## A-Spec

#### We meet – We use all three branches.

#### Limits – There are over 1000 agents in the USFG. Spec explodes the topic.

#### Ground – Non-spec provides them with links to all of the branches and prevents aff spiking – key to predictable ground

#### They justify Agent PICs which are bad

#### Steals all aff ground – 99% of the counterplan is the 1AC

#### Destroys offense – any offense we read links to the plan as well

#### Unpredictable – infinite number of things to PIC out of

#### Voter for fairness.

#### Aspec is not a voter

#### A. No abuse, don't vote on potential abuse. They read \_\_\_\_ other off cases meaning that there is actually no abuse.

#### B. Competing interpretations bad – arbitrary race to the bottom

## Case

### Waste

#### Ban does nto actually exist. Just policy statement saying the gov doesn’t support. Ban lifited in 1981. That’s Saillan.

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

#### Not going for terror.

#### 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.

#### They say no impact to Yucca explosion – 70,000 tons of nuclear waste would spread into the entire biosphere outweighing the impact of any nuclear war. That’s Broad.

#### World of the aff is safer than the SQUO. Spent fuel is the most vulnerable to prolif since there are less safeguards due to assumed radioactive protection. That’s Bunn. Plan solves that.

#### Proliferation from reprocessing is empirically denied – other countries have done it and countries have found other ways to develop nukes.

Beaver, Professor of Social Science at Robert Morris University , ‘10

[William, “The Demise of Yucca Mountain”, The Independent, Vol. 14, No. 4, Spring 2010, RSR]

Today, some nuclear advocates believe that the decision to end reprocessing in the United States is the major reason why the nuclear waste dilemma continues. The fears of nuclear proliferation have proven to be unfounded. Nations that built nuclear weapons found other means to acquire the necessary materials, and, as far as we know, terrorists have not been able to acquire plutonium, although some still believe that terrorists might get their hands on these materials (Inman 2005). Much is also made of the French success in reprocessing spent fuel at La Hague, Normandy, since the 1970s. France, which generates 78 percent of its electricity from nuclear power, reprocesses not only its own spent fuel, but also fuel from several other countries, which has helped offset the costs. To date, few problems have arisen at the 750-acre facility, although environmental groups have protested shipments of spent fuel to La Hague (Rust and Haig 2001).

#### Proliferation concerns are empirically denied, and purification of spent fuel is impractical.

Klein, Associate Director of The Energy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin, 11 (Dale, Spent Nuclear Fuel Is An Abundant Source of Energy, 21st Century Science & Technology, 21 February 2011, http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles\_2011/Spring-2011/Spent\_Nuclear\_Energy.pdf, da 8-23-12)

Now, more than three decades later, six nations have major ¶ ¶ commitments to reprocessing their spent fuel. The arguments ¶ ¶ against reprocessing as a proliferation concern are not compelling and obviously, other nations interested in extracting ¶ ¶ the energy value from their spent fuel do not align with U.S. ¶ ¶ policy.¶ ¶ A typical commercial nuclear power reactor will generate ¶ ¶ about 20 tonnes of spent fuel every year. Contained in that ¶ ¶ spent fuel is about 200 kilograms of reactor-grade plutonium. ¶ ¶ Often misunderstood, or misrepresented by opponents to recycling, the isotopic mixture of reactor-grade plutonium makes it ¶ ¶ unsuitable for nuclear weapons.¶ ¶ Weapons-grade plutonium is approximately 95 percent Pu-¶ ¶ 239, whereas reactor-grade is only about 50 percent Pu-239. ¶ ¶ The cost and complexity of the technologies required to purify ¶ ¶ reactor grade to weapons grade makes it impractical for use in ¶ ¶ nuclear weapons.¶ ¶ In fact, we know of, or strongly believe, that nine nations ¶ ¶ have developed nuclear weapons. Looking historically at the ¶ ¶ origins of the fissile materials used to develop those weapons, we know that the sources were either through enrichment of uranium or with the use of graphite or heavy-water-moderated production reactors, but not commercial ¶ ¶ reactors.¶ ¶ Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea are believed to have ¶ ¶ produced weapons-grade plutonium from the diversion of ¶ ¶ their heavy water research reactors to irradiate target materials. No nation has ever tried to produce nuclear weapons ¶ ¶ from the type of spent fuel discharged by commercial power ¶ ¶ reactors.

#### World of the aff is safer than the SQUO. Nuclear waste is the most vulnerable part of the fuel cycle to terroristic threats. That’s Rogers. Plan solves that.

#### Reprocessing facilities are safe – they’re designed to satisfy all relevant standards.

IAEA, ‘8

[International Atomic Energy Agency, “Spent Fuel Reprocessing Options”, August 2008, RSR]

Existing reprocessing facilities have been designed and constructed to satisfy all relevant national and international standards for the safekeeping of nuclear materials. The key to achieving safeguarding is accountability and transparency, resulting from communications and co-operation between the operator and safeguarding authorities. Today, specific approaches are implemented in reprocessing plants, tailored to take maximum benefit from the features of these plants, such as automation, computerised systems and remote monitoring. Based on the past experience at La Hague and Sellafield, new designs can incorporate smaller material balance zones and can utilize improved technology for the measurement of processes [24]. The new reprocessing plant at Rokkasho-Mura in Japan is an interesting case in point, with implementation of extensive safeguards measures largely automated to such extent that three-quarters of data collection are reported to be performed unattended [76].

### Peak Oil

#### Concede resource wars.

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

#### Economic collapse leads to extinction.

Kemp 10

[Geoffrey, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4]

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

#### Alternative Won’t Solve - Re-Growth will be inevitable.

Raeyrynen**,** U of Helsinki, 1983 (Raimo. “International Studies Quarterly.” P. 394)

There is certainly not a simple congruity between innovation of life cycles, infrastructural investments, the dynamics of new industrial branches and the long waves of economic development. On the basis of the observations summarized here, however, it may be concluded that they are associated with one another. In particular, the **downturns of long economic waves tend to give rise to new technological innovations and to new infrastructural investments. These reinforce each other and lead to a sustained growth which is further propped up by a changed social structure and by organizational innovations.**

#### The right-wing will hijack the movement preventing any transition.

Martin Lewis professor in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke University. Green Delusions, 1992 p170-171

While an explosive socioeconomic crisis in the near term is hardly likely the possibility certainly cannot be dismissed. Capitalism is an inherently unstable economic system, and periodic crises of some magnitude are inevitable. An outbreak of jingoistic economic nationalism throughout the world, moreover, could quickly result in virtual economic collapse. Under such circumstances we could indeed enter an epoch of revolutionary social turmoil. Yet I believe that there are good reasons to believe that the victors in such a struggle would be radicals not of the left but rather of the right. The extreme left, for all its intellectual strength, notably lacks the kind of power necessary to emerge victorious from a real revolution. A few old street radicals may still retain their militant ethos, but today’s college professors and their graduate students, the core marxist contingent, would be ineffective. The radical right, on the other hand, would present a very real threat. Populist right-wing paramilitary groups are well armed and well trained, while establishment-minded fascists probably have links with the American military, wherein lies the greatest concentration of destructive power this planet knows. Should a crisis strike so savagely as to splinter the American center and its political institutions, we could well experience a revolutionary movement similar to that of Germany in the 1930.

#### Decreased growth leads to rapid and unrestrained rebounds supercharging their reasons why growth is bad.

Bronson 6 (Bob, Bronson Capital Markets Research, LLC, May 16, [http://www.financialsense.com/editorials/bronson/2006/0517.html] AD: 6-23-11, jm)

The reasons behind the investor psychology of an “echo-mania” are the stuff of the field of behavioral finance. Quite simply, investors haven’t had enough of the easy money made in the original mania, even though much, if not all, of that money was lost in the first downleg (A) of the Supercycle Bear Market. The eagerness for quick riches is hard to squelch, and so they rush in to buy all over again, creating a second, or “echo” bubble. They tell themselves they’ve “learned a lesson” and “won’t make the same mistake twice” by holding on to their hot stocks too long. They think they’ll sell in time to avoid the next market collapse, but empirical evidence shows they don’t. In fact, their eventual “herding,” when the decline is well underway and they finally “get it” and decide to sell en masse, usually causes a more severe second downleg than the first. Experiments conducted by George Mason University professor Vernon Smith, who shared in the 2002 Nobel Prize for economics, confirmed this behavior. Participants traded a dividend-paying “stock” with a very clear fundamental value. A bubble invariably forms, then bursts. If the experiment is repeated with the same people, a bubble forms again. The second time, though, participants think they will be able to sell their stock before trouble strikes. They then express surprise that, in fact, they weren’t able to get out before the second collapse, which leads to their total disdain for investing in stocks. This collective investor disillusionment is both a necessary and sufficient condition for bringing about the selling that results in the extreme fundamental undervaluation that finally ends the Supercycle Bear Market Period. We have seen exactly this behavior at work since the stock market began its rebound from the October 2002 and March 2003 lows. We expect that the recent “echo-mania” will end like the original mania and like the good professor’s experiment: badly for the investors speculating once again on highly overvalued stock and believing they’re now a better-than-average investor.

#### **Environmental benefits from economic decline are short-term and a small downturn massively increases overall environmental damage—this card is comparative.**

Anbumozhi & Bauer 10

[Venkatachalam Anbumozhi is a capacity building specialist at the Asian Development Bank Institute in Tokyo and Armin Bauer is a senior economist in the Regional and Sustainable Development Department at the Asian Development Bank in Manila, “Impact of Global Recession on Sustainable Development and Poverty Linkages” ADBI Working Paper Series, No. 227, July 2010 http://www.adbi.org/files/2010.07.08.wp227.impact.global.recession.dev.poverty.linkages.pdf]

The global financial crisis and the resulting economic slowdown may be assumed to have at least the benefit of also reducing environmental degradation in the individual countries. This paper discusses the consequences of the crisis for energy use, pollution prevention, and land use in Asia and the associated emissions of greenhouse gases—the principal global warming pollutants—as well as their linkage with poverty. There are some short-term benefits to the global environment from the economic slowdown. Such benefits include reduction in the rate of air and water pollution from reduced energy use—which has direct implications for the urban poor’s health. However, modest benefits to global and local environments arising from the economic slowdown are likely to be much smaller than the costs associated with many environmental conservation measures, related to energy savings, natural resources protection, and water environment. Both supply and demand side investments in energy and environment are being affected. Many ongoing projects are being slowed and a number of downward revisions are being made in expected profitability. Meanwhile, businesses and households are spending less on energy efficiency measures. Tighter credit and lower prices make investment in energy savings and environmental conservation less attractive financially, while the economic crisis is encouraging end users to rein in spending across the board. This is delaying the deployment of more efficient technology and equipment. Furthermore, solution providers are expected to reduce investment in research, development, and commercialization of more energy-efficient models, unless they are able to secure financial support from governments. The economic slowdown is likely to alter land use patterns by increasing the pressure to clear forests for firewood, timber, or agricultural purposes—the livelihood opportunities available with the rural poor. Further, the likely additional delay in many countries in the construction of effluent treatment plans for limiting the discharge of pollutants into the rivers is expected to harm the water environment. Thus on balance, the modest benefits to global and local environments arising from the economic slowdown are likely to be much smaller than the costs of many environmental conservation measures for improving the livelihood conditions of the poor.

#### Trainer admits that a concerted, grass-roots effort must be launched to spur the necessary mindset change

Ted Trainer, 1985, Abandon Affluence, p. 277

The first phase of the transition, now in process, involves little more than the spread of ideas. This is the crucial phase and at best it might require another two or more decades to complete. If it is to be successful it will build the grass-roots political support needed before the necessary structural changes, constituting the second phase of the transition, can be attempted.

#### No impact to nuke terror. CA 1NC Answers.

## Elections

#### 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."

#### Personality, not policy, matters more to swing voters

Martin ’12 (Jonathan, 2012, “Why Barack Obama is winning”, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=978F5153-3BFA-42E3-83CA-54E1A0C143DF)

The phenomenon is the result of three powerful factors, according to interviews with some two dozen political veterans from both parties.¶ The first is a rapidly changing, deeply polarized electorate — one in which external circumstances don’t necessarily swing large numbers of voters whose minds are deeply made up — and also one that, on balance, is becoming more Democratic due to demographic trends. In an environment like this, Obama has not seen his political bottom fall out, as happened to George H.W. Bush in 1992, when Al Gore cited a barrage of statistics and taunted, “Everything that should be down is up, and everything that should be up is down.”¶ (POLITICO’s Swing-State Map)¶ But a more hardened political landscape also means that — at the margins — candidate skills and attributes matter more than ever.¶ Obama’s durability, according to polling and interviews, is the result of a unique connection with voters as someone who broke racial barriers in 2008, his ability to evade much the blame for the recession and a brutally effective campaign.¶ Romney’s inability to capitalize on trends with the economy and national mood that would normally create a wide opening for a challenger is in large measure a reflection of his own defects as candidate and failure to sell himself to voters, according to these same sources, many of whom are Republicans hoping to beat Obama. “He came into the general election with a very negative [image] rating and he has not effectively addressed that,” said longtime GOP pollster Jan van Lohuizen, who worked for Romney in 2008. “What they’ve been doing for five months hasn’t worked. At some point, they need to come to the conclusion that it’s not worked.”

#### Both candidates have the same foreign policy.

Smith, editor of the Hudson Valley Activist Newsletter and is former editor of the (U.S.) Guardian Newsweekly, 10-6

[Jack, “Obama and Romney: Similar Views on Foreign/Military Policy”, 10-6-12, Foreign Policy Journal

http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2012/10/06/obama-and-romney-similar-views-on-foreignmilitary-policy/, RSR]

Despite the sharp charges and counter-charges about foreign/military and national security policy, there are no important differences on such matters between President Barack Obama and challenger Mitt Romney. The back and forth between the candidates on international issues is largely about appearance, not substance. The Washington Post noted on Sept. 26 that the two candidates “made clear this week that they share an overriding belief — American political and economic values should triumph in the world.” Add to that uplifting phrase the implicit words “by any means necessary,” and you have the essence of Washington’s international endeavors.

## States

#### 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

#### US stance against reprocessing hurts relations with South Korea and results in South Korean nuclearization.

Yurman, Staff Writer, ‘12

[Dan, “Revisiting Reprocessing in South Korea”, ANS Nuclear Café, 8-2-12,

<http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2012/08/02/revisiting-reprocessing-in-south-korea/>, RSR]

Comes now the request by the South Korean government, first aired in October 2010, to revise the bilateral cooperation treaty with the U.S. It has been in place for more than 40 years and it is a cornerstone of U.S./South Korean diplomatic relations. Many specialists in the field of nonproliferation see a “hard and fast” policy against any expansion of uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing as a key to stopping states like North Korea from pursuing these activities. That strategy hasn’t worked and, as a result, South Korea wants relief from the restriction in the now-decades-old treaty. Negotiations over changes to the treaty have been going on since last December, but appear to be stalemated around a key set of issues. It is a delicate dance, as diplomats like to say, because if the U.S. leans too heavily on South Korea, it could sour relations between the two countries and spawn nationalist sentiment that might lead to a nuclear weapons program. Since the 1950s, South Korea has depended on the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a shield against aggression from its neighbor to the north.

#### US-SoKo relations k2 regional stability and global security

Clinton 10 [Hillary Rodham Clinton, “America’s Engagement in the Asia-Pacific”, October 28, 2010, http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/10/150141.htm]

This year also marked a milestone with another ally: the 60th anniversary of the start of the Korean War, which Secretary Gates and I commemorated in Seoul this past summer. And in two weeks, our presidents will meet in Seoul when President Obama travels there for the G-20 summit. Our two countries have stood together in the face of threats and provocative acts from North Korea, including the tragic sinking of the Cheonan by a North Korean torpedo. We will continue to coordinate closely with both Seoul and Tokyo in our efforts to make clear to North Korea there is only one path that promises the full benefits of engagement with the outside world – a full, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization.The alliance between South Korea and the United States is a lynchpin of stability and security in the region and now even far beyond. We are working together in Afghanistan, where a South Korean reconstruction team is at work in Parwan Province; in the Gulf of Aden, where Korean and U.S. forces are coordinating anti-piracy missions. And of course, beyond our military cooperation, our countries enjoy a vibrant economic relationship, which is why our two Presidents have called for resolving the outstanding issues related to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement by the time of the G-20 meeting in Seoul.

#### East Asian instability leads to World War III

Knight Ridder 2k

(Jonathon S. Landay, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts”, 3-11, L/N)

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But **even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war**. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. **Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "**We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster**."

## Federalism

#### **Nuclear renaissance now – long term 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.

#### Federalism is dead and the recession killed it – proves that centralization is necessary. Saying that funding for plan pushes us over some brink is simply not true.

**Cauchon 09** (Dennis, journalist. USA Today, “Federal aid is top revenue for states” May 4 2009. http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2009-05-04-fed-states-revenue\_N.htm)

In a historic first, Uncle Sam has supplanted sales, property and income taxes as the biggest source of revenue for state and local governments. The shift shows how deeply the recession is cutting. Federal stimulus money aimed at reviving the economy and a sharp drop in tax collections have altered, at least temporarily, the traditional balance of how states, cities, counties and schools pay for their operations. The sales tax had been the No. 1 source of state and local revenue since the mid-1970s, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. Before that, property taxes were the primary source. That changed in the first three months of 2009. Federal grants — early stimulus money plus conventional federal aid — soared 15% in the first quarter to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $437 billion, eclipsing sales taxes, which fell 2%. The dominance of federal money is set to expand dramatically this year because tax collections are sinking while the bulk of federal stimulus aid is just starting to arrive. "This money isn't manna from heaven. It comes with a price," says Indiana state Sen. Jim Buck, a Republican. He worries that the federal money will leave states under greater federal control and burden future generations with debt. Nick Johnson, a state finance expert at the liberal Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, says the federal aid is well-timed. "This has more to say about the severity of the recession than anything else," he says. "Congress stepped in on a temporary basis to help states." The federal government plans to provide about $300 billion in extra aid to state and local governments over the next two years, mostly for health care, education and transportation projects. State and local governments spend about $2 trillion a year, and the federal government is now paying about 23% of those costs. States are counting on tax collections rebounding by 2012, when stimulus money starts to run out. The early flow of stimulus money helped lift total state and local revenue by 1.6% in the first quarter compared with a year earlier despite a 2.9% drop in total tax collections. Spending rose 1.5%. Things are getting worse for states that rely on the income tax. Reason: Unexpectedly large refund checks in March and April are going to workers who lost jobs or had wage cuts last year. Michigan's income tax collections are down $200 million and refunds are up about $200 million — a $400 million swing. Connecticut has paid nearly $1 billion in tax refunds this year, about 20% more than expected. "These are big numbers. It's put us in a very bad situation," says Connecticut Comptroller Nancy Wyman.

#### Data disproves hegemony impacts.

Fettweis, Department of Political Science at Tulane University, ‘11

[Christopher, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO]

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### Heg can no longer contain conflicts

Layne 11 (Christopher Layne is Professor and Robert M. Gates Chair in National Security at Texas A & M University's Bush School of Government and Public Service. “Bye bye, Miss American Pie” The European Magazine Online – 3-28-2011 <http://theeuropean-magazine.com/223-layne-christopher/231-pax-americana>)

American primacy’s end is result of history’s big, impersonal forces compounded by the United States’ own self-defeating policies. Externally, the impact of these big historical forces is reflected in the emergence of new great powers like China and India which is being driven by the unprecedented shift in the center of global economic power from the Euro-Atlantic area to Asia. China’s economy has been growing much more rapidly than the United States’ over the last two decades and continues to do so. The US decline reflects its own economic troubles U.S. decline reflects its own economic troubles. Optimists contend that current worries about decline will fade once the U.S. recovers from the recession. After all, they say, the U.S. faced a larger debt/GDP ratio after World War II, and yet embarked on a sustained era of growth. But the post-war era was a golden age of U.S. industrial and financial dominance, trade surpluses, and sustained high growth rates. Those days are gone forever. The United States of 2011 are different from 1945. Even in the best case, the United States will emerge from the current crisis facing a grave fiscal crisis. The looming fiscal results from the $1 trillion plus budget deficits that the U.S. will incur for at least a decade. When these are bundled with the entitlements overhang (the unfunded future liabilities of Medicare and Social Security) and the cost of the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is reason to worry about United States’ long-term fiscal stability – and the role of the dollar. The dollar’s vulnerability is the United States’ real geopolitical Achilles’ heel because the dollar’s role as the international economy’s reserve currency role underpins U.S. primacy. If the dollar loses that status America’s hegemony literally will be unaffordable. In coming years the U.S. will be pressured to defend the dollar by preventing runaway inflation. This will require fiscal self-discipline through a combination of tax increases and big spending cuts. Meaningful cuts in federal spending mean deep reductions in defense expenditures because discretionary non-defense – domestic – spending accounts for only about 20% of annual federal outlays. Faced with these hard choices, Americans may contract hegemony fatigue. If so, the U.S. will be compelled to retrench strategically and the Pax Americana will end. The Pax Americana is already crumbling in slow motion The current international order is based on the economic and security structures that the U.S. created after World War II. The entire fabric of world order that the United States established after 1945 – the Pax Americana – rested on the foundation of U.S. military and economic preponderance. The decline of American power means the end of U.S. dominance in world politics and the beginning of the transition to a new constellation of world power. Indeed, the Pax Americana is already is crumbling in slow motion.

#### 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.

#### Turn: A federalist framework of government leads to territorial debates which empirically end in genocide

**Schetter 05** (Conrad, Center for Development Research, University of Bonn, Germany. Geopolitics,“Ethnoscapes, National Territorialisation, and the Afghan War” 2005. EBSCO)

The territorialisation of national ideologies emerged as one of the most significant prerequisites for the use of violence in the name of a nation or an ethnic group. On the one hand, beginning in the nineteenth century the practise of ethnic cleansing gained ground all over the world as a means of creating ethnically homogenised territories and achieving the unity of nation-state and territory.24 On the other hand, the establishment of nation-states and the politics of territorial homogenisation were often enough accompanied by the emergence of political counter-movements. Ethnic elites excluded from access to state power competed with national elites by stressing ethnic counter-ideologies reflecting their own perceptions of ethnoscapes. Once political thinking in terms of the nationstate had attained global primacy, ethnoscapes laid the groundwork for territiorialised claims ranging from rights of territorial autonomy and selfdetermination in a federalist framework to demands for independent territorial nation-states. These ethnoscapes were not in conformity with national territory, since they usually pointed to current or past patterns of settlement and migration or to the territorialisation of ethnic symbols such as battlefields, places of pilgrimage, etc. The rhetorical disputes between protagonists of the nation and rival ethnic groups often culminated in the question: who arrived here first? In many conflicts the belief in a certain ethnoscape was perceived by people as an axiomatic fact that called for certain courses of action: in escalating violent conflicts, for instance, spatial perceptions of national and ethnic identities have again and again provided the immediate legitimacy for acts of violence such as ethnic cleansing and ‘ethnocide’

#### Genocide causes global instability and makes every other impact inevitable

Campbell 01 (Kenneth, Associate Professor of Political Science and International Relations and Director of the International Relations Program at the University of Delaware, Genocide and the Global Village, p. 26)

Genocide is the supreme crime! It is arguably the worst crime that can be committed in the present global system of nation-states and peoples. Genocide is equal to or worse than the crime of aggression. Genocide attacks civilization itself. Contemporary civilization is based upon certain fundamental shared moral values, one of which is the principle that groups of people have the right to exist as a distinct nationality, raced, ethnicity, and religion. If left unchecked, genocide eats away like a cancer at the structure of global society, eventually undermining and destroying just those international institutions designed to foster global cooperation, mitigate global conflict, and avoid global catastrophe such as the world experienced in the 1930s and 1940s. Most scholars, political analysts, and policymakers, unfortunately treat genocide as a mere humanitarian concern, having little to do with the traditional interests of nation-states. They too often fail to see genocide as a threat to strategic global interests, such as political stability, economic prosperity, peace, and security. Genocide, in fact, occupies a unique area of overlap between humanitarian concerns and more traditional state interests to the degree that international peace and security are indivisible in a world of rapidly increasing globalization. For globalization not only speeds up the positive effects of open markets, open technologies, and open societies, it increases the spread of pathological behavior such as genocide.

## Lasers

#### Perm: do both. <explanation for why it doesn’t link to the Net Benefit>

#### Space storage fails – cost and accidents.

Win, Faculty of Science and Technology, Assumption University, 6 (David Tin, The Nuclear Waste Issue – Technical Facts and Philosophical Aspects, Assumption University, July 2006, http://www.journal.au.edu/au\_techno/2006/july06/vol10no1\_a1.pdf, da 9-21-12)

Currently, space, sea bed, and large stable ¶ geologic formations on land are considered for ¶ nuclear waste storage. The most appealing ¶ long-term storage option for high level, ¶ radioactive waste is space. But high cost of ¶ delivery into space is a prohibiting factor. Also, ¶ space garbage can collide with satellites and ¶ other spacecraft and is likely to re-enter the ¶ earth’s atmosphere over the several thousand ¶ year storage period. Another factor is that an ¶ accident during launch could be disastrous. ¶ Hence space disposal is not a practical option ¶ until space travel is well established (Rochester ¶ University 2005)

#### Space debris will render satellites useless – kills heg.

Ansell, grad student in the Master in International Science and Technology Policy program @ the George Washington University’s Elliot School of International Affairs, ‘10

[Megan, “Active Space Debris Removal: Needs, Implications, and Reccomendations for Today’s Geopolitical Environment” http://www.princeton.edu/jpia/past-issues-1/2010/Space-Debris-Removal.pdf ACC 7/18/11]

There are currently hundreds of millions of space debris fragments orbiting the Earth at speeds of up to several kilometers per second. Although the majority of these fragments result from the space activities of only three countries—China, Russia, and the United States—the indiscriminate nature of orbital mechanics means that they pose a continuous threat to all assets in Earth’s orbit. There are now roughly 300,000 pieces of space debris large enough to completely destroy operating satellites upon impact (Wright 2007, 36; Johnson 2009a, 1). It is likely that space debris will become a signiﬁcant problem within the next several decades. Predictive studies show that if humans do not take action to control the space debris population, an increasing number of unintentional collisions between orbiting objects will lead to the runaway growth of space debris in Earth’s orbit (Liou and Johnson 2006). This uncontrolled growth of space debris threatens the ability of satellites to deliver the services humanity has come to rely on in its day-to-day activities. For example, Global Positioning System (GPS) precision timing and navigation signals are a signiﬁcant component of the modern global economy; a GPS failure could disrupt emergency response services, cripple global banking systems, and interrupt electric power grids (Logsdon 2001). Furthermore, satellite-enabled military capabilities such as GPS precision-guided munitions are critical enablers of current U.S. military strategies and tactics. They allow the United States to not only remain a globally dominant military power, but also wage war in accordance with its political and ethical values by enabling faster, less costly warﬁghting with minimal collateral damage (Sheldon 2005; Dolman 2006, 163-165). Given the U.S. military’s increasing reliance on satellite-enabled capabilities in recent conﬂicts, in particular Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom, some have argued that losing access to space would seriously impede the ability of the United States to be successful in future conﬂicts (Dolman 2006, 165).

#### **Revival of U.S. nuclear programs, particularly reprocessing, is key to promote nuclear nonproliferation.**

Bengelsdorf 7(Harold, consultant and former director of energy department offices, “THE U.S. DOMESTIC CIVIL NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND U.S. NONPROLIFERATION POLICY”, http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/COUNCIL\_WHITE\_PAPER\_Final.pdf)

U.S. nuclear exports can be used to influence other states’ nuclear programs through the nonproliferation commitments that the U.S. requires. The U.S. has so-called consent rights over the enrichment, reprocessing and alteration in form or content of the nuclear materials that it has provided to other countries, as well as to the nuclear materials that are produced from the nuclear materials and equipment that the U.S. has supplied. Further, the ability of the U.S. to develop improved and advanced nuclear technologies will depend on its ability to provide consistent and vigorous support for nuclear R&D programs that will enjoy solid bipartisan political support in order that they can be sustained from one administration to another. As the U.S. Government expends taxpayer funds on the Nuclear Power 2010 program, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, the Generation IV initiative and other programs, it should consider the benefit to the U.S. industrial base and to U.S. non-proliferation posture as criteria in project design and source selection where possible. Finally, the ability of the United States to resolve its own difficulties in managing its spent fuel and nuclear wastes will be crucial to maintaining the credibility of the U.S. nuclear power program and will be vital to implementing important new nonproliferation initiatives designed to discourage the spread of sensitive nuclear facilities to other countries.

#### Unchecked nuclear spread will cause global nuclear war – shorter flight times and lack of second strike capacity

Cimbala 8 (Stephen, Political Science Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, March, “Anticipatory Attacks: Nuclear Crisis Stability in Future Asia” Comparative Strategy, Vol 27 No 2, p 113-132, InformaWorld)

The spread of nuclear weapons in Asia presents a complicated mosaic of possibilities in this regard. States with nuclear forces of variable force structure, operational experience, and command-control systems will be thrown into a matrix of complex political, social, and cultural crosscurrents contributory to the possibility of war. In addition to the existing nuclear powers in Asia, others may seek nuclear weapons if they feel threatened by regional rivals or hostile alliances. Containment of nuclear proliferation in Asia is a desirable political objective for all of the obvious reasons. Nevertheless, the present century is unlikely to see the nuclear hesitancy or risk aversion that marked the Cold War, in part, because the military and political discipline imposed by the Cold War superpowers no longer exists, but also because states in Asia have new aspirations for regional or global respect.12 The spread of ballistic missiles and other nuclear-capable delivery systems in Asia , or in the Middle East with reach into Asia, is especially dangerous because plausible adversaries live close together and are already engaged in ongoing disputes about territory or other issues.13 The Cold War Americans and Soviets required missiles and airborne delivery systems of intercontinental range to strike at one another's vitals. But short-range ballistic missiles or fighter-bombers suffice for India and Pakistan to launch attacks at one another with potentially “strategic” effects. China shares borders with Russia, North Korea, India, and Pakistan; Russia, with China and North Korea; India, with Pakistan and China; Pakistan, with India and China; and so on. The short flight times of ballistic missiles between the cities or military forces of contiguous states means that very little time will be available for warning and attack assessment by the defender. Conventionally armed missiles could easily be mistaken for a tactical nuclear first use. Fighter-bombers appearing over the horizon could just as easily be carrying nuclear weapons as conventional ordnance. In addition to the challenges posed by shorter flight times and uncertain weapons loads, potential victims of nuclear attack in Asia may also have first strike-vulnerable forces and command-control systems that increase decision pressures for rapid, and possibly mistaken, retaliation. This potpourri of possibilities challenges conventional wisdom about nuclear deterrence and proliferation on the part of policymakers and academic theorists. For policymakers in the United States and NATO, spreading nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in Asia could profoundly shift the geopolitics of mass destruction from a European center of gravity (in the twentieth century) to an Asian and/or Middle Eastern center of gravity (in the present century).14 This would profoundly shake up prognostications to the effect that wars of mass destruction are now passe, on account of the emergence of the “Revolution in Military Affairs” and its encouragement of information-based warfare.15 Together with this, there has emerged the argument that large-scale wars between states or coalitions of states, as opposed to varieties of unconventional warfare and failed states, are exceptional and potentially obsolete.16 The spread of WMD and ballistic missiles in Asia could overturn these expectations for the obsolescence or marginalization of major interstate warfare. For theorists, the argument that the spread of nuclear weapons might be fully compatible with international stability, and perhaps even supportive of international security, may be less sustainable than hitherto.17 Theorists optimistic about the ability of the international order to accommodate the proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems in the present century have made several plausible arguments based on international systems and deterrence theory. First, nuclear weapons may make states more risk averse as opposed to risk acceptant, with regard to brandishing military power in support of foreign policy objectives. Second, if states' nuclear forces are second-strike survivable, they contribute to reduced fears of surprise attack. Third, the motives of states with respect to the existing international order are crucial. Revisionists will seek to use nuclear weapons to overturn the existing balance of power; status quo-oriented states will use nuclear forces to support the existing distribution of power, and therefore, slow and peaceful change, as opposed to sudden and radical power transitions. These arguments, for a less alarmist view of nuclear proliferation, take comfort from the history of nuclear policy in the “first nuclear age,” roughly corresponding to the Cold War.18 Pessimists who predicted that some thirty or more states might have nuclear weapons by the end of the century were proved wrong. However, the Cold War is a dubious precedent for the control of nuclear weapons spread outside of Europe. The military and security agenda of the Cold War was dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union, especially with regard to nuclear weapons. Ideas about mutual deterrence based on second-strike capability and the deterrence “rationality” according to American or allied Western concepts might be inaccurate guides to the avoidance of war outside of Europe.19