# 2AC

## Case

### Solvency

#### They say Yucca’s not long term – NIMBY attitudes and political pressure prevents the feasibility of other options. Empirically proven with proposals in Wyoming. That’s Tollefson.

#### They say tax incentives fail – investment tax investment of 20% would provide an increase in energy of 4 mills/kWh. That’s Lagus. Also, tax incentives mitigate the long timeframe and inherent market risks. That’s the IAEA evidence. Also, this mitigates the cost of the government regulatory regime. That’s Selyukh.

#### Other countries—private companies see federal support for reprocessing in foreign countries, they want the same in the U.S.

Koenig ’11 – St. Louis Beacon Washington correspondent

(Robert Koenig, “From Yucca to reprocessing, nuclear waste options spark hot debates”, St. Louis Beacon, 3-29-2011, https://www.stlbeacon.org/#!/content/16591/from\_yucca\_to\_reprocessing\_nuclear\_waste\_options\_spark\_hot\_debates\_)

In the early days of nuclear energy, the ideal solution to reducing the tonnage of nuclear waste appeared to be reprocessing -- that is, using chemical procedures to separate uranium, plutonium and other useful components from spent nuclear fuel. But the production of plutonium -- a major component of nuclear weapons -- meant that reprocessing might hurt the effort to stop the proliferation of such weapons. President Gerald Ford first suspended the commercial reprocessing of plutonium in 1976; Jimmy Carter made the ban permanent the following year. (Countries such as France and the United Kingdom continued to reprocess spent nuclear fuel.) President Ronald Reagan lifted the U.S. ban in 1981, but Congress never came up with the billions of dollars needed to re-establish commercial reprocessing. In recent years, the DOE has authorized some reprocessing to create so-called MOX nuclear fuel for certain thermal nuclear reactors, but the reprocessed uranium is so costly that it is not attractive as commercial fuel. Even so, supporters of reprocessing point out that France and some other countries have been doing it for decades. Calling greater federal support for reprocessing research "long overdue," Durbin said Friday at the nuclear safety forum that "we need to reopen the conversation about research involving spent nuclear fuel" -- especially if ways could be found to reprocess the radioactive waste into substances less dangerous than plutonium. "It's important for us to develop our own research -- maybe in concert with some of [the countries that now do reprocessing] -- keeping in mind the concern expressed by President Carter" about nuclear proliferation, Durbin said. "There has to be a way for us to pursue this in an environmentally responsible way and in a responsible way when it comes to national security." Kirk also backed the concept of a greater focus on reprocessing Friday, but he and Mark T. Peters, a nuclear fuel-cycle expert at Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois, both supported the proposed Yucca Mountain repository as the best long-term solution to the challenge of safely storing nuclear waste. Peters said, "We've started to grow back our research infrastructure" to investigate reprocessing options, "but the investments are quite modest in the United States." If more nuclear plants are to be built in this county, Peters said, "It makes sense to recycle because you can make optimal use of repository space" -- given that recycling reduces the tonnage of nuclear waste. But the expense of reprocessed fuel does not make it attractive to the nuclear industry. "Unless we start this as a matter of national policy, we won't pursue it for quite some time, because the economics are not there to support the initial investment" in reprocessing, said Exelon Generation's CEO, Charles Pardee. "The countries that have done this have done it with federal funds, as a matter of federal policy."

### Waste

#### Framing issue – all of their ev is about core reactor meltdown not a waste based meltdown. Pref specificity of ev.

#### They say no impact to meltdowns – reactors contain radioactivity 100x that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That’s Lendman.

#### They say no impact to nuke terror – their ev does not take into account the political pressure for retaliation following a terrorist attack that triggers global nuke war. Best studies agree that it’s also likely. That’s Rhodes.

#### Answered Yucca above. Political pressure for it now. Waste developing on site.

#### They say Yucca won’t explode – it’s located right above multiple earthquake faults, has the risk of groundwater flooding the site and volcanic activity near it. That’s Warrick.

### Peak Oil

#### They say reprocessing doesn’t solve – reprocessing increases the nuclear supply which is 1.) independently key to displacing oil from the market. That’s Szabo and 2.) critical to the hydrogen economy that can replace oil in the transportation sector. That’s Choppin.

#### They say no impact to resource wars – resource wars inevitably drag in major powers which will result in escalatory conflicts that involve nukes. That’s Lendman.

#### They say no impact to econ collapse – econ collapse triggers nationalist sentiments in countries and pronounces divisions within countries triggering nuclear confrontation. Best statistical studies prove that growth solves conflict. That’s Royal.

## Russia Oil DA

### 2AC

#### They say no peak oil – newest data says you’re wrong. Oil prices could soon reach $100 a barrel as data from the top 50 oil companies show costs increasing. That’s Worstall. All their claims are empirically denied.

#### Oil peak will happen before 2020, even oil companies agree

Micu 10 (Mirela, Doctoral School of Econ Studies Academy, Bucharest, ““Peak Oil” – Are We There Yet?” *Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Technical Series*, 63(3B), p. 99-104) KGH

At least one oil company, French super-major Total S.A., announced plans in 2008 to shift their focus to nuclear energy instead of oil and gas. A Total senior vice president explained that this is because they believe oil production will peak before 2020, and they would like to diversify their position in the energy markets.[119] In October 2009, a report published by the Government-supported UK Energy Research Centre, following 'a review of over 500 studies, analysis of industry databases and comparison of global “PEAK OIL” – Are we there yet? 101 supply forecasts', concluded that 'a peak in conventional oil production before 2030 appears likely and there is a significant risk of a peak before 2020'.[121] The authors believe this forecast to be valid 'despite the large uncertainties in the available data'.[122] The study was claimed to be the first to undertake an 'independent, thorough and systematic review of the evidence and arguments in the 'peak oil’ debate'.[123] The authors noted that 'forecasts that delay a peak in conventional oil production until after 2030 are at best optimistic and at worst implausible' and warn of the risk that 'rising oil prices will encourage the rapid development of carbon-intensive alternatives that will make it difficult or impossible to prevent dangerous climate change[123] and that 'early investment in low-carbon alternatives to conventional oil is of considerable importance' in avoiding this scenario.[124] A 2010 report by Oxford University researchers in the journal Energy Policy predicted that production would peak before 2015.

#### Oil price volatility now – futures look bleak.

Powell, Staff Writer, 10-3

[Barbara, “Oil Options Volatility Jumps as Crude Sinks to Two-Month Low”, 10-3-12, Businessweek,

http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-10-03/oil-options-volatility-jumps-as-crude-sinks-to-two-month-low, RSR]

Crude oil options volatility jumped to a 10-day high as the underlying futures sank to the lowest level in two months in the biggest retreat since June. Implied volatility for options expiring in November, a measure of expected price swings in futures and a gauge of options prices, was 31.9 percent as of 2:40 p.m. in New York, up from 28.7 percent yesterday. “The lower we go, the firmer volatility becomes,” said Ray Carbone, president of Paramount Options Inc. in New York.

#### Global movement to renewables now should have triggered the link.

Bapna, Interim President at the World Resources Institute, ‘12

[Manish, “2012: A Breakthrough for Renewable Energy?,” Huffington Post, February 12, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/manish-bapna/2012-a-breakthrough-for-r\_b\_1263543.html]

Despite conventional wisdom, there is a growing body of evidence showing that renewables are no longer decades away from being a viable and affordable alternative to fossil fuels. Instead, onshore wind and solar photovoltaics are close to a tipping point to compete head-to-head with coal and natural gas in many countries. In fact, it’s likely that 2012 could be the year when investment in renewable energy (not counting hydropower) will surpass fossil fuels, signaling a profound shift toward a global clean energy economy. Investors are leading the charge toward a clean energy future, betting heavily on renewable energy. Global investment in clean energy generation capacity reached a record high of $260 billion in 2011, Bloomberg New Energy Finance announced last month. That was up 5 percent above 2010 levels and almost five times the 2004 total. The United States, surprisingly, led the world in renewable energy investment at nearly $56 billion, and China was second with more than $47 billion. Wind farms in China and solar panels on rooftops in Europe are the biggest signs of growth. But the renewables boom is a global phenomenon. In South and Central America, investments rose 39 percent to $13 billion. In India, they rose by 25 percent to almost $4 billion; and in the Middle East and Africa, by 104 percent to $5 billion. So what is getting investors– from asset financiers to venture capitalists— so excited? The answer is simple: wind and solar energy is becoming increasingly cost competitive with coal and natural gas. In the past few years, the costs of PV modules and wind turbines have tumbled, driven mainly by technology innovations and a maturing supply chain. The results are evident in falling clean energy prices around the world. Take just a few examples: In the United States, the authoritative National Renewable Energy Laboratory forecasts that solar PV residential electricity prices could be cost competitive by 2015 across two-thirds of the country. In Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal, and Japan, solar PV is on course to match retail electricity fossil fuel prices next year, without the benefit of subsidies, according to Pike Research. In Brazil, wind power plants undercut natural gas competitors in bidding for government power contract tenders last summer. And in China, wind power prices are expected to be competitive with coal within two years. But before rushing to invest your entire pension in clean energy, there are some important caveats. Renewable power is not yet a mainstream global industry. It made up only a little over 3 percent of total world electricity generation, as of 2009. While its future seems bright, the outcome may hang on how two key issues play out: First is the unpredictable effect of the shale gas boom. In countries, like the United States, where low electricity prices already make it tough for renewables to become cost competitive, abundant and cheap shale gas may drive energy prices down even further and divert investment from wind and solar power. Low-priced natural gas is good for consumers, but it could slow the growth of renewable. This could have additional negative environmental consequences, including on greenhouse gas emissions. The second key issue is whether governments will keep up their investor-friendly commitments to clean energy policy and incentives. The BNEF report, Global Trends in Renewable Energy Investment 2011, showed significant progress on that front. By early 2011, some 119 countries had policies or targets in place to support renewables, more than half of them in the developing world. But given the turbulent global economy, it is likely that fiscal and political constraints will continue to bite across much of the globe in 2012. Governments may see support for wind and solar as tempting for budget cuts. In the United States, for example, wind power developers are nervous about the potential expiration of the Production Tax Credit in December 2012. If Congress fails to renew or replace it, the industry’s robust growth will likely falter. President Obama acknowledged as much during State of the Union, when he called on Congress to extend support for wind power and solar power. So the outlook for the year is still sunny, but not cloudless for renewables. Given the significant strides the industry has made, it would be unfortunate if governments and investors turned their backs now. If they forge ahead, 2012 could indeed see global investment surpass that for fossil fuels, crossing an important threshold toward a clean energy future.

#### Nuclear renaissance now. Worthington says nuclear is already receiving subsidies and building plants.

#### Nuclear power is globally expanding and is catching on in the U.S.

WNA 11 (World Nuclear Association, The Nuclear Renaissance , August 2011, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf104.html>) JD

Since about 2001 there has been much talk about an imminent nuclear revival or "renaissance" which implies that the nuclear industry has been dormant or in decline for some time. Whereas this may generally be the case for the Western world, nuclear capacity has been expanding in Eastern Europe and Asia. Globally, the share of nuclear in world electricity has showed slight decline from about 17% to 13.5% since the mid 1980s, though output from nuclear reactors actually increased to match the growth in global electricity consumption. Today nuclear energy is back on the policy agendas of many countries, with projections for new build similar to or exceeding those of the early years of nuclear power. This signals a revival in support for nuclear power in the West that was diminished by the accidents at Three Mile Island and Chernobyl and also by nuclear power plant construction cost overruns in the 1970s and 1980s, coupled with years of cheap natural gas. The March 2011 Fukushima accident has set back public perception of nuclear safety, despite there being no deaths or serious radiation exposure from it (while the direct death toll from the tsunami which caused it is some 25,000). Also the advent of shale gas has adversely changed the economics of nuclear power in places such as North America.

#### Link going to be triggered anyway – Russia plans on expanding its own nuclear industry.

Gosling, ‘11

(Tim, Business New Europe, “Russia to keep building nuclear plants despite Fukushima”, The Telegraph, 4-5-11,

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/business/8429048/Russia-to-keep-building-nuclear-plants-despite-Fukushima.html, accessed 8-4-12, RSR)

Among the emerging markets, Russia is the most reliant on nuclear power. Sixteen per cent of its power comes from nuclear energy and it is planning to double nuclear capacity in the next 20 years. “Inevitably, some of these plans might have to be reconsidered, ” said Mr Bubnov. “Russia has a vocal environmental lobby, which might lead to the delay or even cancellation of some projects, leading to higher prices.” However, as Russia’s economy returns to strong growth, the government has little choice but to build new nuclear plants. Before the financial crisis, the supply and demand for power were evenly matched, so further economic growth would be constrained by blackouts. The Energy Ministry plans to cope with rising Russian energy needs by building 18 nuclear power and hydropower plants with a combined installed capacity of 11.2 gigawatts. “It is impossible to speak about a global energy balance without the nuclear power industry,” Mr Putin said at a meeting of the intergovernmental council of the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC). Without waiting for the Fukushima crisis to be resolved and an investigation to be carried out by international experts, Russian authorities ordered an urgent review of all nuclear plant construction projects, both at home and abroad. Tests are already under way to assess the fire- and seismic-proof qualities of the country’s own plants, and facilities will be shut down if necessary,  officials said. “We will take all necessary measures, however much that might cost,” said Alexander Lokshin, deputy director general at the Rosatom state nuclear energy corporation. However, events at Fukushima do not appear to have seriously dented confidence in nuclear power in the Russian industry.

#### Case outweighs and turns the DA. High oil prices trigger US economic collapse. Every other economic indicator is up. That’s Zakaria. This impact is verified by 40 years of data. That’s Li. US economic collapse spreads over eventually to Russia causing nationalistic tensions. That’s Lachman and Auslin.

#### High oil prices bad for Russian econ

#### A.) Oil drives inflationary growth

Aris 12 (Ben Aris - Ben is the editor/publisher of[bne](http://www.bne.eu/) and an Eastern Europe specialist. He has worked as Moscow bureau chief for the Daily Telegraph, contributing editor at The Banker and Euromoney - Russian Economy Showing Signs of Overheating http://www.themoscowtimes.com//article/russian-economy-showing-signs-of-overheating/461657.html#ixzz1zttKtz9A)

Russia's external debt is up slightly to $585 billion, slightly more than the gross international reserves of $513 billion as of the end of June, but this still means that Russia can cover its debt nearly dollar-for-dollar with cash, unlike most Western economies that have national debts of about 100 percent of gross domestic product these days. And even capital outflow is finally slowing and is expected to drop to $9.5 billion in the second quarter, following a $43 billion outflow in the first quarter. All this means that economists are starting to ask whether the economy is overheating. Alexei Ulyukayev, first deputy chairman of the Central Bank, says that when consumer-lending growth rises above 28 percent, the economy is in danger of overheating — and Russia is well beyond that point now. The danger in this lending is that some analysts are suggesting that the quality of loans is falling, which opens banks up to problems if there is another bad external shock from Europe. However, nearly everyone agrees that if this does happen, the Central Bank has more than enough cash in reserve to prop up the banks and avoid a systemic financial crisis. The black spot is in the corporate sector, where companies have already started to destock. One of the reasons the 2008 crisis was so painful was that companies were carrying a lot of inventory to meet the burgeoning demand of a booming market. However, when the crisis struck, these companies basically switched off their machines to save money and sold their inventory instead. The result was that the economy came to a stand still literally overnight, resulting in a 7 percent contraction. The process took about six months to complete, after which companies had to turn their machines on again after stocks ran out to meet new orders and the economy began to recover. This time round, fearing another (and possibility worse) meltdown in Europe, companies have already started destocking before the crisis has even appeared. "As opposed to 2008, when strong consumption was accompanied by overheated industrial production growth, this year we see producers taking a much more cautious approach. In 2010-2011 the recovery in economic growth was at 70 percent, driven by stock building," said Natalya Orlova, chief economist at Alfa Bank. "However, starting in the fourth quarter of 2011, the Russian economy entered a destocking process. According to our estimates, in that quarter inventories contributed minus 0.2 percent to GDP growth and minus 0.4 percent in the first quarter of this year. This was the first sign that the producer started to be cautious earlier than expected." Russia finds itself in a very weird place now. Kolya's experience and the robust consumer demand mean that the economy is getting hot to the point where inflation is starting to rise. Russia's inflation overshot the Central Bank target last month and left it struggling to keep consumer-price growth below last year's record low as a weaker ruble stokes food costs and utility tariffs rise, economists said. "What is surprising is how quickly headline inflation has reversed its deceleration," wrote Alexander Morozov, chief economist at HSBC Holdings Plc. in Moscow in a note to clients. "The Central Bank's job of keeping inflation in the range is seen as 'Mission Impossible.'" But on the other hand, the behavior of companies suggests that the economy is slowing down. Industrial production took a nose dive in March — as it did in the rest of the world as growth collapsed for psychological reasons as much as anything else. This means that the Central Bank should move to bolster confidence and encourage growth. Put in simple terms, the dilemma is: the Central Bank should increase interest rates to curb inflation and cool the economy, and at the same time it should cut rates to encourage more investment and growth. The upshot of this confusion is that economists are forecasting a wide spread of growth rates this year, from at least 3 percent to 5 percent. When spreads on forecasts get this wide, it always means that the experts are basically clueless about what will happen next. To be fair, Russia's strong growth is fragile because it is partly connected to the recovery of the oil price, which is currently back at about $100 a barrel. Because of the lack of reforms and investment, high oil prices are pumping money into the economy, which is feeding through to consumer demand. If oil prices fall — an event the government is preparing for by adding a $60 scenario to its budget planning despite assuming an average price of $115 for this year — then that would quickly take the wind out of Russia's sails. But that has always been Russia's problem. Strong consumer demand has encouraged real progress and investment, but it is still nowhere near what is needed.

#### Inflation outweighs oil price decline

Investment Innovation Business 12 (http://eng.spb-venchur.ru/news/14616.htm)

The major risks for Russia in the near future are likely to come from an overheated economy, rather than falling oil prices, as accelerating consumption and lagging output might fuel inflation, Goldman Sachs warned Friday.¶ The drop in unemployment together with the rise in people's incomes are boosting consumption, while output has yet to catch up to meet growing demand, the company said in a presentation.¶ The trend is unlikely to change in the near future, said Clemens Grafe, Goldman Sachs' chief economist for Russia and CIS.¶ "The risk in Russia now is overheating, as consumption will accelerate further rather than slowing down to a sustainable path," he told a news conference in the company's Moscow office.

#### B.) High oil prices cause corruption which collapses the economy.

Brooke2011— journalist, VOA Russia Bureau Chief, previously Moscow Bureau Chief for Bloomberg and New York Times reporter (James, March 18, 2011, “Russia Gets Giant Boost from Rising Oil Prices” http://www.voanews.com/english/news/economy-and-business/Russia-Gets-Giant-Boost-from-Rising-Oil-Prices-118258659.html)

In one decade, the oil price gyrated wildly - from a low of $8 a barrel in 1998 to a peak of $147 in 2008. Looking at the long term, analysts say Japan's nuclear crisis may benefit Russia by pushing the world energy pendulum away from nuclear toward natural gas. Germany imports almost half of its gas from Russia. Even before the crisis, Russia was investing to increase gas production by 50 percent over the next 20 years.The downside is that high prices ease pressures to cut corruption, to diversify the economy and to lighten the hand of government on business**.** Chris Weafer, chief strategist with Uralsib Capital, fears that the new flood of oil earnings is leading the Kremlin to slow its privatization program. “We have seen it in the Gulf Arab countries. and we saw it in Russia in the last 10 years that as the oil price is rising governments talk about the need for reform and using the money wisely, but as the price goes up too high, the whole process slows down, people become complacent**,** they become lazy, they live the good life as it were, until the collapse comes**,”** he said. “And then then whole process starts again.” In public opinion polls, corruption rivals food prices as the number one public complaint for Russians. According to Transparency International, Russia is the most corrupt of the Group of 20 major economies. Last week in a speech in Moscow, U.S. Vice President Joe Biden clearly warned Russia that corruption scares away investors. “No amount of government cheerleading or public relations or U.S. support or rebranding will bring wronged or nervous investors back to a market they perceive to have these shortcomings**,**” he said. “Only bold and genuine change.“

#### Low oil prices usher necessary economic and political reforms.

[Andrew E. Kramer, New York Times, “Rise in Oil Price Eases Push for Reform in Russia”, 6/3/2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/04/business/global/04ruble.html>]

The two previous major oil price slumps in the last quarter-century were followed by significant economic and political changes in Moscow that paved the way for future growth. For a time, it seemed the current oil shock would follow the same path. Indeed, the mood was so glum last winter, when oil dipped below $40 a barrel, that some advisers close to the government suggested that the country might be compelled to open up politically to spur development. At the least, policies encouraging Russia to diversify beyond oil were seen as imminent. What is needed to diversify the economy and stabilize the financial system, critics of the Russian government say, is an overhaul of the courts and a crackdown on corruption to improve property rights and separate the bureaucracy from the economy. But with oil prices now above $60 a barrel, the pressure on the government of Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin to change has eased, even though the stock market remains 44 percent off its high in December 2007. Instead, an economic strategy that amounts to essentially waiting out the downturn is beginning to take shape.

## Diminished Tax Credit CP

### 2AC

#### 1.) Perm: do both

#### Conditionality is a voting issue – being able to kick positions at will destroys argumentative responsibility, skews the 2AC, the focal point of all aff offense, because we have to spend more time answering things than they do kicking them, and justifies aff conditionality to be reciprocal.

#### 2.) Conditions Counterplans are a Voting Issue.

#### 1 – Logical policymaker double-bind: either the condition isn’t logical because it doesn’t dejustify the act of giving the tax incentive OR the condition is logical which justifies perm: do the CP.

#### 2 – Artificial competition – the counterplan proves the condition isn’t mutually exclusive with the plan – it artificially provides intrinsicness to their net benefit, which makes answering it on the aff impossible because it proves the net benefit isn’t a relevant consideration to the plan.

#### Perm do the CP

#### No solvency: Timeframe – plan must be passed immediately.

#### Security experts agree that nuclear terrorism is most likely to happen by 2015. Any delays risk the impact. That’s Rhodes.

#### Waste blowup is very possible right now. Fukushima proves. That’s Kinitisch.

#### Yucca mountain will be approved after the election cycle.

Greenville Online, ‘12

[“Yucca Mountain gets potential nudge”, 8-8-12,

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/article/20120809/OPINION/308090006/Yucca-Mountain-gets-potential-nudge>, RSR]

A court order to move ahead with the evaluation would be a step forward — albeit a small one — for Yucca Mountain. The project has barely been on life support since President Barack Obama ordered the federal government to stop all work on the project. However, heading into 2013 when there could be new leadership in the White House and a Congress that’s more supportive of Yucca Mountain, it could give the project enough life to resurrect it. That’s what should happen. Yucca Mountain remains the only viable option on the table for disposing of the nation’s nuclear waste. The White House and Congress — led by Democratic Sen. Harry Reid of Nevada — have dragged their feet on the issue and all but killed it, but no other options have been suggested by opponents.

#### Peak oil coming now. Newest data is showing that there are trends in decline of production and lack of capacity. That’s Worstall.

#### No solvency: must show unconditional support for reprocessing. Ban has been lifted since 1981 yet no investment. That’s Saillan. Must provide an unconditional national policy in favor of it to get private industry on board. That’s Selyukh.

#### Plan solves the heg net benefit

## Nuclear Renaissance

### 2AC

#### Nuke renaissance now - Obama is pushing right now and the industry is receiving a huge amount of subsidies. That’s Worthington.

#### **Long term nuclear prospects remain strong, NRC ruling has no effect, and cost issues are solved by SMRs.**

Downey, Senior Staff Writer, 8-31

[John, “Anticipated nuclear rebirth faces tough challenges”, The Charlotte Business Journal, 8-31-12,

<http://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/print-edition/2012/08/31/anticipated-nuclear-rebirth-faces.html?page=all>, RSR]

But inside the industry, representatives insist the challenges are not insurmountable. In the United States, they say, the nuclear renaissance has been slower than anticipated. But the long-term prospects for nuclear power remain strong. “I would say the nuclear renaissance is just pushed a little to the right,” says Tom Franch, senior vice president for nuclear reactors and services at Areva Inc. A key test for the industry will be the construction just under way of four new-generation nuclear reactors — two at Southern Co.’s Plant Vogtle expansion in Georgia and two at SCANA Corp.’s V.C. Summer plant in South Carolina. “If the industry does as we’ve promised and can be predictable on costs and construction time in this cycle of new construction, it will answer a lot of questions,” Franch says. “People will look at it from a business perspective.” And he says the waste issue will have little practical effect on nuclear projects. None of that affects the licenses for the four reactors now being built. And while several utilities (including Duke Energy Corp.) have applications in process for new licenses, none are far enough along that the recent federal actions are likely to delay approval. There have been questions raised about the fate of relicensing applications for nine plants. But if, as Franch hopes, the NRC quickly addresses the court’s concerns about the waste issue, he expects no significant delays. Growth in the nuclear sector remains important to the Charlotte region as it works to establish itself as a national hub for the energy industry. Figures compiled by the Charlotte Regional Partnership show that the nuclear industry accounts for 25% of the nearly 28,000 energy jobs in the region. The Shaw Power Group, based in Charlotte, is the contractor for the nation’s two nuclear-plant construction projects. Westinghouse Electric Co., which designed the AP1000 reactor being installed at both plants, has expanded its nuclear operations in the region. Areva has 600 employees, mostly engineers, in its nuclear operations here. Toshiba America Nuclear Energy has moved some of its U.S. operations here. The Babcock & Wilcox Co. moved its headquarters here in 2010, and Mitsubishi Nuclear Energy Systems opened a 100-employee office in Charlotte. “There is no question that within the energy sector here the nuclear industry plays a prominent role,” says Jeff Merrifield, senior vice president at the Shaw Power Group. “I don’t mean to use the pun, but there’s a critical mass here in the sector.” But the industry faces policy and economic challenges, says the Natural Resources Defense Council’s Fettus. The unresolved questions about waste are one. The expense of reactors has generally meant that they do not get built unless they are subsidized (both Vogtle and Summer have benefited from federal loan guarantees). Equity analyst Paul Fremont of Jeffries & Co. says it’s not clear any nuclear plant can move forward without subsidies. He has made the case strongly for more than a year that low natural gas prices make nuclear plants a financially unattractive risk. And gas prices appear poised to remain low for several years. The financial issues and a decision by Moody’s Investors Service in 2009 to consider plans for nuclear construction as a negative factor for a utilities’ debt ratings have led critics to say Wall Street won’t back new projects. Merrifield and Franch dispute that. “I talk to lots of Wall Street folks,” Merrifield says. “There are some concerns about investments in nuclear, but it comes down very much to personal preferences.” He likens the divide to that between people who believe in renting versus buying a big-ticket item. “If you are looking only at the next three years, who would even buy a car or house?” he says. “Wall Street is very bullish on nuclear,” Franch says. “They realize it needs to be part of well-diversified portfolio of energy sources.” Both say the biggest obstacle for nuclear construction in the United states is the slow economy. Demand for electricity fell for the first time in the nation’s history as the 2008 financial crisis led to a severe recession. And demand hasn’t returned to prerecession levels. But that won’t mean downtime for nuclear specialists. The overseas demand for nuclear construction remains strong. Shaw is involved in the construction of four AP1000 plants in China. Areva has projects in China, France, Finland and the United Kingdom. And for the long term, the nascent small-modular-reactor industry is another source for industry growth. The reactors, now in the development stage, are designed for 75 to 400 megawatts of capacity, as opposed to the 1,000 to 1,500 megawatts for the new generation of large reactors. Advocates say the small reactors can be largely manufactured in assembly plants and shipped to plant sites for installation. That should hold down costs and offer an attractive alternative for utilities worried about the large upfront investment of full-sized plants. So while the U.S. nuclear industry is growing slowly, its leaders are encouraged about their companies’ prospects. “I am still very passionate about the industry,” Franch says.

#### Nuclear leadership in reprocessing is key to overall technical leadership – brain drain.

Martin, Chairman of the Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, and Ahearne, Vice-Chairman, 8 (William F. and John, Nuclear Energy: Policies and Technology for the 21st Century, Nuclear Energy Advisory Committee, November 2008, http://www.ne.doe.gov/neac/neacPDFs/NEAC\_Final\_Report\_Web%20Version.pdf, da 9-1-12)

The consequences of a weakened nuclear infrastructure in the United States include reduced domestic capability to support the role of nuclear energy as well as the related problem of the reduced ability to attract and retain the talent at all levels—from technicians to engineers to Ph.D.’s—needed to develop and sustain active U.S. participation in the domestic and global nuclear marketplace. In that vein, NEAC recommends that both university and industry programs in nuclear R&D be strengthened, and that laboratories and facilities in the DOE complex be modernized and made more efficient. These programs should be developed in consultation with relevant government agencies and scientists, DOE national laboratories, private industry, and the academic community. NEAC makes the following recommendations: • The DOE lead the establishment and implementation of a nuclear energy R&D roadmap, in consultation with appropriate parties. • University and industry programs in nuclear R&D be strengthened, and that laboratories and facilities in the DOE complex be modernized and made more efficient. • The DOE review existing nuclear fuel cycle research and development to assure that it is meeting U.S. needs in the nuclear fuel cycle.

#### Technological leadership necessary to maintain US heg – our IL explains the past five centuries of global hegemons.

Drezner 1 (Daniel Drezner (professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University) 2001 “State structure, technological leadership and the maintenance of hegemony” http://www.danieldrezner.com/research/tech.pdf)

In this decade, proponents of globalization argue that because information and capital are mobile, the location of innovation has been rendered unimportant.6 While this notion has some popular appeal, the globalization thesis lacks theoretical or empirical support. Theoretically, even in a world of perfect information and perfect capital mobility, economists have shown that the location of technological innovation matters.7 Empirically, the claims of globalization proponents have been far-fetched. Capital is not perfectly mobile, and increased economic exchange does not lead to a seamless transfer of technology from one country to another.8 The location of innovation still matters. Long-cycle theorists have paid the most attention to the link between technological innovation, economic growth, and the rise and fall of hegemons.9 They argue that the past five hundred years of the global political economy can be explained by the waxing and waning of hegemonic powers. Countries acquire hegemonic status because they are the first to develop a cluster of technologies in leading sectors. These innovations generate spillover effects to the rest of the lead economy, and then to the global economy. Over time, these ‘technological hegemons’ fail to maintain the rate of innovations, leading to a period of strife until a new hegemonic power is found.

#### CA Baru from the 1NC.

#### Nuclear power is the only way to avert catastrophic warming that causes extinction.

Lynas, Contributor, ‘12

[Mark, “Without nuclear, the battle against global warming is as good as lost”, The Guardian, 9-14-12,

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/sep/14/nuclear-global-warming?newsfeed=true>, RSR]

Let me be very clear. Without nuclear, the battle against global warming is as good as lost. Even many greens now admit this in private moments. We are already witnessing the first signs of the collapse in the biosphere this entails – with the Arctic in full-scale meltdown, more solar radiation is being captured by the dark ocean surface, and the weather systems of the entire northern hemisphere are being thrown into chaos. With nuclear, there is a chance that global warming this century can be limited to 2C; without nuclear, I would guess we are heading for 4C or above. That will devastate ecosystems and societies worldwide on a scale which is unimaginable. Given the trauma the Japanese people have suffered since the earthquake and tsunami of 11 March 2011, it is understandable that major questions are asked of domestic politicians. But we must never forget that Fukushima has killed no one. More people in Japan recently died from an E coli outbreak due to eating contaminated pickles. Scientists also agree there will never be an observable cancer increase in the Japanese population attributable to Fukushima. But in response to the nuclear shutdown, oil and gas imports to Japan have doubled, and carbon dioxide emissions soared by more than 60m tonnes. Any environmentalist who celebrates this outcome is not worthy of the name.

## States CP

### 2AC

#### Perm do both. Solves elections, looks like deference to the states which is popular, and solves spending because states would foot the bill.

#### CP links to elections – reverse coattails in 2008 prove

Rosenberg 8 (Andy, Obama's Reverse Coattails, Huffington Post, 3 October 2008, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andy-rosenberg/obamas-reverse-coattails\_b\_131592.html, da 10-5-12)

But an interesting thing has happened in the months since the primary. For a variety of reasons - the resurgent posture of the Democrats in Congress, a dominant fundraising performance by the DCCC and a stable of far superior congressional candidates than those proffered by the GOP - the coattails have actually reversed and it is Obama who is being helped by a strong down ticket surge in pivotal regions across the country.¶ A good example of this is the Pennsylvania 3rd Congressional District, where Republican incumbent Phil English is getting the challenge of his career from businesswoman and political neophyte Kathy Dahlkemper. A recent poll conducted for Roll Call showed Dahlkemper leading English 49 percent to 45 percent, with 6 percent undecided. English was elected to his seat in the GOP-leaning district in 1994, succeeding Republican Tom Ridge, who was elected governor that year. It was drawn to guarantee a solid Republican seat. With Dahlkemper's strength pulling support to the Democrats, however, the poll shows Republican presidential nominee John McCain leading Obama by just 48 percent to 46 percent in the district. Local pundits are observing that an unexpectedly robust Dahlkemper campaign could be generating new votes for Obama in this key region of the state where John McCain needs to dominate.¶ Another example of a strong down ticket surge in a pivotal state for Obama is the Senate campaign of former Virginia Governor Mark Warner. Currently ahead by 30 points over his hapless Republican opponent, the enormously popular Warner has the opportunity to provide coattails to Obama - carrying the Democratic nominee to near-certain victory should he help generate a win in Virginia. (Should Warner win by 30 and not bring Obama with him, however, many Democratic activists would consider it a hollow victory ... and something Warner should definitely be working hard to avoid.)¶ As the list of swing districts and states grows in which unexpectedly strong Congressional and Senatorial Democratic candidates are dominating their Republican opponents, Obama stands to benefit from a national wave of down ticket strength - a phenomenon that is reversing prior assumptions about the election, and just may be the unforeseen factor that propels Obama to a dominant outcome on election day.

#### States CP are V/I. 1.) No comparative literature compares the action of 50 states simultaneously vs. the federal government. 2.) Fiat abuse – uniformity circumvents the common disputes about state action like race to the bottom and enforcement. Kills competitive equity.

#### Doesn’t solve the aff – absent the plan, companies would be vary of going against NATIONAL policy because it could kill the industry. That’s Selyukh 10.

#### CP can’t solve – federal investment is necessary to remove the perceptual ban on reprocessing.

Adams, ‘8

[Rod, “What Do You Do About the Waste? Recycle and Reuse”, Clean Technica, 5-29-2008,

<http://cleantechnica.com/2008/05/29/what-do-you-do-about-the-waste-recycle-and-reuse/>, RSR]

The US used to have a plan to recycle our fuel as well, but a great deal of marketing and pressure by people that do not like the idea of using plutonium as a source of commercial heat resulted in President Ford issuing a presidential order to temporarily halt nuclear fuel recycling in 1976. President Carter, a man who claimed to be a nuclear engineer, made that ban permanent in the hopes that forcing US companies to avoid fuel recycling would cause others to abandon the very logical idea. That effort did not work as planned, but the people who had invested large amounts of time and money into building three recycling plants in the US only to have them shut down with the stroke of a pen decided “once bitten, twice shy.” Though President Reagan removed the ban, President Clinton essentially reinstated it and no commercial company has been willing to build a facility and risk having it turn into a white elephant after an election.

#### CP can’t solve - federal preemption of the counterplan exists now

Ostrow, associate professor of law at Hofstra Law School, ’11

(Ashira Pelman Ostrow, “Process Preemption in Federal Siting Regimes, Harvard Journal of Law, July 2011, <http://www.harvardjol.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Ostrow_Article.pdf>)

For national security reasons, the federal government has long asserted exclusive authority to manage high-level radioactive waste. 130 The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 131 and the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 132 granted the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC”) exclusive regulatory authority over high-level nuclear waste facilities. 133 The statutes left no room for state participation, other than in an advisory capacity for certain transportation issues. 134 Nonetheless, by the late 1970s, the states began to actively regulate, restrict, and even ban the shipment of highly toxic nuclear waste and the establishment of radioactive waste facilities within their borders. 135 To resolve the jurisdictional conflict, Congress enacted the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (“NWPA”). 136 The Act was intended to “establish a schedule for the siting, construction, and operation of repositories” to protect the public and the environment “from the hazards posed by high-level radioactive waste.” 137 The NWPA required the Secretary of Energy to nominate five sites for a high-level radioactive waste repository and to recommend three of them to the President for further study by January 1, 1985. 138 The Act further required the Secretary of Energy to develop guidelines by which to evaluate potential repository sites. 139

## Elections DA

### 2AC

#### Romney will win – debates propel him ahead of Obama

Ferrechio, Chief Congressional Correspondent, 10-4 (Susan, Romney moves swiftly to capitalize on debate success, Washington Examiner, 4 October 2012, http://washingtonexaminer.com/romney-moves-swiftly-to-capitalize-on-debate-success/article/2509926#.UG9qB6RYt8w, da 10-5-12)

The Republican nominee has been virtually even with Obama in national tracking polls, and though the president was starting to pull away in a handful of battleground states like Ohio, Romney aides and supporters said his powerful debate performance is likely to attract undecided voters and propel him higher in the polls.¶ "Undecided voters in Ohio wanted to hear more about where Mr. Romney was going to take the country and they heard that in this debate," Sen. Rob Portman, R-Ohio, who helped prepare Romney for the debate, told The Washington Examiner. "I think this is going to change the dynamics of the race."¶ Historically, polls have occasionally shifted, at least by a few percentage points, as a result of great -- or terrible -- debate performances.¶ In 1980, Republican presidential nominee Ronald Reagan was trailing Democratic President Jimmy by 3 percentage points among likely voters until the two debated a week ahead of the election. After the debate, Reagan's standing rose by 6 points and he beat Carter

#### Romney will win – new polls show he’s making headways in swing states.

The Hill, 10-5

[Justin Sink and Jonathan Easley, “Polls show Romney making headway in swing states”

http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/polls/260511-polls-show-romney-making-swing-state-charge, RSR]

A set of new swing-state polls show Mitt Romney making big gains in three critical battleground states just two days after the Republican nominee's widely-heralded debate performance. The polls — from conservative-leaning Rasmussen and We Ask America — showed Romney closing the gap or leading in Ohio, Florida and Virginia, three states the GOP candidate would likely need to capture to win the White House. And they represent a dramatic reversal from last week, where polls showed President Obama with a commanding lead. In Ohio, the We Ask America poll gave Romney a 47-46 percent edge over the president, while Rasmussen flipped those results, giving Obama a 50-49 percent lead. Both polling firms completed the sampling for their survey Thursday, in the aftermath of Wednesday's shaky debate for the president. A number of polls before the debates showed Obama extending his lead in the Buckeye State to as much as 8, 9 or 10 points. Obama now leads Romney by 3 in Ohio, according to the Real Clear Politics average of polls. In Florida, We Ask America found Romney with a 49-46 percent lead, good for a six-point swing in the Republican nominee's favor from the polling firm's survey conducted in late September. The RCP average now shows Obama and Romney tied in Florida. Florida and Ohio are two of the biggest swing-state prizes, with 29 and 18 electoral votes at stake, respectively. And in Virginia, both polling firms found Romney with an advantage. We Ask America gave Romney the greater edge, finding the Republican challenger leading the president 48-45 percent. Rasmussen, meanwhile, gave Romney a 49-48 percent lead.

#### Turn: Romney wins now, but Nevada is key.

Joseph 10-4 (Cameron, GOP takes new tack: Romney can still win while losing Ohio, The Hill, 4 October 2012, http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/260133-gop-takes-new-tack-romney-can-still-win-while-losing-ohio, da 10-5-12)

“Ohio is extremely important but I also know that we have other good things going for us right now as well: Wisconsin, Iowa, Colorado, Nevada,” Priebus told The Hill on Wednesday morning. While he described Ohio as “extremely close,” he says he also sees “avenues to 270 [electoral votes] opening up for Mitt Romney in places that weren’t there in ’08.” Priebus’s comments come on the heels of Rove’s remark last week that “There are 11 different ways to win without Ohio.” Polling in the state over the past few weeks has shown Obama’s lead growing, with the president up by 8 points in the most recent poll from NBC/Wall Street Journal/Marist. If he loses the state, Romney has to all but sweep the rest of the map to win the presidency. Republicans feel the most confident about North Carolina and Florida, where Romney is expected to do well, and believe they’re even with Obama or only slightly trailing in Virginia, Iowa and Colorado.

#### Plan gives Obama Nevada - massively supported by Nevada voters

Whaley ’12

(Sean Whaley, “Gov. Sandoval Says Nevada Does Not Want Nuclear Waste, But New Poll Shows Support For Research Facility”, Nevada News Bureau, 3-12-2012, <http://www.nevadanewsbureau.com/2012/03/12/gov-sandoval-says-nevada-does-not-want-nuclear-waste-but-new-poll-shows-support-for-research-facility/>)

Sandoval’s letter comes just as a new poll commissioned by Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy shows support for Yucca Mountain as a research park for the study of reprocessing nuclear spent fuel. The poll of 500 likely Nevada voters, taken in late February by Public Opinion Strategies, showed 62 percent in support of the research park versus 34 percent who said Yucca Mountain should be closed entirely. The question posed was whether respondents would prefer to: “Open Yucca Mountain for the study and potential reprocessing of nuclear waste into usable energy because of the jobs and money such a project would bring to the state . . .” Or: “Close Yucca Mountain altogether to help protect Nevada’s environment.” “UNR, UNLV, and many national labs around the country are conducting research on how to utilize innovative technologies now available to reprocess spent fuel, so bringing them all together to develop the best technology for commercial reprocessing makes sense,” said Gene Humphrey, the head of Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy (NV4CFE), a non-profit organization that supports building the research park. “Since several national laboratories are already doing work at the Nevada Test Site, it seems like the logical location to continue the legacy of nuclear exploration. But this project could generate a new form of clean energy, establish new export industries and create thousands of jobs for Nevadans.”

#### Turn: Plan key to Florida which is key to the election – addresses voter concerns regarding energy and the economy.

Whitman and Avilla, ‘12

[Christine and Karen, “Nuclear energy = green jobs, economic growth in Fla., beyond”, The Orlando Sentinel, 6-22-12,

http://articles.orlandosentinel.com/2012-06-22/opinion/os-ed-nuclear-energy-florida-jobs-062212-20120621\_1\_nuclear-energy-green-jobs-hispanic-community, RSR]

We all know how critical Florida is to the outcome of this year's election. This week, as Orlando hosts the annual conference of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, all eyes are on the presidential candidates as they speak to Hispanic elected officials — and by extension, to their constituents — about the issues that are top of mind for voters. Notably, the conference addresses two issues also of paramount concern to all Floridians: energy and the economy. From our perspective, these issues are deeply intertwined — and one way that Floridians and the state's thriving Hispanic community can advocate for economic growth through renewed investment in clean energy is by supporting nuclear energy. We need to let the candidates know that Americans are relying on the next president for clean, sustainable energy policies that benefit us all. As we look toward diversifying America's energy portfolio and building out the energy generated by renewables, candidates should look to nuclear energy as one proven way to effectively meet growing demand. In doing so, they are registering their support for well-paying jobs, sustained economic growth and clean, affordable energy options.

#### Funding now. Worthington ev. says subsidies now. Even if no new reactors, there’s already the perception of Obama pushing.

#### Turn: Subsidies for nuclear power popular with the American public.

Bisconti, PhD and President of Bisconti Research Inc., ‘12

[Ann Stoufer, “High Expectations for Nuclear Energy”, NEI, RSR]

Strong majorities support renewing the licenses of nuclear power plants that meet federal safety standards and preparing for new nuclear power plants when needed. Nearly six of 10 surveyed (58 percent) would agree on definitely building new nuclear power plants in the future. The public has moderately favorable perceptions of nuclear plant safety, due in part to high expectations for American technology to advance and a long history without major events in this country. The American public historically does not want to put all of its energy production eggs in one basket. There is near consensus that the country should take advantage of all low-carbon energy sources, including nuclear energy, hydropower and renewable energy. To help make that happen, three-fourths of the public supports loan guarantees for the development of these low-carbon sources.

#### Turn: The plan will be spun as job creation.

Ling, NYT Staff Writer, ‘9

[Katherine, New York Times, 5-19-2009, “Is the solution to the U.S. nuclear waste problem in France?”,

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2009/05/18/18climatewire-is-the-solution-to-the-us-nuclear-waste-prob-12208.html?pagewanted=all> Published, RCM]

The outgoing Bush administration tested the political reaction to reprocessing in 2006 and found 11 communities that showed interest in having a reprocessing facility. The approach promised high-paying jobs for hosting a regional intermediate highly radioactive nuclear waste site, a sort of "energy park."

#### Trade doesn’t solve war

Martin et. al. 8(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.