a bad day for our country and a bad day for the Republican Party if they continue standing in the way of this. So the answer is yes," Reid said.¶ Obama choose Reid's home state of Nevada, with a sizable Hispanic population, as the site for a major speech last Tuesday pushing Congress to pass an immigration bill.¶ Hispanic voters were crucial in helping Obama beat Republican nominee Mitt Romney - who advocated "self-deportation" of illegal immigrants - in Nevada in November.¶ "It has to get done," Reid said of immigration legislation.¶ "It's really easy to write principles. To write legislation is much harder. And once we write the legislation, then you have to get it passed. But I think things are looking really good," Reid added.¶ After years on the back burner, immigration reform has suddenly looked possible as Republicans, chastened by the fact that more than 70 percent of Hispanic voters backed Obama in the November election, appear more willing to accept an overhaul.

**OTEC requires Obama to expend political capital- or they don’t solve**

**Agardy** **‘7** (Ph.D in Biological Sciences and Masters in Marine Affairs from the University of Rhode Island. “An Ocean of Energy There for the Taking,” World Ocean Observatory, <http://www.thew2o.net/newsletter.html>., 2007)

There are three factors that currently constrain us from using ocean energy to meet our needs. First is the lack of investment in researching new energy sources and technologies. Costs of developing and then utilizing these new technologies are prohibitive; investors cannot be assured of returns on investment for small scale experimental projects, but larger scale economically viable projects cannot be developed without the small scale prototypes. Few governments are progressive enough to sufficiently subsidize R&D in ocean energy technologies. And the few stalwart private sector companies who have embarked on the exploratory trail are understandably not willing to share their trade secrets with other companies or with government energy agencies. The solution thus lies in strong public private partnerships. The second obstacle is insufficient education of the public at large. For too long the people of the developed world have taken energy for granted; it is only in times of high energy costs (particularly rising costs at the fuel pump or on home heating bills) that the public is even conscious of the fact that supplying energy is a costly, and sometimes unpredictable, endeavor. The sudden surge of interest in the effects of global warming, and increasing geopolitical tensions between oil supplying and oil consuming countries has opened many people’s minds to considerations of new sources of energy, as well as to issues of energy conservation. But even those open minds have had difficulty accessing good information about the costs and benefits of ocean energy. Public education and outreach which is based on the best available science, and uninfluenced by vested economic interests or political ones, is a top priority. The last constraint is related to the first two. The public sector must find ways to increase incentives for the private sector to research and develop cost-effective and environmentally sensitive ocean energy ventures. And in order for that to happen, there needs to be political will – political will built on the realization of ocean energy potential, and political will driven by the demands of an increasingly educated and informed public. Such political will cannot blossom if politicians continue to yield to the enormous political pressure being brought down upon them by the lobbyists and spokespeople of conventional energy corporations, so developing this political will requires courage. Under the direction of good political leadership, we may soon realize the enormous potential that the oceans hold in meeting our energy needs.

#### PC key to get immigration compromise,

Hollander 1-21. [Catherine, reporter, "4 Ways Obama Could Boost Economy in His 2nd Term" National Journal -- www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/4-ways-obama-could-boost-economy-in-his-2nd-term-20130121]

3. Pass immigration reform. Obama has made clear that immigration reform is a top priority for his second term. A bipartisan group of senators has been working to draft a bill to overhaul the nation's immigration laws. The issue is teed up for the 113th Congress. On Sunday, top White House adviser David Plouffe said there was “no reason” immigration reform shouldn’t move through Congress this year. Still, passing legislation will be no easy feat. Republicans want to take up immigration initiatives piecemeal, while Obama is calling for comprehensive legislation.¶ If Congress can reach agreement on immigration policy, it could help the economy. “Comprehensive immigration reform that legalizes currently unauthorized immigrants and creates flexible legal limits on future immigration in the context of full labor rights would help American workers and the U.S. economy,” Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda of the University of California-Los Angeles, wrote in the Cato Journal last winter. More recently, Kevin Hassett of the conservative American Enterprise Institute argued that a “vast expansion of legal immigration could feed the next economic boom.”

#### Visas resolve US nursing shortage

Hayes 10

(Anthony Hayes works for the Overseas Recruitment Association, “Medical Staffing Through TN Visas (NAFTA) & Recruitment of Nurses From Abroad”, http://ezinearticles.com/?Medical-Staffing-Through-TN-Visas-(NAFTA)-and-Recruitment-of-Nurses-From-Abroad&id=2206000

Staffing solutions for nursing, medical, healthcare service to hospitals, nursing homes, care services and clinic orientated medical establishments is still in demand. One solution to the lack of health care professionals is through the TN visa from Mexico. NAFTA TN1 Visas are valid for 3 years offering stability to the Medical Staffing Industry. They are available as part of the NAFTA treaty which allows professionals to work between the 3 countries...USA, Canada and Mexico with a relatively easy, fast and painless visa process. International nurse recruitment for American and Canadian employers really does offer a very good option which allows for foreign nurse recruitment from Mexico. Mexican nurses need to have NCLEX, CFGNS (optional), Visa Screen and IELTS to be able to get a visa and legally work in USA which offers excellent options for staffing solutions within the medical staffing industry. The Overseas recruitment Association have recruited over 60 nurses from Mexico and have a database of other professionals including healthcare professionals, therapists, physicians, doctors, Licenses practical nurses, registered nurses, pediatric and other clinical, health care and medical occupations. The NAFTA agreement is one of the best overseas nursing recruitment options for International nurse recruitment agencies. Nursing in particular is in short supply in America, solutions do exist for finding staff. Travel nursing, care professionals, locum, nurse staffing services, health care services etc can all benefit from the NAFTA agreement TN1 Visas, the staffing solutions do exist if we can get the word out to the medical establishments that would benefit. A list of jobs that could be filled by the TN Visa is available from the site too, these include engineers, architects, doctors and many other professions. The NAFTA agreement opened up possibilities to recruit RN Nurses that many employers, staffing services and recruiters still haven't heard or learned about. The recent extension from renewable 1 year visas to 3 year visas has made it even more attractive as a solution for the chronic shortage of health and other professionals in the USA and Canada. With the H-1B program now a limited option to recruit foreign nurses and being so problematic as a legal vehicle to bring in skilled and experienced RN nurses, there really is no other opportunity for those that are willing to take action to find quality foreign nurses and other professionals from Mexico.

#### Combating culture barriers to healthcare and the nursing shortage are key to effective responses to bioterrorism - extinction

Green 4

PhD, Director, Outreach and Lead GE3LS Advisor, Ontario Genomics Institute (Shane, American Medical Association Journal of Ethics, May, Vol. 6, No. 5, <http://virtualmentor.ama-assn.org/2004/05/pfor2-0405.html>)

Consider the threat of bioterrorism: the potential use of biological weapons against this country raises the specter of a unique kind of war in which battles will be fought not against soldiers and artillery but against epidemics. Without significant reform to ensure access to health care for all Americans, the US will be unable to fight such battles effectively. Why Access? Using infectious diseases as weapons, bioterrorism threatens to weaken the civilian workforce and, hence, a nation's ability to go about its daily business. Moreover, in the case of diseases that are transmissible person to person, each infected individual becomes a human weapon, infecting others, who then infect others, and so on, tying up medical responders and overwhelming medical resources. A nation's greatest defense against bioterrorism, both in preparation for and in response to an attack, is a population in which an introduced biological agent cannot get a foothold, ie, healthy people with easy access to health care. Yet, in spite of spending significantly more per capita on health care than any other developed nation, the US is peppered with communities in which many people have little or no access to health care. This may be due to a lack of adequate health insurance—a fact of life for over 43 million demographically diverse Americans—or to cultural barriers that inhibit proper utilization of available services, or to inadequate distribution of health professionals and services. These communities are more vulnerable to infectious diseases [4] and therefore might be considered the nation's Achilles' heal in a bioterrorism attack. Take, for example, vaccination. A lack of access to health care among US citizens, particularly immigrant populations and those living in poverty, is associated with a failure to be vaccinated. This can have a serious impact on the spread of contagion, as evidenced by a rubella outbreak in 1997 in Westchester County, New York, in which a readily containable virus managed to infect a community composed largely of immigrants who had not been immunized [5]. Granted, US federal law permits all persons, including immigrants living here illegally, to receive emergency health care, immunizations and treatment of communicable diseases; those who are unable to pay can receive these services through Medicaid. Studies have shown, however, that immigrants are often disinclined to apply for Medicaid for fear that doing so will compromise their residency status or citizenship applications [6]. Still others avoid the health care system altogether due to mistrust or language barriers [7]. Yet, the stockpiling of "prophylactic countermeasures" remains the focus of many current preparedness initiatives, including Project BioShield [8]. The national stockpile of smallpox vaccine, for example, has been expanded in the wake of the 2001 terrorist attacks to a point where it now contains sufficient quantities to vaccinate the entire US population, in the event that the threat of smallpox is deemed imminent [9]. If effectively disseminated—through mass vaccination programs, for example—the vaccines would indeed constitute a significant line of defense against smallpox; however, it would be a line unwittingly breached by persons unable to be vaccinated. Since this is true of any and all such stockpiles, barriers to access must be addressed if these initiatives are to effectively mitigate the harmful effects of any bioterrorist attack. Immunization, however, is not the whole story; though comprehensive vaccination programs may help to defend against select agents like smallpox, it is simply impractical to suggest that all Americans could, in anticipation of such an attack, be given vaccines and subsequent boosters, if necessary, for each and every pathogen that could be used as a weapon—especially since a bioweapon would quite possibly contain an engineered strain of a pathogen for which no satisfactory vaccine exists. If such an attack were to take place, it would be imperative for infected individuals to seek immediate medical attention. This is especially true for index cases, the identification and isolation of which is essential to limit the spread of contagion (if the agent used is transmissible person to person). Early identification of index cases enables health officials to trace contacts and swiftly report potential cases, thereby allowing early measures—such as isolation or quarantine—to halt, or at least slow, an emerging potential epidemic [10]. A lack of access would greatly impede such an early and effective response, turning vulnerable citizens into unwitting facilitators for the spread of infectious disease. Indeed, it has been shown that people without health insurance report up to 47 percent fewer visits to physicians [11], and often wait longer to seek medical attention even when doing so would be prudent, eventually presenting in advanced stages of infection. Almost certainly, once an incident of bioterrorism has been identified and news of it has permeated the media, all potentially exposed persons, insured and uninsured alike, would report to health care facilities for assessment. But by then it might be too late to prevent the outbreak from devastating entire communities—especially since recent data suggest that to prevent new viral epidemics, infected patients must be identified and isolated at the earliest possible stages of an outbreak to avoid the virus reaching peak infectivity [12].

### K

Their use of security is articulated through gendered binaries—that requires domination and elimination of those who threaten the dominant masculine body politic

Wilcox 3 [Lauren, PhD in IR @ University of Minnesota, BA @ Macalester College, MA @ London School of Economics, “Security Masculinity: The Gender-Security Nexus”, RCB]

Post-structuralists emphasize not only the discursive process of securitization, but the ways in which issues of identity factor into this process. ”Practicing security‘ entails specific state actions not just in external policies, but in internal politics as well. By labeling external threats, the state constructs a regime of identity by demarcating who and what is to be feared by ”us.‘ ”Security‘ implies not only specific actions, but specific implications for the identity of what is being ”secured‘. David Campbell argues in Writing Security: American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity, that security is the raison d‘être of the state. He further notes hat—the state requires discourses of ”danger‘ to provide a new theology about who and what ”we‘ are by highlighting who or what ”we‘ are not, and what ”we‘ have to fear.“10 Thus, the process of ”securitizing‘ can also be a process to define a nation‘s identity by drawing boundaries between who and what is acceptable (on the ”inside‘) and what is unacceptable (on the ”outside‘). ”Security‘ is implicated in the production of dichotomies that structure the discipline and the way we think about international relations, such as inside/outside, self/other, us/them and sovereignty/anarchy. Much of this type of language was used in reference to terrorist and immigration, including the creation of a hierarchy between ”us‘ and ”them,‘ the criminalization and militarized responses, fears of internal subversion, and the discursive location of threats being outside the territory of the US.My understanding of ”security‘ and ”gender‘ is rooted in feminist contributions to international relations and security studies as well. Feminist scholarship informs my work in many ways, as feminist theorists, like critical theorists, attempt to, —make strange what has previously appeared familiar [and] to challenge us to question what has hitherto appeared as ”natural.‘ “11 Of key importance to this specific study are feminist scholars of IR who take the post-structuralist analysis further, and note how the dichotomies that constitute the field of international relations are so readily ”mapped onto‘ gender. Feminist scholar Charlotte Hooper‘s analysis of the gendered nature of the field of international relations is similar to Campbell‘s, noting how dichotomies such as active/passive, war/peace, and order/anarchy are assigned masculine and feminine traits, with the first being valued over the second. This use of the concept of gender is consistent with how ”gender‘ is used in this paper. The insights feminist post-structuralists provide into the gendered nature of the process of drawing borders between ”us‘ and ”them‘ and ”domestic‘ and ”foreign‘ are particularly relevant in the context of my research into the securitization of immigration and terrorism, as the discourses used in this context have clearly made these distinctions. They are also gendered discourses, as they rely on gendered dichotomies. My analysis of the gendered discourses of terrorism and immigration is based on this type of post-structuralist feminist analysis.Because of the prevalence of gendered dichotomies in IR and their role in constructing identities and boundaries, the practice of international relations and ”security‘ is inextricably linked to identity formation. Feminist scholars of international relations have noted the extensive association of masculinity and war, and have analyzed how war and IR and masculinities have been mutually constructed though military service, 12 and by several different kinds of ”hegemonic masculinities‘ that serve as the prototypical behavior for men indifferent contexts.13When writing of ”gender,‘ I want to make clear I do not equate this term to ”men and women‘ (or just women for that matter) but, as a system of asymmetrical social constructs of masculinity and femininity.14 While employing a gender analysis of issues such as militarization, war, and terrorism, I will not be addressing such issues as whether or not men or women are inherently violent or peaceful, or, in response to Francis Fukuyama, what would happen if women were our political leaders.15 Rather, I use to concept of gender as a symbolic system organizes many cultural discourses, and is mapped on to certain dichotomies, such as hard/soft, inside/outside, sovereignty/anarchy, active/passive, as I briefly explained above. As gender is a normative system in which the concept associated with masculinity in the dichotomy is considered more desirable, gender in International Relations also serves as a prescriptive formulation. This is not say that actual men and women are irrelevant to gender, but that gender as a discursive system represents men and women differently, and constructs different social spaces and functions for them. Race, class, and other variables are also part of a gender discourse that represents a feminine ”other‘ that deviates from the masculine ”norm‘. The concept of ”hegemonic masculinity‘ is also related to the concept of gender. This term, which is discussed at length in chapter three, indicates the prevailing definition of masculinity, driven by social and political trends and defined against subordinate masculinities, such as racial minorities and non-heterosexual orientations.

**The impact is Extinction**

**Warren and Cady 94**—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

**Vote neg to reject the hegemonic masculinity inherent in the ideational process of the 1AC**

**Beland 2009**

Daniel Beland. “Gender, Ideational Analysis, and Social Policy” Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society. Vol 16 Num 4. Pp 558-581. Winter 2009

To further illustrate the role of frames in politics and policy change, let me discuss three ways in which political actors can mobilize them. First, **frames can take the form of a public discourse used by speciﬁc political actors to convince others that policy change is necessary.** This is what political scientist Robert H. Cox (2001) calls “the social construction of the need to reform” and what politi- cal philosopher Nancy Fraser (1989) has called the “politics of needs interpretation.” From this perspective, **discursive frames can help convince political actors and the general public that existing policy legacies are ﬂawed, and that reforms should be enacted to solve perceived social and economic problems.** Thus, **policy learning can feed framing processes in the sense that experts, ofﬁcials, and interest groups can publicly voice their negative assessments of exist- ing policies to convince other actors that the time has come to improve or even replace them.** But “social learning remains analyti- cally distinct from framing activities in part because learning can occur without the emergence of a public discourse about the need to reform. An autonomous set of evaluative activities, social learning generally predates and, in only some cases, informs framing pro- cesses” (Be´ land 2006, 562). Overall, **discursive frames help actors make a case for policy change, and this activity generally involves a public discussion of the meaning and performance of existing policy legacies.** Second, **these frames help political actors convince other groups and individuals to form a coalition around a concrete proposal or vision for change.** As discussed above, ideational processes partici- pate in the construction of interests and the ranking of policy goals. In this context, **particular political actors can use frames and politi- cal discourse to inﬂuence the way other actors see their interests and identify with shared policy goals.** From this perspective, **policy debates are largely about the construction of interests, policy goals, and identities, without which political coalitions can hardly survive.** Although concrete quid pro quos between key political actors are a major aspect of coalition building (Bonoli 2000), **frames can help sell concrete policy alternatives to the public and build a stronger coalition around them.** On one hand, politicians can “speak to their base” and argue that the measures they support are consistent with the broad ideological principles that cement their existing coalition. On the other hand, ambiguous policy ideas and proposals can make many different actors believe that they have an interest in supporting a complex policy alternative, which can lead to seemingly paradoxi- cal coalitions (Palier 2005). Third, political actors can mobilize framing processes to counter criticism targeting the policy alternatives they support. Thus, one might expand Weaver’s notion of blame avoidance strategies (Weaver 1986) to take on a discursive form. For instance, ofﬁcials may blame economic cycles for higher unemployment rates to con- vince the public that their decisions are not at the origin of this negative situation. **Policymakers can also frame policy alternatives in a way that diverts attention away from their actual departure from well-accepted political symbols or policy paradigms.** For example, since the 1980s, Swedish politicians have referred to enduringly popular idea of “social democracy” to legitimize forms of policy change that are arguably closer to neoliberalism than to traditional social democratic ideals (Cox 2004). Blame avoidance frames such as these have a preventive component because political actors use them to shield the policy alternatives they support from criticism (Be´ land 2005, 11). **Scholars interested in the gender – social policy nexus have long analyzed discursive and framing processes** (Tannen 1994), and their potential impact on policy change (Lewis 2002). A good example of this type of scholarship is the research of Hobson and Lindholm (1997) on the mobilization of Swedish women during the 1930s. In order to understand this mobilization, the authors bridge the power resource approach and the sociological scholarship on social movements. **Their analysis of women’s mobilization emphasizes the role of what they call “discursive resources,” a concept that “acknowledges that social groups engage in struggles over the mean- ings and the boundaries of political and social citizenship. This includes the cultural narratives and metaphors that social actors exploit in their public representations as well as the contesting ideological stances that they take on dominant themes and issues on the political agenda.”** (Hobson and Lindholm 1997, 479) For these two scholars, **ideational processes clearly serve as powerful framing tools in struggles over gender and social policy change.** Once again, **this discussion of the gender scholarship points to the relationship between ideational processes and categorical inequalities, a major issue that is frequently overlooked in the general ideational literature on policy and politics. By pointing to this key relationship, students of gender and social policy make a strong and original contribution to this ideational literature.**

### States

**Text: The fifty state and federal territorial governments of the United States should**

**through Clean Energy Funds.**

**Solves best- states can take the lead on energy policies through CEFs**

**Milford et al ’12** [Lew Milford is a non-resident senior fellow at Brookings and president of Clean Energy Group. Mark Muro is a senior fellow and director of policy for the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings. Jessica Morey is a consultant to Clean Energy Group. Devashree Saha is a senior policy analyst at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program. Mark Sinclair is executive director of Clean Energy States Alliance, “Leveraging State Clean Energy Funds for Economic Development,” January, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/11%20states%20energy%20funds/0111_states_energy_funds.pdf>]

And so **U.S. states, as classic “laboratories of experimentation,” should build on leading-edge CEFs’ recent experiments with economic development and move more expansively to spur economic growth in clean energy**. To that end, this paper suggests a number of strategies for best utilizing CEFs that states can explore in pursuit of clean energy economic development. In this regard, it is worth noting that **state CEFs are public entities with a unique history of success in financing clean energy projects that can now be brought to bear on the need in many states for more aggressive clean energy economic development**. In a time of tough fiscal austerity and reluctance to dedicate new funds, then, **state public CEFs are in a perfect position to** institute a new set of economic development strategies to **create thriving clean energy industries. To act on this promise, states without clean energy funds should consider establishing dedicated clean energy revenue streams to engage in project finance and smart industry support**. These states typically do not have dedicated support for either clean energy projects or clean energyrelated economic development activities. 16 **A range of sources for these funds exists and includes general revenue bonds, tax or lottery revenues, pollution charges, and renewable portfolio standard (RPS) compliance fees**. However, experience has shown that electricity surcharges set on electricity consumption or “wires charges” tend to be the most stable and reliable revenue source, as well as the most fair as they internalize the environmental consequences of electricity purchases. 17 **States should examine these sources as potential bases for the establishment of new clean energy funds. In those states where CEFs already exist, fund administrators should seek to expand the funds’ economic development role**. Specifically, states with funds should pursue four major agendas: ➤ Reorient a significant portion of state CEF money to clean energy-related economic development ➤ Develop detailed state-specific clean energy market data ➤ Link clean energy funds with economic development entities, development finance organizations and other stakeholders in the emerging industry ➤ Collaborate with other state, regional, and federal efforts to best leverage public and private dollars and to learn from each other’s experiences

#### Solves uniform energy production policy.

Energy Report 1. [“Governors adopt new energy policy to address challenges” -- August 13 -- lexis]

The governors of all 50 states last week agreed to adopt a new energy policy, recognizing the need for new supplies as well as improved conservation. The National Governors Association, at its annual meeting in Providence, R.I., adopted the new policy in an effort to keep up with the massive changes in the energy industry, and following recent spikes in gasoline, home heating and natural gas prices. The new energy policy is the first major change in a decade to the governors' policy. "The policy sends a clear message that solving our nation's energy problems demand more conservation, especially utilizing renewable fuels like ethanol," said Iowa Gov. Thomas Vilsack, the Democrat chairman of the NGA Committee on Natural Resources, which drafted the new policy. "Our goal should always be to assure American families and businesses their energy prices will be stable." The new policy recognizes that energy and environmental challenges facing the United States, such as periodic shortages in oil, gas and electricity, cause hardship for consumers and businesses, harm the economy and can harm national security. "The United States' dependence on foreign sources of oil is at an all-time high while demand for energy continues to rise," said Oklahoma Gov. Frank Keating, a Republican. "Energy issues must be addressed nationally but state and local authority over energy and environmental matters also needs to be maintained. It would be a mistake to develop a national energy policy without full cooperation and partnership with the states and their governors." The policy recognizes that "demand for energy will continue to grow, however. Simultaneously, energy efficiency is projected to continue to improve. "Yet even with more conservation, innovation, and new technology, the United States will need more energy supplies," the NGA policy states. North Dakota Gov. John Hoeven, a Republican, added: "We must expand and upgrade the transmission networks to move energy from the source to the consumer. Improving energy transmission will impact conservation, efficiency and supply." The governors and Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham last week agreed to launch a two-year project aimed at culling together recommendations for new policies applying to generation, transmission and the development of regional electricity markets (see story below). The governors made it clear, however, that states - not the federal government - should play a lead role in shaping energy policy. "Energy issues must be addressed nationally, while still recognizing state and local authority over environmental and energy matters," the policy statement said. "The solution to the need for energy will require increased conservation and energy efficiency as well as exploration of new energy supplies, including environmentally responsible development of traditional sources and greater reliance on alternative and renewable sources. We also must continue the trend of reducing emissions associated with energy production."

### Coral

**Coral decline won’t cause extinction – empirics**

**Goklany 8** (Indurt, PhD, U.S. Delegate to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, U.S. Representative to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, Julian Simon Fellow at the Property and Environment Center, Visiting Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, <http://www.catostore.org/index.asp?fa=ProductDetails&method=cats&scid=32&pid=1441339>)

**How often have you heard that coral reefs are fragile and would be wiped out by global warming?** If you google “fragile coral reefs” (without the quotes) you’ll get 493,000 hits. **So imagine my surprise on stumbling on a news report titled, “Marine life flourishes at Bikini Atoll test site.**” The report tells us: **It was blasted by the largest nuclear weapon ever detonated by the United States but half a century on, Bikini Atoll supports a stunning array of tropical coral**, scientists have found. In 1954 the South Pacific atoll was rocked by a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb 1,000 times more powerful than the explosives dropped on Hiroshima. The explosion shook islands more than 100 miles away, generated a wave of heat measuring 99,000ºF and spread mist-like radioactive fallout as far as Japan and Australia. But, **much to the surprise of a team of research divers who explored the area, the mile-wide crater left by the detonation has made a remarkable recovery and is now home to a thriving underwater ecosystem**. 99,000 degrees Fahrenheit! By comparison the upper-bound estimate for global warming is a puny global temperature increase of 11.5 degrees Fahrenheit (less in the ocean). **So even if global warming wipes out life on earth, global warming catastrophists can take comfort that nature will, as it inevitably must, reassert itself**. Some, convinced that humanity is the problem, may even welcome such an outcome — no humans, but plenty of nature (over time). [Fifty-four years later at Bikini Atoll, recovery is not complete. Perhaps 28 percent of coral species may still be absent.]

**Oceans resilient**

**Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD.** (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus **rendering them ecologically adaptable**. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

**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**

**IPCC Models are inaccurate – they are rigged and over exaggerated**

**Young ‘9** (Gregory, PhD, physicist and researcher @ University of Oxford, Graduate degrees @ University of Oxford, King's College, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, *American Thinker*, “It's the Climate Warming Models, Stupid!”March 31, 2009, http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/03/its\_the\_climate\_warming\_models.html)

Compounding the problems of inaccuracy in climate models is their subsequent and de facto publication, virtually assured if the study is favorable to AGW. Reporting in the journal Energy and Environment, Volume 19, Number 2, March 2008, Evidence for "publication Bias" Concerning Global Warming in Science and Nature by Patrick J. Michaels has found significant evidence for the AGW penchant in his survey of the two premier magazines, namely Science and Nature. Astoundingly, he found that it's more than 99.999% probable that Climate studies' extant forecasts are biased in these two publications. In contrast the AGW party-line believes that there is an equal probability that published findings will raise or lower extant forecasts. This is akin to believing the MSM is fair, objective and balanced. Michaels rightly warns that such bias "...has considerable implications for the popular perception of global warming science, for the nature of ‘compendia' of climate change research, such as the reports of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate change, and for the political process that uses those compendia as the basis for policy." And such bias did, does, and will continue to influence world politics. This predicament has been vigorously exposed by Lord Monckton, who previously revealed through consummate analysis that a whole bevy of proven modeling errors yet to be have been corrected, willfully resisted, and pugnaciously ignored by the IPPC continues to this day to prejudice world opinion in favor of AGW. Monckton specifically found that errors "via 30 equations that computer models used by the UN's climate panel (IPCC) -- [models] which were purposely pre-programmed with such overstated or falsified values for the three variables whose product is ‘climate sensitivity' (temperature increase in response to greenhouse-gas increase) -- resulted in a 500-2000% overstatement of CO2's effect on temperature in the IPCC's latest climate assessment report, published in 2007." Accordingly, and in total agreement with other published opinions, Lord Monckton stated most recently that there is an "overwhelming weight of evidence that the UN's climate panel, the IPCC, prodigiously exaggerates both the supposed causes and the imagined consequences of anthropogenic ‘global warming;' that too many of the exaggerations can be demonstrated to have been deliberate; and that the IPCC and other official sources have continued to rely even upon those exaggerations that have been definitively demonstrated in the literature to have been deliberate."

**Biodiversity won’t cause extinction – their science is flawed**

**Campbell 11** (Hank, Science Writer for Science 2.0, “I Wouldn't Worry About The Latest Mass Extinction Scare,” March 8th, <http://www.science20.com/science_20/i_wouldnt_worry_about_latest_mass_extinction_scare-76989>, EMM)

You've seen it everywhere by now - Earth's sixth **mass extinction**: Is it almost here? and other articles discussing an article in Nature (471, 51–57 doi:10.1038/nature09678) claiming the end of the world is nigh. Hey, I like to live in important times. So do most people. And something so important it has only happened 5 times in 540 million years, well that is really special. But **is it real?** Anthony Barnosky, integrative biologist at the University of California at Berkeley and first author of the paper, claims that if currently threatened species, those officially classed as critically endangered, endangered, and vulnerable, actually went extinct, and that rate of extinction continued, the sixth mass extinction could arrive in 3-22 centuries. Wait, what?? That's a lot of helping verbs confusing what should be a fairly clear issue, if it were clear. **If you know anything about species** and extinction, **you have** already read one paragraph of my overview and **seen the flaws in their model. Taking a few extinct** mammal **species** that we know about **and then extrapolating** that out to be **extinction hysteria** right now if we don't do something about global warming **is not good science**. Worse, an integrative biologist is saying evolution does not happen. Polar bears did not exist forever, they came into existence 150,000 years ago - because of the Ice Age. Greenpeace co-founder and ecologist Dr. Patrick Moore told a global warming skepticism site, “I quit my life-long subscription to National Geographic when they published a similar 'sixth mass extinction' article in February 1999. This [latest journal] Nature article just re-hashes this theme” and "The fact that the study did make it through peer-review indicates that the peer review process has become corrupted.” Well, how did it make it through peer review? Read this bizarre justification of their methodology; "If you look only at the critically endangered mammals--those where the risk of extinction is at least 50 percent within three of their generations--and assume that their time will run out and they will be extinct in 1,000 years, that puts us clearly outside any range of normal and tells us that we are moving into the mass extinction realm." Well, **greater extinctions occurred when Europeans visited the Americas and in a much shorter time.** And since we don't know how many species there are now, or have ever been, if someone makes a model and claims tens of thousands of species are going extinct today, that sets off cultural alarms. It's not science, though. If only 1% of species have gone extinct in the groups we really know much about, that is hardly a time for panic, especially if some **99 percent of all species that have ever existed** we don't know anything about because they...**went extinct. And we did not.** **It won't keep** some **researchers, and the mass media, from pushing the panic button**. Co-author Charles Marshall, also an integrative biologist at UC-Berkeley wants to keep the panic button fully engaged by emphasizing that the small number of recorded extinctions to date does not mean we are not in a crisis. "Just because the magnitude is low compared to the biggest mass extinctions we've seen in half a billion years doesn't mean they aren't significant." **It's a double negative, bad logic and questionable science**, though.

### Guam

**No Impact and turn – Guam basing is more vulnerable to attack and too far from flash points to prevent conflict**

**Kan, Asian Security Affairs Specialist, 2010**

[Shirley A., "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments", Congressional Research Service, 6-30-10, CRS Report for Congress]

In addition, Guam’s size and remoteness and conditions raised more questions about hosting and educating military dependents, training on Guam and with other units in Asia, Hawaii, or the west coast, and costs and time for extended logistical support and travel. Addressing another concern, a former commander of Marine Forces Pacific urged in 2007 that Guam’s buildup include more than infrastructure to develop also human capital, communities, and the environment.15

In 2009, Wallace Gregson became Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs. Guam’s higher military profile could **increase its potential as an American target for terrorists and adversaries during a possible conflict**. China is believed to have deployed ballistic missiles that could target Guam. In addition, in 2008 North Korea started to deploy its intermediate range ballistic missile (Taepodong-X) with a range of about 1,860 miles that could reach Guam, according to South Korea’s 2008 Defense White Paper.

Any such vulnerabilities could raise Guam’s requirements for both counterterrorism and missile defense measures. Moreover, some say that Guam is still too distant from flash points in the Asia and advocate closer cooperation with countries such as Singapore, Australia, the Philippines, and Japan.

Building up the U.S. presence in those countries could enhance alliances or partnerships, increase interoperability, and reduce costs for the United States. In July 2010, the U.S. Navy’s Joint Guam Program Office issued the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on implications of the defense buildup on Guam.

The detailed study estimated a higher population increase than the move of 8,000 marines to Guam. A total of 8,552 Marines plus 630 Army soldiers would form the 9,182 permanent military personnel to relocate to Guam. The total military population on Guam would increase by 30,190 (including 9,182 permanent military personnel, 9,950 dependents, 9,222 transient military personnel, and 1,836 civilian workers). In addition, construction workers and others would mean a total increase in population of about 79,000 at the peak in 2014. The study also found that Guam cannot accommodate all training for the relocated marines, and the nearby island of Tinian (100 miles away) would help to provide land for their training. There would be a challenge for sustaining operational readiness in training while limiting the time and expense to travel to train. The study found that “the training ranges currently planned for Guam and Tinian only replicate existing individual-skills training capabilities on Okinawa and do not provide for all requisite collective, combined arms, live and maneuver training the Marine Corps forces must meet to sustain core competencies. As with Marine Corps forces currently in Okinawa who must now travel to mainland Japan, other partner nations, and the U.S. to accomplish this requisite core competency training, the Marine Corps forces relocating from Okinawa to Guam would also have to use alternate locations to accomplish requisite core competency training.” In addition, the Navy would need a new deep-draft wharf at Apra Harbor to support a transient aircraft carrier. Third, the Army would relocate about 600 military personnel to establish and operate an Air and Missile Defense Task Force (AMDTF).

**Economic collapse is inevitable – it forces a transition to sustainable communities – we indict your authors**

**Brownlee 10** – This essay was adapted from a presentation at Xavier University in Cincinnati on Nov. 7, 2010, as part of a lecture series on Ethics, Religion, and Society (Michael, 11/30, “The Evolution Of Transition In The U.S,” http://countercurrents.org/brownlee301110.htm)

Here, we need to know that economic decline will soon accelerate to inevitable collapse. There will be no long-term economic recovery. The underpinnings of modern human society (and the global economy) as we have known it are fundamentally unsustainable, and they are beginning to unravel before our eyes. This is partly because the entire globalized economy is based on the U.S. dollar, which is based on cheap oil. And now the whole system is beginning to come apart. When you hear predictions of economic recovery, just remember that those economists and politicians who are making these predictions are the very same ones who were predicting not so long ago that there was virtually zero chance that we could slip into an economic recession—and we now understand they were saying this at a time when we were already at least a year into recession. We need to recognize these rosy predictions for what they are, and prepare for the end of economic growth as we have known it. In our lifetime, we will most likely experience roller-coaster periods of global recession followed by weak and partial recoveries; this will ultimately give way to grinding, long-term global depression. In the process, many of the institutions on which we have come to rely as anchors for certainty and normalcy and sanity will surely fail, some of them slowly, some of them suddenly and spectacularly. It will be a chaotic time for the next several decades, and the chaos will prevail long after most of us have left this planet. Over the last few years I’ve noticed that we tend to think of fossil fuel depletion, climate change, and economic decline as three separate global crises. But of course they are all deeply interrelated. When we say this, it seems so obvious. But we’re just beginning to wake up to this reality: Our growth economy is based on cheap fossil fuels, and burning fossil fuels is obviously dramatically altering our climate. Therefore, economic growth as we have known it cannot and will not continue. Our Industrial Growth Society cannot and will not continue. This is what James Howard Kunstler has called The Long Emergency. And this is really what we are preparing ourselves and our communities for. Clearly, we are entering into a prolonged period of profound change, an era of “unintended consequences.” The changes that are coming our way will **profoundly** alter not only how we live, but even how we conceive of ourselves, how we think about the world, and how we see the future. And not only will we have to learn to cope with severe disruption to our conception of ourselves and the world, but we will also need to forge a new vision of the world that we can live by. Where will that vision come from? The larger context for the Transition movement, of course, is that **all** communities are in transition, whether we realize it or not, whether there is a formal Transition Initiative present or not—and so are all cultures, all nations, and all institutions. We are in a transition as a species, even as a planet in a larger Universe.

**Collapse now allows us to survive, but delay risks multiple scenarios for extinction**

**Barry 8** – Ph.D. in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Masters of Science in Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development also from Madison, and a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Marquette University (Glen, 01/14, “Economic Collapse And Global Ecology,” http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm)

Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet **well beyond** its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to **human extinction** and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are **fundamentally** incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes **sooner rather than later**, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

**Growth causes ecosystem collapse and extinction**

Jim **Chen 2k** - Prof of law U of Minneasota, Now Dean of Law School at Louisville (“Globalization and Its Losers:, 9 Minn. J. Global Trade 157’ HeinOnline)

Globalization marks the end of an epoch. Not merely an ep- och in the colloquial sense, but an epoch in the geological sense. **The spread of** Homo sapiens **around the earth has** brought about mass extinctions **and related ecological changes on a scale not seen since the Cretaceous period.** In its evolutionary impact**, comprehensive human** colonization **of the planet easily out-** classes an ice age**, or even twenty**.' The previous geological event of comparable magnitude ushered out the dinosaurs; the one before that, the mass extinction that closed out the Permian period, nearly ended the terrestrial tenure of what we arro- gantly call "higher" life forms.2 In the last 600 million years of geological history, only five previous extinction spasms have taken place.3 We are living - or perhaps more accurately, dy- ing - through the sixth.4 "[Half the world's species will be ex- tinct or on the verge of extinction" by the end of the twenty-first century.5 In environmental terms, globalization merely contin- ues what humanity has been doing since the glaciers last re- treated: subdue every niche within its reach. he spectacle of mass extinction gives rhetorical ammuni- tion to all opponents of globalization - not just environmental- ists, but also those who resist free trade as a threat to labor standards, cultural independence, religious values, declining languages, agricultural self-sufficiency, and the like. Just as the global expansion of a single "Terminator" primate species has sparked the Holocene epoch's ecological holocaust, the emer- gence of a global society threatens a host of human institutions. Where a geological clock once marked the entrance and exit of species, an accelerated human stopwatch now tracks the rise and fall of regimes, religions, languages, and civilizations. Time and chance happen to them all.7 The extinction metaphor describes not only a natural world in ecological cataclysm, but also a human society buffeted by changes of unprecedented scope and seemingly relentless accel- eration. In this dual sense, globalization is nothing short of the end of the world.**8** So apocalyptic an assertion deserves nothing less than the most grandiose of intellectual frameworks. I will examine globalization through a Darwinian lens, in the hope that an application of natural evolution as "universal acid" will "eat[ ] through just about every traditional concept, and leave[ ] in its wake a revolutionized world-view, with most of the old landmarks still recognizable, but transformed in fundamental ways."9 In economic, cultural, and environmental realms, globaliza- tion unleashes the same Darwinian dynamics of adaptation, natural selection, and extinction. But the natural world and human society do differ fundamentally. For natural species, ex- tinction truly is forever. The ecosystems they inhabit will not recover in any time frame that humans can meaningfully con- template. Human institutions, **by contrast,** are **much more** readily preserved and revived. **To the extent that globalized** so- ciety **must choose, it** should **systematically** favor the environ- ment over jobs **and even culture.** One final observation bears notice. Received wisdom in American intellectual circles distrusts almost any extension of evolutionary metaphors and analogies outside the strictly bio- economic case for free trade lies beyond reasonable dispute, "so- cial issues" affecting employment and income, community and culture, and health and environment supply the primary - per- haps even exclusive - fault lines for legal debate.16

**No impact to trade—**

**A) Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace**

**MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008** (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

**Does globalization pacify international relations**? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 **however**, that **during the 1870–2001 period**, **the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not** a **clear cut** one. **The first era of globalization**, at the end of the 19th century, **was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I**. Then, **the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts**. **After World War II, world trade increased rapidly**, while the number of conflicts decreased (**although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower** prevalence of **military conflicts**, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Status quo solves- 1AC author

Bill Moore, 4/12/2006. Discussion with Dr. Hans Jurgen Krock, the founder of OCEES on the revival of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion. “OTEC Resurfaces,” http://www.evworld.com/article.cfm?storyid=1008.

If we are stupid enough not to take advantage of this, well then this will be China's century and not the American century."

Krock is currently negotiating with the U.S. Navy to deploy first working OTEC plant offshore of a British-controlled island in the Indian Ocean -- most likely Diego Garcia though he wouldn't confirm this for security purposes. He is also working with firms in Britain and Netherlands and will be headed to China for talks with the government in Beijing. "The Chinese know very well that they cannot build there futures on oil," he stated, noting that China's is investing large sums of money in a blue water navy. "The United States will be playing catch-up in this technology. We're here. We're willing to do it. We're doing it with the Navy." He expects to put his first plant to sea sometime in 2008 after constructing it, mostly likely, in Singapore. "We simply have to look at the all the alternatives [to conventional fossil fuels and nuclear power] and this is, hands down, the only alternative that's big enough to replace oil."

**Great power war is a myth – nuclear deterrence and liberal democracies ensure NO conflict is likely to erupt -**

**Ikenberry 11** (G. John, “A World of our Making” [**http://www.democracyjournal.org/21/a-world-of-our-making-1.php?page=all**](http://www.democracyjournal.org/21/a-world-of-our-making-1.php?page=all))

There are four reasons to think that some type of updated and reorganized liberal international order will persist. First, the old and traditional mechanism for overturning international order—great-power war—is no longer likely to occur. Already, the contemporary world has experienced the longest period of great-power peace in the long history of the state system. This absence of great-power war is no doubt due to several factors not present in earlier eras, namely nuclear deterrence and the dominance of liberal democracies. Nuclear weapons—and the deterrence they generate—give great powers some confidence that they will not be dominated or invaded by other major states. They make war among major states less rational and there-fore less likely. This removal of great-power war as a tool of overturning international order tends to reinforce the status quo. The United States was lucky to have emerged as a global power in the nuclear age, because rival great powers are put at a disadvantage if they seek to overturn the American-led system. The cost-benefit calculation of rival would-be hegemonic powers is altered in favor of working for change within the system. But, again, the fact that great-power deterrence also sets limits on the projection of American power presumably makes the existing international order more tolerable. It removes a type of behavior in the system—war, invasion, and conquest between great powers—that historically provided the motive for seeking to overturn order. If the violent over-turning of international order is removed, a bias for continuity is introduced into the system.

**Heg causes terror – 9/11 proves**

**Layne 6** (Christopher, Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A & M University, 2006, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present, p. 190-191)

The events of 9/11 are another example of how hegemony makes the United States less secure than it would be if it followed an offshore balancing strategy. Terrorism, the RAND Corporation terrorism expert Bruce Hoff­man says, is “about power: the pursuit of power, the acquisition of power, and use of power to achieve political change.”56 If we step back for a moment from our horror and revulsion at the events of September 11, we can see that the attack was in keeping with the Clausewitzian paradigm of war: force was used against the United States by its adversaries to advance their political objectives.87 As Clausewitz observed, “War is not an act of senseless passion but is controlled by its political object.”88 September 11 represented a violent counterreaction to America’s geopolitical—and cultural—hegemony. As the strategy expert Richard K. Betts presciently observed in a 1998 Foreign Affairs article: It is hardly likely that Middle Eastern radicals would be hatching schemes like the destruction of the World Trade Center if the United States had not been identified so long as the mainstay of Israel, the shah of Iran, and conservative Arab regimes and the source of a cultural assault on Islam.89 U.S. hegemony fuels terrorist groups like al Qaeda and fans Islamic funda­mentalism, which is a form of “blowback” against America’s preponderance and its world role.

**Extinction**

**Gordon 2002** [Harvey Gordon, Visiting Lecturer, Forensic Psychiatry, Tel Aviv University, Psychiatric Bulletin, v. 26, 2k2, p. 285-287, online: http://pb.rcpsych.org/cgi/content/full/26/8/285.]

Although terrorism throughout human history has been tragic, until relatively recently it has been more of an irritant than any major hazard. However, the existence of weapons of mass destruction now renders terrorism a potential threat to the very existence of human life (Hoge & Rose, 2001). Such potential global destruction, or globicide as one might call it, supersedes even that of genocide in its lethality. Although religious factors are not the only determinant of ‘suicide’ bombers, the revival of religious fundamentalism towards the end of the 20th century renders the phenomenon a major global threat. Even though religion can be a force for good, it can equally be abused as a force for evil. Ultimately, the parallel traits in human nature of good and evil may perhaps be the most durable of all the characteristics of the human species. There is no need to apply a psychiatric analysis to the ‘suicide’ bomber because the phenomenon can be explained in political terms. Most participants in terrorism are not usually mentally disordered and their behaviour can be construed more in terms of group dynamics (Colvard, 2002). On the other hand, perhaps psychiatric terminology is as yet deficient in not having the depth to encompass the emotions and behaviour of groups of people whose levels of hate, low self-esteem, humiliation and alienation are such that it is felt that they can be remedied by the mass destruction of life, including their own.

**No Asian war**

**Bitzinger & Desker 8** – senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf)

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

TEXT: The United States federal government should fully fund research and development for Future Combat Systems, and should permanently expand the authorized end-strength of the United States Army by 100,000 troops. We’ll clarify.

AND

The United States Federal Government should develop and implement a mobile Sea Basing naval capability as quickly as possible aimed at ensuring adequate United States forward deployment and power projection capabilities.

Counter-plan is key to hegemony and solves the aff’s internal links

Perry in 2k9 (Commander Michael F, US Navy, 6-5, “IMPORTANCE OF SEABASING TO LAND POWER GENERATION”, USAWC PROGRAM RESEARCH. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/ GetTRDoc?AD=ADA508337& Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf, AD: 8/26/10)

This study reaches six conclusions regarding the importance and future of Seabasing. First, given America’s increasingly limited access to overseas bases, Seabasing is essential to land power generation and will likely become even more essential throughout the 21st Century. Specifically, land power is of little use without access to the internal lines of communication that it seeks to sever and control. Seabasing provides the most efficient and effective means of placing boots on the ground, particularly in the increasingly frequent case where modern air and seaports are unavailable due to underdevelopment, devastation or anticipated losses. Rather, Seabasing allows applying force directly to an objective from the relative security of the sea. Second, Corbett was right. The ultimate center of gravity of any opponent is its homeland and internal lines of communication. Sea and air power lack the direct and sustained influence required to achieve a decisive and lasting victory. Thus, historically, and for the foreseeable future, “imposing one’s will on an enemy involves threatening the integrity of his state” by “threatening or conducting an invasion of his homeland.”98 Such “gun boat diplomacy” works best when one clearly has the ways and means to impose a desired end. Seabasing allows Joint Force Commanders to rapidly mass and move land power around the periphery of a continental opponent and attack at the times and places of their choosing. This clearly communicates the ability of U.S. forces to rapidly respond anywhere in the world. Nothing could be more important to deterring aggression against the U.S. and its allies and supporting American foreign policy.99 Thus, Seabasing “is the most promising option available to national security planners, both civilian and military, because it can achieve political purpose in a manner which most other joint capabilities cannot match.”100

FCS are crucial to readiness and hegemony – our ev is comparative and all experts vote neg.

Lexington Institute 8 ("FCS: The Logic of Future combat Systems” http://lexingtoninstitute.org/docs/808.pdf, April]

No single program can solve every problem the military faces. Funding will always be limited, the future will always be unpredictable, and new technology is no substitute for well-trained troops or inspired leadership. But within the constraints that limit all military initiatives, Future Combat Systems seems to offer the best solution to emerging Army needs. Not only can it cope with the full range of prospective threats and contingencies, but it leverages areas in which America has unique advantages -- from the sophistication of its sensors to the initiative of its soldiers. FCS would not be a good match for the conscripted military of a foreign dictatorship, but its design speaks directly to the intelligence, discipline and values of America’s all-volunteer force. Within that framework, there are five key points about Future Combat Systems that explain why it is likely to remain the centerpiece of Army modernization for the foreseeable future: • Without the improvements in agility, awareness and protection delivered by FCS, many soldiers are going to die unnecessarily on future battlefields as emerging threats mature. • FCS technology is already making a difference on today’s battlefields, because new capabilities are being fielded as they become available in response to needs identified by soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan. • The price-tag for fielding FCS over the next 20 years represents barely four percent of projected Army spending during that period, and will enable the service to avoid the cost of maintaining many legacy systems. • If FCS is scaled back, a similar amount of money (or more) will need to be spent on alternatives, since cold war systems are overdue for replacement and cannot cope with emerging dangers. • FCS isn’t just the centerpiece of Army modernization, it also enables other facets of improvement by providing the concepts, capabilities and systems that will define the entire future Army. Thus, the Army has no practical alternative to proceeding with Future Combat Systems. It is the only integrated solution to future warfighting needs that fits within the framework of feasibility and affordability constraining all military efforts. A whole generation of Army leaders have stressed the importance of the capabilities that FCS will deliver, and now the operational needs statements being generated by soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan confirm that those capabilities are indeed required in the field as soon as possible. Whatever challenges the future may hold for America’s warfighters, Future Combat Systems is the closest thing the Army has to an answer.

# 2NC

## T

### INTERPS

2 – SOLAR THERMAL is NOT OCEAN THERMAL – our interpretation requires that the SUN be the immediate provider of the energy without a secondary conduit. Solar thermal energy requires the heating of particular TUBES with ANTI-FREEZE – they might stick giant tubes in the ocean – but these tubes

**OTEC is ocean energy – distinct from solar energy in the literature**

Kobayashi ‘1(The Present Status and Features of OTEC and Recent Aspects of Thermal Energy Conversion Technologies, Hiroki KOBAYASHI Hitachi Zosen Corporation Sadayuki JITSUHARA, Dr. Xenesys Inc. Haruo UEHARA, Dr. Saga University, 2001 http://www.nmri.go.jp/main/cooperation/ujnr/24ujnr\_paper\_jpn/Kobayashi.pdf) The world population is 6.1 billion in 2000, and it is still growing explosively. At the same time, energy consumed by human is also increasing explosively, as shown in Fig.1. By considering future economic growth and environmental problems it is obvious that in the 21st century we cannot rely on the current mainstream resources, i.e. oil, coal, and uranium for the world energy supply. Thus, we must face the urgent and important problem of developing an alternative energy source to fossil and nuclear fuel. For the alternative energy sources we can easily consider, for example, such as wind, solar and geothermal power. However, ocean energy should become also an important potential energy source which must be obtained. Among the various forms of ocean energy, the ocean thermal energy is plentiful and very stable. During the last decade, the technology of OTEC has been made great strides. It is worthy of special mention that OTEC technology is easily applicable in many industrial fields for recovery and saving of energy in lower temperature range and small thermal head.

**Any aff would include both Oceanic and Solar energy – at best they are extra topical – this is a voting issue because it proves the resolution alone is insufficient to address the problem AND Solar thermal is a SECONDARY source for OTEC – they at least include oceanic**

Raju 10 (OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION SEMINAR REPORT Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Master of Technology in Civil Engineering (Environmental Engineering) of the University of Kerala). The results of these studies revealed that due to a small temperature difference (approximately 15–25 K) between the surface water and deep water of the ocean, the Rankine-cycle efficiency is limited to be only 3–5%. This results in a high cost of the electricity generated by an OTEC plant. In order to improve the cycle efficiency, an ammonia–water mixture as the working fluid have been developed and reported to have better thermal efficiency than the Rankine cycle at the same temperature difference. However, it is evident that increasing the temperature difference between the hot and cold heat sources is the most effective solution to improve the thermal efficiency of a thermodynamic power generation cycle. In this study, an OTEC system was described that utilizes not only ocean thermal energy but also solar-thermal energy; the latter is used as a secondary heat source. A solar collector used in a residential application is

**Contextually different in the media**

**Merrick 11** (Calvin, “OTEC – Alternative Energy from the Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion, <http://voices.yahoo.com/otec-alternative-energy-ocean-thermal-energy-9826177.html>) You don't hear much about ocean thermal energy conversion in the media. One reason for this is that solar energy and bio-fuels currently hold the spotlight. Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) is an alternative energy technology that uses ocean water temperature differences to produce electricity. It's a clean energy solution with excellent potential for the future. More specifically, OTEC systems use the temperature difference between warm shallow ocean waters and cooler deep running ocean waters. The heat energy from the [water](http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/8237633/water_conservation_save_water_save.html) is then converted into electric power.

**Even different for energy conferences**

Carlson 11(Doug, <http://hawaiienergyoptions.blogspot.com/>, [Asia Pacific Energy Summit Convenes This Week as Resistance To Big Wind Builds Steam on Molokai](http://hawaiienergyoptions.blogspot.com/2011/09/asia-pacific-energy-summit-convenes.html))The third annual [Asia Pacific Clean Energy Summit and Expo](http://www.ct-si.org/events/APCE2011/) kicks off tomorrow, and it takes a couple minutes for the website to cycle through the photographs of more than 200 speakers. They include a governor and ex-governor, utility representatives, legislators, military officials, advocates for solar, wind, geothermal and ocean thermal energy conversion technology, landfill experts, private equity investors, lawyers and many others. There’s at least one misidentification – the current chair of the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission is still listed as a state representative – but getting everything right would be a stretch. Word comes from Molokai as the Summit gets underway that opposition to the Big Wind energy project is growing, and one wonders whether that community-based effort will be noticed by the guests.

**Different by the people WHO DO IT!!!**

South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commissions 01OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, March 2001 SOPAC Miscellaneous Report 417, http://www.clubdesargonautes.org/energie/sopacotec.pdf The Pacific Regional Energy Assessment (PREA) conducted in 1992 highlighted the failures in using unconventional approaches (wind power, wave power, ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC), biogas digesters, biogas gasifiers and solar power). Further unsuccessful introduction of renewable energy technologies, except for solar photovoltaics, were highlighted in the European Community’s Lomé II Pacific Regional Energy Programme Final Report, August 1994. Both reports stressed the lack of technical, economic or financial viability of the options in the Pacific context and their unsustainable institutional support requirements. This led to the Pacific island countries remaining very much dependent on imported petroleum products to cater for their day to day energy requirements.

#### T VERSION OF AFF SOTEC would solve

**McCalister, 11** (Roy, “Patent application title: INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF SUPPLEMENTED OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY CONVERSION (SOTEC) SYSTEMS”http://www.faqs.org/patents/app/20110061383#ixzz2KXweaHii, 03/17/11)

A supplemented ocean thermal energy conversion (SOTEC) system is described. In some embodiments, the system includes a solar collector configured to warm ocean water provided to a heat engine, such as the water provided to a vaporizer. The warmed water enables the vaporizer to vaporize a working fluid and propel a turbine, generating electricity, among other things. Using the solar collector, the system provides water from the surface of the ocean to the heat engine that is at a temperature higher than the water at the surface of the ocean. This causes an increased temperature difference between the water provided to the vaporizer and water from lower areas of the ocean that is provided to a condenser of the heat engine, thereby increasing the efficiency of the thermal energy conversion system, among other benefits. Thus, the system, in some embodiments, provides affordable and dependable energy for sustainable economic development by harnessing solar and other forms of energy to produce electricity, hydrogen, and so on.

## CASE

## Bio-D Advantage

### Coral

**Coral decline won’t cause extinction – empirics**

**Goklany 8**

**Oceans resilient**

**Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD.**

**Warming doesn't cause extinction – irrelevant with dedev**

**Lomborg ‘8** (

**Biodiversity won’t cause extinction – their science is flawed**

**Campbell 11**

## Guam Advantage

### A2 DETERRENCE INTERNAL LINK

#### No scenario for losing deterrence

Kristensen, 12 -- FAS nuclear weapons expert

[Hans, "DOD: Strategic Stability Not Threatened Even by Greater Russian Nuclear Forces," FAS, 10-10-12, www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2012/10/strategicstability.php, accessed 1-27-13, mss]

DOD: Strategic Stability Not Threatened Even by Greater Russian Nuclear Forces

A Department of Defense (DOD) report on Russian nuclear forces, conducted in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and sent to Congress in May 2012, concludes that even the most worst-case scenario of a Russian surprise disarming first strike against the United States would have “little to no effect” on the U.S. ability to retaliate with a devastating strike against Russia. I know, even thinking about scenarios such as this sounds like an echo from the Cold War, but the Obama administration has actually come under attack from some for considering further reductions of U.S. nuclear forces when Russia and others are modernizing their forces. The point would be, presumably, that reducing while others are modernizing would somehow give them an advantage over the United States. But the DOD report concludes that Russia “would not be able to achieve a militarily significant advantage by any plausible expansion of its strategic nuclear forces, even in a cheating or breakout scenario under the New START Treaty” (emphasis added). The conclusions are important because the report come after Vladimir Putin earlier this year announced plans to produce “over 400” new nuclear missiles during the next decade. Putin’s plan follows the Obama administration’s plan to spend more than $200 billion over the next decade to modernize U.S. strategic forces and weapons factories. The conclusions may also hint at some of the findings of the Obama administration’s ongoing (but delayed and secret) review of U.S. nuclear targeting policy. No Effects on Strategic Stability The DOD report – Report on the Strategic Nuclear Forces of the Russian Federation Pursuant to Section 1240 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 – was obtained under the Freedom of Information Act. It describes the U.S. intelligence community’s projection for the likely development of Russian nuclear forces through 2017 and 2022, the timelines of the New START Treaty, and possible implications for U.S. national security and strategic stability. Much of the report’s content was deleted before release – including general and widely reported factual information about Russian nuclear weapons systems that is not classified. But the important concluding section that describes the effects of possible shifts in the number and composition of Russian nuclear forces on strategic stability was released in its entirety. The section “Effects on Strategic Stability” begins by defining that stability in the strategic nuclear relationship between the United States and the Russian Federation depends upon the assured capability of each side to deliver a sufficient number of nuclear warheads to inflict unacceptable damage on the other side, even with an opponent attempting a disarming first strike. Consequently, the report concludes, “the only Russian shift in its nuclear forces that could undermine the basic framework of mutual deterrence that exists between the United States and the Russian Federation is a scenario that enables Russia to deny the United States the assured ability to respond against a substantial number of highly valued Russian targets following a Russian attempt at a disarming first strike” (emphasis added). The DOD concludes that such a first strike scenario “will most likely not occur.” But even if it did and Russia deployed additional strategic warheads to conduct a disarming first strike, even significantly above the New START Treaty limits, DOD concludes that it “would have little to no effects on the U.S. assured second-strike capabilities that underwrite our strategic deterrence posture” (emphasis added). In fact, the DOD report states, the “Russian Federation…would not be able to achieve a militarily significant advantage by any plausible expansion of its strategic nuclear forces, even in a cheating or breakout scenario under the New START Treaty, primarily because of the inherent survivability of the planned U.S. Strategic force structure, particularly the OHIO-class ballistic missile submarines, a number of which are at sea at any given time.” Implications These are BIG conclusions with BIG implications. They reaffirm conclusions made by DOD in 2010 [http://www.foreign.senate.gov/publications/download/executive-report-111-06-treaty-with-russia-on-measures-for-further-reduction-and-limitation-of-strategic-offensive-arms-the-new-start-treaty], but the new report is important because it comes after Russia earlier this year announced plans to produce “over 400” nuclear missiles over the next decade. In the real world, however, Russian nuclear forces are not increasing. Even with Putin’s missile production plan, simultaneous retirement of older missile will continue the downward trend and result in a net reduction of Russian strategic nuclear forces over the next decade and a half. This fact has not stopped some from arguing against additional U.S. nuclear reductions. Their argument is that reductions are unwise at a time when Russia and others are modernizing their nuclear forces. Others have even argued that Russia could break out of the New START Treaty by cheating and presumably achieve some strategic advantage. Even the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent resolution that in 2010 approved the New START Treaty required that “the President should regulate reductions in United States strategic offensive arms so that the number of accountable strategic offensive arms under the New START Treaty possessed by the Russian Federation in no case exceeds the comparable number of accountable strategic offensive arms possessed by the United States to such an extent that a strategic imbalance endangers the national security interests of the United States” (emphasis added). A similar obsession with numbers was echoed in the 2012 report by the State Department’s International Strategic Advisory Board on future U.S.-Russian “Mutual Assured Stability,” which concluded that it requires some “rough parity” of nuclear forces. (A similar number obsession has evolved with NATO about non-strategic nuclear weapons, but that’s another story). But the DOD report appears to conclude that such warnings and parity requirement are missing the point. Strategic stability and deterrence today are provided by a secure retaliatory capability, primarily ballistic missile submarines. In fact, although ICBMs and bombers also play a role in the U.S. nuclear posture, they seem oddly absent from the report’s description of what is required to maintain strategic stability based on a sufficient secure retaliatory capability. Retaining that capability, it seems, does not even require the ballistic missile submarines to be on alert (although the report doesn’t explicitly say so). It only requires that a sufficient number of submarines “are at sea” and secure at any given time – or perhaps even only in a crisis. Likewise, the conclusion that a Russian disarming first strike “will most likely not occur” may be obvious to most but, if formal, seems to remove the need for having ICBMs on alert, as long as a sufficient number of submarines are at sea to provide the basic deterrence that underpins strategic stability.

### Guam

**No Impact and turn – Guam basing is more vulnerable to attack and too far from flash points to prevent conflict**

**Kan, Asian Security Affairs Specialist, 2010**

[

### Dedev

THEY DO SOLVE THE ECONOM – their panzner evidence says that they do

**The impact is global nuclear war – this based off of econ not neccesarily trade**

**Panzner 8**

**Telecomm is key to the economy**

Rogers 2012

**Collapse now allows us to survive, but delay risks multiple scenarios for extinction**

**Barry 8** –

**Growth causes ecosystem collapse and extinction**

Jim **Chen 2k** –

T/BIO-D

T/War

### ECON COLLAPSE

**Economic collapse is inevitable – the economy is based on oil, which is fundamentally unsustainable – we have indicted your authors – those economists were the same ones predicting there was no chance we’d slip into a recession – that’s Brownlee**

**Here are more warrants –**

**a. The laws of thermodynamics**

**Martenson 11** – PhD from Duke University (Chris, 10/24, “Oil and the Economy,” http://www.aspousa.org/index.php/2011/10/oil-and-the-economy-by-chris-martenson/)

The critical fact is this: Because all money is loaned into existence, our economy requires perpetual growth to function. The purpose of this article is not to opine on whether this is a good or a bad system, but merely to describe it and the risks it carries by virtue of its design. With constant economic growth, our money system is relatively happy; without growth, it becomes utterly despondent. Without constant economic growth, preferably in the range of 3% (or more!), the collective pile of debts cannot be serviced out of new growth and so they begin to default. This is exactly the dynamic that has been exposed and now is in play in Europe and, if my guesses are correct, will soon visit the very core of the thin-air money machine, the US itself. That’s the difference between growth and shrinkage in our world economy. Night and day. Life and death. If this strikes you as a rather fragile and **unsustainable** way to construct an economy, thenyou are not alone. After all, how can anything grow forever? The key takeaway here is this: Our economy must grow in order to function. When I have the opportunity to present to and interact with people who are one the economic/financial side of the equation, they very rarely understand - truly understand - the energy side of the equation. You know, the not-so-subtle difference between total energy and net energy, and the fact that the first and second laws of thermodynamics have never been broken. And in reverse, I often find that people in the energy camp do not really appreciate how the economy functions, and that it is really a complex system with multiple nested feedback loops predicated upon growth. In my view, each camp would benefit from spending a little bit more time in the other camp because both are really making some very profound assumptions. The economic folks are assuming that energy will somehow be found and brought to market and the energy folks are assuming that the economy will be there to support their capital and technology-intensive efforts. Neither of these assumptions are very helpful if they help us overlook thepotential disruption thatdeclining net energy could unleash within our economy. To return to the idea of our economy as a complex system for a minute. The field of complexity research is pretty robust and understands the basic principles of the coupling between energy flows and complexity. Whether the complex system being studied is a wave encountering the shore, a pile of sand, or an economy; the same fundamental rules seem to apply. Maintaining complexity requires energy while increasing complexity requires more energy. At this point I have to confess that my earlier description of the economy was woefully narrow. Yes, it is a nested system with multiple feedback loops, but those in turn are interconnected with political, social and cultural systems, each of which are themselves complex systems. It is in the largest sense that we must consider the impact of declining net energy on the complexity and behaviors of our most critical systems. To make things even more uncertain, another feature of complex systems is that they are inherently unpredictable. When an event might occur, or how big that event might be, are both unknowable, whether it is the size and timing next earthquake on an overdue fault or the vigor and demands of the social uprising we are talking about. Complex systems are frequently tightly coupled and little events cascade and become larger events; the so-called butterfly effect. My view here is that a decline in net energy will disrupt the economy, and other interlocking systems, in ways that are both unknowable and **larger than expected** by most. Recently there was a revealing AP story about coal seams in Kentucky being chased that were only six inches thick. Revealing because it tells us a lot about where we are in the net energy story. Those managing pensions with 30 year investment horizons should be thinking really hard about those six inch coal seams. They should ponder what it means that half of all the oil ever burned has been burned over the past 22 years and wonder about where the supplies will come from to fund the next 22 years. In fact all of us should; what we assume to be the way the world works, and the way all of those interlocking complex systems function, is a very, very recent development historically speaking and can continue if, and only If, the amount of available surplus energy continues to grow. This is not an idle concern, but one that will shape our futures by shaking our monetary and economic systems **to the core**. Such is the nature of complex systems starved of the requisite amount of energy required to both maintain and advance the current level of complexity//////. The implications for stocks, bonds, and every other growth-dependent investment class are **enormous**. In aggregate they will fall in value. Whether dollars, euros or yen are depreciated or inflated in value does not matter, either way stocks and bonds will be worth less than they currently are because the growth premium will be reduced or eliminated. To make things just a little bit darker for equities today is the fact that from a historical perspective dividend yields are quite unattractive and reversion to the mean is the better bet: Historically, truly compelling equity yields are in the vicinity of 10% but even the long term average is more than double the current yield. The two ways to bring the dividend yield back into the historical fold are for prices to fall by half or dividends to be doubled. Unless a massive earnings binge is expected, which rising energy costs render difficult if not impossible, the ‘fall by half’ option is the more likely outcome. How could equities fall by half? One way would be to keep the dollar constant and let the prices fall. This is the more obvious method. The other way is to debase the currency and let the purchasing power of stocks erode by half while holding their nominal prices constant. If that sounds tricky, it is exactly what has happened over the prior thirteen years where the S&P is now trading at the exact same level it was back then. Inflation has been anything but absent over that same period and this is how printing money in the face of declining net energy (and an enormous credit bubble popping) will deliver to us smaller returns even as the tried and formerly true monetary levers are pulled and pulled again in search of a response we can recognize. The bottom line here is that everything we think we know about investing and how the world works is challenged by the pesky reality of energy sources that are dwindling in both quantity and quality. The days of pulling magic monetary and fiscal levers and then having the resources magically appear are **over**. A new and more complex future has arrived. Unfortunately the experience set of practically everyone currently with their hands on these levers does not extend to energy, physics, the laws of thermodynamics, or anything outside of the tidy but **woefully incomplete** world of economics.

**b. Empirics, increasing complexity and finite resources – collapse now is better than later**

**MacKenzie 8** – science journalist who writes regularly in New Scientist and other publications, cites Joseph Tainter, Head of the Department of Environment and Society at Utah State University, leader at the Rocky Mountain Research Station in the USDA Forest Service, also cites Thomas Homer-Dixon, director of the Waterloo Institute for Complexity and Innovation, CIGI Chair of Global Systems at the Balsillie School of International Affairs (Debora, 04/05, “Are we doomed?” EBSCO)

DOOMSDAY. The end of civilisation. Literature and film abound with tales of plague, famine and wars which ravage the planet, leaving a few survivors scratching out a primitive existence amid the ruins. **Every** civilisation in history has collapsed, after all. Why should ours be any different? Doomsday scenarios typically feature a knockout blow: a massive asteroid, all-out nuclear war or a catastrophic pandemic. Yet there is another chilling possibility: what if the very nature of civilisation means that ours, like all the others, is **destined** to collapse sooner or later? A few researchers have been making such claims for years. Disturbingly, recent insights from fields such as complexity theory suggest that they are right. It appears that once a society develops beyond a certain level of complexity it becomes increasingly fragile. Eventually, it reaches a point at which even a relatively minor disturbance can bring everything **crashing down**. Some say we have already reached this point, and that it is time to start thinking about how we might manage collapse. Others insist it is not yet too late, and that we can - we must - act now to keep disaster at bay. History is not on our side. Think of Sumeria, of ancient Egypt and of the Maya. In his 2005 best-seller, Jared Diamond of the University of California, Los Angeles, blamed environmental mismanagement for the fall of the Mayan civilisation and others, and warned that we might be heading the same way unless we choose to stop destroying our environmental support systems. Lester Brown of the Earth Policy Institute in Washington DC agrees. He has that governments must pay more attention to vital environmental resources. "It's not about saving the planet. It's about saving civilisation," he says. Others think our problems run deeper. From the moment our ancestors started to settle down and build cities, we have had to find solutions to the problems that success brings. "For the past 10,000 years, problem solving has produced increasing complexity in human societies," says Joseph Tainter, an archaeologist at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies. If crops fail because rain is patchy, build irrigation canals. When they silt up, organise dredging crews. When the bigger crop yields lead to a bigger population, build more canals. When there are too many for ad hoc repairs, install a management bureaucracy, and tax people to pay for it. When they complain, invent tax inspectors and a system to record the sums paid. That much the Sumerians knew. There is, however, a price to be paid. Every extra layer of organisation imposes a cost in terms of energy, the common currency of all human efforts, from building canals to educating scribes. And increasing complexity, Tainter realised, produces diminishing returns. The extra food produced by each extra hour of labour - or joule of energy invested per farmed hectare - diminishes as that investment mounts. We see the same thing today in a declining number of patents per dollar invested in research as that research investment mounts. This law of diminishing returns appears everywhere, Tainter says. To keep growing, societies must keep solving problems as they arise. Yet each problem solved means more complexity. Success generates a larger population, more kinds of specialists, more resources to manage, more information to juggle - and, ultimately, less bang for your buck. Eventually, says Tainter, the point is reached when all the energy and resources available to a society are required just to maintain its existing level of complexity. Then when the climate changes or barbarians invade, overstretched institutions break down and civil order collapses. //What emerges is a less complex society, which is organised on a smaller scale or has been taken over by another group. Tainter sees diminishing returns as the underlying reason for the collapse of all ancient civilisations, from the early Chinese dynasties to the Greek city state of Mycenae. These civilisations relied on the solar energy that could be harvested from food, fodder and wood, and from wind. When this had been stretched to its limit, things fell apart. Western industrial civilisation has become bigger and more complex than any before it by exploiting new sources of energy, notably coal and oil, but these are limited.

### Disease

**Growth causes disease spread**

**Hamburg 8** – Commissioner of the FDA, Vice President for Biological Programs and Senior Scientist at the Nuclear Threat Initiative (Margaret A., October, “Germs Go Global: Why Emerging Infectuous Diseases Are A Threat To America,” healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf)

Globalization, the worldwide movement toward economic, financial, trade, and communications integration, has impacted public health significantly. Technology and economic interdependence allow diseases to spread globally at rapid speeds. **Experts** believe that the increase in international travel and commerce, including the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales contribute to the spread of emerging infectious diseases.47 Increased global trade has also brought more and more people into contact with zoonosis -diseases that originated in animals before jumping to humans. For example, in 2003, the monkeypox virus entered the U.S. through imported Gambian giant rats sold in the nation’s under-regulated exotic pet trade. The rats infected pet prairie dogs, which passed the virus along to humans.48 International smuggling of birds, brought into the U.S. without undergoing inspection and/or quarantine, is of particular concern to public health experts who worry that it may be a pathway for the H5N1 “bird flu” virus to enter the country. Lower cost and efficient means of international transportation allow people to travel to more remote places and potential exposure to **more infectious** diseases. And the close proximity of passengers on passenger planes, trains, and cruise ships over the course of many hours puts people at risk for higher levels of exposure. If a person contracts a disease abroad, their symptoms may not emerge until they return home, having exposed others to the infection during their travels. In addition, planes and ships can themselves become breeding grounds for infectious diseases. The 2002-2003 SARS outbreak spread quickly around the globe due to international travel. SARS is caused by a new strain of coronavirus, the same family of viruses that frequently cause the common cold. This contagious and sometimes fatal respiratory illness first appeared in China in November 2002. Within 6 weeks, SARS had spread worldwide, transmitted around the globe by unsuspecting travelers. According to CDC, 8,098 people were infected and 774 died of the disease.49 SARS represented the first severe, newly emergent infectious disease of the 21st century. 50 It illustrated just how **quickly** infection can spread in a highly mobile and interconnected world. SARS was contained and controlled because public health authorities in the communities most affected mounted a rapid and effective response.

**Extinction**

**Keating 9** – associate editor at Foreign Policy and the editor of the Passport blog. He has worked as a researcher, editorial assistant, and deputy Web editor since joining the FP staff in 2007. In addition to being featured in Foreign Policy, his writing has been published by the Washington Post, Newsweek International, Radio Prague, the Center for Defense Information, and Romania's Adevarul newspaper. He has appeared as a commentator on CNN International, C-Span, ABC News, Al Jazeera, NPR, BBC radio, and others. A native of Brooklyn, New York, he studied comparative politics at Oberlin College (Joshua, 11/13, “The End of The World,” http://infoit.ecosapiens.ro/tag/generally-burning-up-in-the-atmosphere-occasionally/)

PLAGUE How it could happen: Throughout history, plagues have brought civilizations to their knees. The Black Death killed more off more than half of Europe’s population in the Middle Ages. In 1918, a flu pandemic killed an estimated 50 million people, nearly 3 percent of the world’s population, a far greater impact than the just-concluded World War I. Because of globalization, diseases today spread **even faster** – witness the rapid worldwide spread of H1N1 currently unfolding. A global outbreak of a disease such as ebola virus — which has had a 90 percent fatality rate during its flare-ups in rural Africa — or a mutated drug-resistant form of the flu virus on a global scale could have a devastating, even **civilization-ending impact**. How likely is it? Treatment of deadly diseases has improved since 1918, but so have the diseases. M////odern industrial farming techniques have been blamed for the outbreak of diseases, such as swine flu, and as the world’s population grows and humans move into previously unoccupied areas, the risk of exposure to previously unknown pathogens increases. More than 40 new viruses have emerged since the 1970s, including ebola and HIV. Biological weapons experimentation has added a new and just as troubling complication.

### Trade

**No impact to trade—**

**A) Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace**

**MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008**

**No impact to trade—**

**B) Doha proves even sudden collapse of free trade will not cause war**

**THE SEATTLE TIMES** 7-31-**2008**

**Economists disagree on the Doha round's potential benefits**; estimates of economic gain that could have been reaped through additional trade range from $4 billion to $100 billion. **Set against the rapid expansion of global trade** to $13.6 trillion last year from $7.6 trillion **five years ago, however, the bottom-line loss from Doha's failure is "not a market issue**," said Julian Callow, an economist at Barclays Capital in London. **Nor is the world on the edge of the kind of protectionist wave that ended the last period of globalization in the early 20th century and contributed to two world wars, analysts say. Countries are likely to go on negotiating bilateral trade deals with each other**, such as the U.S.-South Korea free-trade deal earlier this year.

### HEG

**Great power war is a myth – nuclear deterrence and liberal democracies ensure NO conflict is likely to erupt -**

**Ikenberry 11**

**Heg causes terror – 9/11 proves**

**Layne 6** (

### Asia

**No Asian war**

**Bitzinger & Desker 8**
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## A2 – Add Ons

### Naval

**Naval power inevitable - reject their evidence**

**Farley 7** (Roberts, Assistant Professor @ the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, "The False Decline of U.S. Navy," Oct 23, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the\_false\_decline\_of\_the\_us\_navy,

We live in strange times. While the United States is responsible for close to 50 percent of aggregate world military expenditure, and maintains close alliances with almost all of the other major military powers, a community of defense analysts continues to insist that we need to spend more. In the November issue of The Atlantic, Robert Kaplan asserts that United States hegemony is under the threat of “elegant decline,” and points to what conventional analysts might suggest is the most secure element of American power; the United States Navy. Despite the fact that the U.S. Navy remains several orders of magnitude more powerful than its nearest rival, Kaplan says that we must beware; if we allow the size of our Navy to further decline, we risk repeating the experience of the United Kingdom in the years before World War I. Unfortunately, since no actual evidence of U.S. naval decline exists, Kaplan is forced to rely on obfuscation, distortion, and tendentious historical analogies to make his case. The centerpiece of Kaplan’s argument is a comparison of the current U.S. Navy to the British Royal Navy at the end of the 19th century. The decline of the Royal Navy heralded the collapse of British hegemony, and the decline of the U.S. Navy threatens a similar fate for the United States. The only problem with this argument is that similarities between the 21st century United States and the 19th century United Kingdom are more imagined than real. It’s true that the relative strength of the Royal Navy declined at the end of the 19th century, but this was due entirely the rise of the United States and Germany. But the absolute strength of the Royal Navy increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the United Kingdom strove to maintain naval dominance over two countries that possessed larger economies and larger industrial bases than that of Great Britain. In other words, the position of the Royal Navy declined because the position of the United Kingdom declined; in spite of this decline, the Royal Navy continued to dominate the seas against all comers until 1941. Britain’s relative economic decline preceded its naval decline, although the efforts to keep up with Germany, the United States, and later Japan did serious damage to the British economy. The United States faces a situation which is in no way similar. Returning to the present, Kaplan takes note of the growth of several foreign navies, including the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese. He points out that the Japanese Navy has a large number of destroyers and a growing number of submarines. He warns that India “may soon have the world’s third largest navy” without giving any indication of why that matters. Most serious of all, he describes the threat of a growing Chinese Navy and claims that, just as the Battle of Wounded Knee opened a new age for American imperialism, the conquest of Taiwan could transform China into an expansionist, imperial power. The curious historical analogies aside, Kaplan is careful to make no direct comparisons between the growing navies of foreign countries and the actual strength of the United States Navy. There’s a good reason for this oversight; there is no comparison between the U.S. Navy and any navy afloat today. The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.

### Space Col

**Technology is nowhere near ready**

**Clark 2k** (Greg, Staff Reporter – Space.com, “Will Nuclear Power Put Humans on Mars?”, Space.com, 5-21,

<http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/solarsystem/nuclearmars_000521.html>)

When it comes to attracting interest in new mission plans to far-out places in the solar system, it is often the **wildly futuristic concepts** that **get the attention**. **Antimatter propulsion**, **solar and magnetic sails** all **make great stories, but** such **futuristic concepts** **don't do anything** **to get humans out** to the moon, or Mars, or to various local comets or asteroids **within the** **foreseeable futur**e. **With** these **futuristic technologies** **barely out of their conceptual phases**, practical use of such far-out concepts for **human space transportation is** **decades away at best**.

**U.S. isn’t key**

**Kaufman 8** (Marc, Staff – Washington Post, “US Finds It’s Getting Crowded Out There”, Global Policy Forum, 7-9,

http://www.globalpolicy.org/empire/challenges/competitors/2008/0709space.htm)

**Six separate nations and the E**uropean **S**pace **A**gency **are now capable of sending sophisticated satellites and spacecraft into orbit -- and more are on the way**. New rockets, satellites and spacecraft are being planned to carry Chinese, Russian, European and Indian astronauts to the moon, to turn Israel into a center for launching minuscule "nanosatellites," and to allow Japan and the Europeans to explore the solar system and beyond with unmanned probes as sophisticated as NASA's. While the United States has been making incremental progress in space, its **global rivals have been taking the giant steps that once defined NASA:** • Following China's lead, India has announced ambitious plans for a manned space program, and in November the European Union will probably approve a proposal to collaborate on a manned space effort with Russia. Russia will soon launch rockets from a base in South America under an agreement with the European company Arianespace, whose main launch facility is in Kourou, French Guiana. • Japan and China both have satellites circling the moon, and India and Russia are also working on lunar orbiters. NASA will launch a lunar reconnaissance mission this year, but many analysts believe **the Chinese will be the first to return astronauts to the moon.** • The United States is largely out of the business of launching satellites for other nations, something the Russians, Indians, Chinese and Arianespace do regularly. Their clients include Nigeria, Singapore, Brazil, Israel and others. The 17-nation European Space Agency (ESA) and China are also cooperating on commercial ventures, including a rival to the U.S. space-based Global Positioning System. • South Korea, Taiwan and Brazil have plans to quickly develop their space programs and possibly become low-cost satellite launchers. South Korea and Brazil are both developing homegrown rocket and satellite-making capacities. This explosion in international space capabilities is recent, largely taking place since the turn of the century. While the origins of Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Israeli and European space efforts go back several decades, their **capability to pull off highly technical feats -- sending humans into orbit, circling Mars** and the moon with unmanned spacecraft, landing on an asteroid and visiting a comet -- **are all new developments.** A Different Space Race In contrast to the Cold War space race between the United States and the former Soviet Union, the global competition today is being driven by national pride, newly earned wealth, a growing cadre of highly educated men and women, and the confidence that achievements in space will bring substantial soft power as well as military benefits. **The planet-wide eagerness to join the space-faring club is palpable.** China has sent men into space twice in the past five years and plans another manned mission in October. More than any other country besides the United States, experts say, **China has decided that space exploration**, and its commercial and military purposes, **are** as **important** as the seas once were to the British empire and air power was to the United States.

## K

### Overview

**Epist key -**

**Plans focus on terminal war impacts masks structural violence - causes extinction**

**Pandey in 2k6** (Anupam, thesis submitted to faculty of graduate studies and research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctorate of philosophy department of political science Carleton university, Forging bonds with women, nature and the third world: an ecofeminist critique of international relations, pg. 17-18)

Despite the fact that many significant critiques have made their presence felt, **the discipline of IR continues to be dominated by the sub-field of military security. The** chief **reason** for the same **is** the preponderance of **the Realist paradigm which needs to be situated within the circumstances of the historical legacy and birth of IR,** the Cold War, **the emergence of a single hegemon post-Cold War, the renewed threat of terrorism, etc**. Thus, **concepts of balance of power, deterrence, sovereignty, etc. have come to occupy the central and vast majority of space in the subject matter of the discipline**. Both theory and practice have served to reinforce each other and this partnership has served to marginalize all other issues which are regarded as “normative” concerns to the margins of the IR. Thus, **issues such as Third World debt and poverty are relegated to the realm of “low politics” and hence put on the backburner, while matters pertaining to state security, wars, weaponisation and sovereignty are studied as an integral part of the “high politics” which deserve salience.** However, **the more recent innovation of human security studies is relevant to the Third World by sheer dint of its subject matter which explores human vulnerability across the globe that could be the result of natural or man-made disasters**. Simon Dalby states that traditionally there have been two elements to human security — freedom from fear and freedom from want but over the years, the former element has overshadowed the latter (2002: 7). Further, he quotes the UNDP Human Development Report (1994) to define human security. Thus, **issues of poverty, disease, hunger, famines, financial crises feature prominently here under the overarching topics of freedom from want and hunger** (Thomas and Wilkins 2004). In the coming century**, the six great threats to human security are unchecked rise in population, disparities in economic opportunities, excessive international migration, environmental degradation, drug trafficking and international terrorism** (Dalby 2002: 8**). It becomes clear that these threats are the result of actions of millions of people rather than deliberate actions of specific states.** Therefore, **the concept of security must change from the realist, statist and militarist preoccupations to include human welfare**. Despite the fact that the approach is holistic in its understanding of world affairs and emancipatory in terms of its agenda, its drawback lies in that it largely espouses a liberal humanitarian framework rather than a radical departure from existing structural constraints.

**The Aff’s androcentric approach to science creates a self-fulfilling prophecy in which communities of difference cannot survive. It is not that science or technology is bad, rather that patriarchal values have infiltrated these venues as a means to dominate, oppress, exploit and kill. The only logical outcome is ecological and nuclear catastrophe.**

**Nhanenge 7**

(Jytte, Masters @ U South Africa, Accepted Thesis Paper for Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT, uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/10500/570/1/dissertation.pdf)

The androcentric premises also have political consequences. They protect the ideological basis of exploitative relationships. Militarism, colonialism, racism, sexism, capitalism and other pathological 'isms' of modernity get legitimacy from the assumption that power relations and hierarchy are inevitably a part of human society, **due to man's inherent nature**. Because when mankind by nature is autonomous, competitive and violent (i.e. masculine) then coercion and hierarchical structures are necessary to manage conflicts and maintain social order. In this way, the cooperative relationships such as those found among some women and tribal cultures, are by a dualised definition unrealistic and utopian. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This means that power relations are generated by universal scientific truths about human nature, rather than by political and social debate. The consequence is that people cannot challenge the basis of the power structure because they believe it is the scientific truth, so it cannot be otherwise. In this way, militarism is justified as being unavoidable, regardless of its patent irrationality. Likewise, if **the scientific "truth**" were that humans would always compete for a greater share of resources, then the rational response to the environmental crisis would seem to be "dog-eat-dog" survivalism. This creates a **self-fulfilling prophecy in which nature** and community simply **cannot survive**. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This type of social and political power structure is kept in place by social policies. It is based on the assumption that if the scientific method is applied to public policy then social planning can be done free from normative values. However, according to Habermas (Reitzes 1993: 40) the scientific method only conceal pre-existing, unreflected social interests and pre-scientific decisions. Consequently, also social scientists apply the scientific characteristics of objectivity, value-freedom, rationality and quantifiability to social life. In this way, they assume they can unveil universal laws about social relations, which will lead to true knowledge. Based on this, correct social policies can be formulated. Thus, social processes are excluded, while scientific objective facts are included. Society is assumed a static entity, where no changes are possible. By promoting a permanent character, social science legitimizes the existing social order, while obscuring the relations of domination and subordination, which is keeping the existing power relations inaccessible to analysis. The frozen order also makes it impossible to develop alternative explanations about social reality. It prevents a historical and political understanding of reality and denies the possibility for social transformation by human agency. The prevailing condition is seen as an unavoidable fact. This implies that human beings are passive and that domination is a natural force, for which no one is responsible. This permits the state freely to implement laws and policies, which are controlling and coercive. These are seen as being correct, because they are based on scientific facts made by scientific experts. One result is that the state, without consulting the public, engages in a pathological pursuit of economic growth. Technology can be used to dominate societies or to enhance them. Thus both science and technology could have developed in a different direction. But due to patriarchal values infiltrated in science the type of technology developed is meant to **dominate, oppress, exploit and kill**. One reason is that patriarchal societies identify masculinity with conquest. Thus **any technical innovation will continue to be a tool for more effective oppression and exploitation**. The highest priority seems to be given to technology that destroys life. Modern societies are dominated by masculine institutions and patriarchal ideologies. Their technologies prevailed in Auschwitz, Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world. Patriarchal power has brought us acid rain, global warming, military states, poverty and countless cases of suffering. We have seen men whose power has caused them to lose all sense of reality, decency and imagination, and we must fear such power. **The ultimate result of unchecked patriarchy will be ecological catastrophe and nuclear holocaust**.

### Perm

**Epistomology focus key to good policy making**

**Beland 2009**

Daniel Beland. “Gender, Ideational Analysis, and Social Policy” Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society. Vol 16 Num 4. Pp 558-581. Winter 2009

Importantly, under many circumstances, political actors and the general public become aware of socially constructed economic and social problems through changing—and socially constructed— statistical indicators such as unemployment, fertility rates, and poverty rates and “focusing events” like perceived catastrophes or unexpected electoral outcomes that attract widespread media cover- age (Kingdon 1995). Moreover, **in areas where the state has long been active, policy problems are perceived through the lens of exist- ing policy legacies and possible grievances about their functioning and impacts.** In other words, **the problems of the day are frequently seen in the mirror of policy-learning processes through which actors draw lessons from existing policies to assess their effectiveness and potential ways to improve or replace them** (e.g., Bennett and Howlett 1992; Bothfeld 2008; Hall 1993; Heclo 1974; King and Hansen 1999; Rose 2004; Sabatier 1988). **Debates about the effec- tiveness of the existing policies are instrumental in shaping the per- ception of the problems that political actors seek to address through their reform proposals** (Weir 1992, 18). In most of the traditional policy literature, **policy learning is depicted as a rationalistic and technocratic process unrelated to cat- egorical inequalities, power, hierarchy, and political struggles.** Yet, in recent years, a growing number of scholars have challenged this vision of policy learning to emphasize its social and political con- struction (Be´ land 2006; Fischer 2003; King and Hansen 1999). Most **students of policy learning**—including feminist scholars—**agree that, when existing policies are seen as ineffective for handling major problems, actors may feel the need to revise or even replace such policies** (e.g., Abrar, Lovenduski and Margetts 2000; Bothfeld 2008; Jenson 1986; Mazur 2003; Skocpol 1992). For example, when civil society experts and advocates discover that existing social programs negatively impact fertility rates, they can make a case for policy change (Jenson 1986). Therefore, **policy learning can help trigger policy change and, in the ﬁeld of social policy, learning pro- cesses frequently involve gendered categories.** For instance, the learn- ing processes surrounding the concept of social investment has reﬂected changing gender relations—mothers’ employment, most notably (e.g., Dobrowolsky and Lister 2008; Dobrowolsky and Saint-Martin 2005; Jenson 2004). In short, many learning processes regarding social policy are gendered.