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#### We meet: Nuclear fuel recycling is energy production.

World Nuclear Association 12 [Processing of Used Nuclear Fuel, http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf69.html]

Used nuclear fuel has long been reprocessed to extract fissile materials for recycling and to reduce the volume of high-level wastes. ¶ New reprocessing technologies are being developed to be deployed in conjunction with fast neutron reactors which will burn all long-lived actinides. ¶ A significant amount of plutonium recovered from used fuel is currently recycled into MOX fuel; a small amount of recovered uranium is recycled. ¶ A key, nearly unique, characteristic of nuclear energy is that used fuel may be reprocessed to recover fissile and fertile materials in order to provide fresh fuel for existing and future nuclear power plants. Several European countries, Russia and Japan have had a policy to reprocess used nuclear fuel, although government policies in many other countries have not yet addressed the various aspects of reprocessing.¶ Over the last 50 years the principal reason for reprocessing used fuel has been to recover unused uranium and plutonium in the used fuel elements and thereby close the fuel cycle, gaining some 25% more energy from the original uranium in the process and thus contributing to energy security. A secondary reason is to reduce the volume of material to be disposed of as high-level waste to about one fifth. In addition, the level of radioactivity in the waste from reprocessing is much smaller and after about 100 years falls much more rapidly than in used fuel itself.¶

#### Counter interpretation:

#### The aff has to affect both resource extraction and conversion into energy

Australian Government, Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency 2011 [“Energy Production and Consumption,” http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/initiatives/national-greenhouse-energy-reporting/publications/supplementary-guidelines/energy-production-consumption.aspx]

Production of energy: in relation to a facility, means the:

1. extraction or capture of energy from natural sources for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility or for use other than in the operation of the facility
2. manufacture of energy by the conversion of energy from one form to another form for final consumption by or from the operation of the facility, or for use other than in the operation of the facility (regulation 2.23(3) NGER Regulations).

#### We meet the counter-interpretation: recycling involves both the act of reprocessing the used fuel and using it to create new nuclear energy.

#### Our interp good:

A. Predictability – Only our interpretation guarantees link arguments to both extraction and the burning of resources to produce energy. This is crucial link ground for pollution DAs and domestic/foreign energy tradeoff DAs.

B. Limits: Requiring the aff to both extract and convert the energy is necessary to eliminate affs that only extract, like capture carbon or methane or stockpile oil as a strategic military reserve with heg advantages. Also key to prevent affs that only burn fuels like Bataille-style affs that encourage rapid consumption or R&D affs that incentivize new ways to burn the same resources.

#### Competing interpretations are bad: Race to the bottom: they’re just trying to limit out one more case

#### Prefer reasonability: as long as we’re reasonably topical, there’s no reason to pull the trigger. Don’t vote on potential abuse.

## Case

### Peak Oil

#### 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.

#### Even if it is abiotic – still more expensive to reproduce this oil meaning that it would make oil far more expensive killing the economy. That’s Zakaria and Li.

#### 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.

#### Economic collapse leads to extinction – rogue states and extremism

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.

#### 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.

#### Their renewables evidence says that we have to increase efficiency of alternative energy. We do that by increasing sustainability of nuke power and hydrogen.

#### 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.

#### **Saudi Arabia lacks both incentive and ability to flood the oil market.**

Levi and McNally, ‘12

[Robert (President of the Rapidan Group, served as Special Assistant to the President at the U.S. National Economic Council and Senior Director for International Energy at the U.S. National Security Council under President George W. Bush) and Michael (David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations), “A crude predicament: the era of volatile oil prices." Foreign Affairs 90.4 (2011): 100. Academic OneFile]

A repeat of the boom-bust pattern is now more likely than not. The International Energy Agency, the U.S. Department of Energy, and many experts estimate that Saudi Arabia and its OPEC partners are not investing enough in production capacity today to meet both increasing demand and the five percent threshold for reserves. This is largely because Saudi Arabia, historically the main holder of OPEC's spare capacity, is both less able and less willing to play the part. Saudi officials say they plan to keep as spare capacity only 1.5-2.0 million barrels of oil a day, or less than two percent of global demand. As they regularly note, holding extra capacity is expensive. For example, the Manifa oil field, Saudi Arabia's next big project to shore up production capacity and prevent its spare capacity from dropping even further, will cost about $16 billion just to build and will add only 0.9 million barrels per day of capacity. Despite such efforts to expand production, Saudi Arabia remains worried about oversupplying the market and thus depressing prices, and so it is likely to aim low in its planning for spare capacity. It worries that if demand grows more slowly than anticipated--demand growth in Asia is much tougher to predict than it used to be--or other countries' supplies turn out to be larger than expected, it will be saddled with low prices or massive amounts of unused investment. Just as Saudi Arabia's ability to hold spare capacity is declining, its incentives to do so are waning, too. With U.S.-Saudi ties having frayed over the last decade, Riyadh's motivation to continue contributing to its security partnership with the United States by maintaining spare crude capacity has diminished. In the past, Saudi Arabia held spare capacity partly as a way of disciplining OPEC: spare capacity allowed it to threaten to punish cartel members by flooding the market if they cheated on their quotas. It also allowed Saudi Arabia to align itself with the United States by countering calls for higher oil prices by price hawks such as Iran and Venezuela. But today, Riyadh is less certain about the strength of its alliance with Washington and may thus be less willing to incur the costs and risks involved in contributing to the U.S.-Saudi partnership in these ways. To be sure, Saudi Arabia and OPEC will maintain some influence over oil prices in the future. They can prop them up in the short term by capping production and in the long term by limiting investment in new supplies. But they will not be able to consistently put a lid on prices. U.S. officials have forecast low spare capacity through 2012 (their projections do not extend any further), and the International Energy Agency anticipates that between 2013 and 2016, OPEC's spare capacity will be below the five percent threshold. Some developments could ease the pressure on supplies: a slowdown of economic growth in Asia; improved security in Iraq, leading to increased production there; political change in Iran or Venezuela that allowed international capital and technology to flow into those countries' oil sectors. Yet any of these changes would take many years to translate into large increases in supplies. The development of alternative technologies for transportation, the faster adoption of fuel-efficient vehicles, and the greater use of natural gas in the transportation sector could also change the picture. But such transitions would also take many years, if not decades.

#### 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.

#### No impact to Russian economy – recession proves.

Blackwill, Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning, ‘9

[Robert, Former Associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession – A Caution”,

http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf]

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

#### No Israeli strike—they know the barriers are too high.

Isenberg, Adjunct National Security Fellow at the Cato Institute, ‘12

[David, “Israeli Attack on Iran’s Nuclear Facilities Easier Said than Done”, Asia Times, 2-15-12

<http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=106739>]

Despite renewed media speculation regarding possible Israeli attacks against Iran's nuclear facilities as early as this spring, scepticism that such a campaign could actually be successfully carried out remains relatively high, raising the question of whether there is more bark than bite to Israeli threats. It cannot expect a repeat of 1981 when the Israeli air force destroyed the Osirak reactor at Al-Tuwaythah, just south of Baghdad. The Iranians are aware of both Israeli capabilities and the U.S.-made precision-guided penetrating munitions in the Israeli inventory. The Iranian program has been dispersed all over the country — estimates range between 12 and more than 20 locations — and the facilities have been built with U.S. and Israeli capabilities in mind and are protected by modern Russian air defence systems. The single most critical element of the Iranian program is thought to be the Natanz facility. The heart of the facility is the centrifuge area, located in an underground, hardened structure. But even if Israel tries to limits the target set, it would still have to attack other facilities besides Natanz. For example, the newer Fordow fuel-enrichment plant near Qom, where Iran has already moved 3.5-percent enriched uranium from Natanz, is built into the side of a mountain and is heavily fortified. There is a uranium conversion plant at Isfahan, a heavy-water facility being constructed at Arak and centrifuge factories outside Tehran. The straight-line distance between Israel and Natanz is almost 1,609 kilometers. Since the countries do not share a common border, Israeli aircraft or missiles must fly through foreign — and hostile — airspace to get to the target. The least risky method of striking Natanz is with Israel's mediumrange ballistic missiles, the Jericho II or III. It is believed that the Israeli missiles can reach Natanz. However, to travel that far the missiles will have a limited warhead weight, and it is doubtful that these warheads will be able to penetrate far enough underground to achieve the desired level of destruction. Thus, an attack by the Israeli air force's U.S.-made fighter-bomber aircraft is the most likely option. The Israelis have 25 F-15I and about 100 F-16I jets. The F-15I is capable of carrying four metric tons of fuel in its internal tanks, conformal fuel tanks (CFT), and detachable tanks. This enables it to fly about 4,450 kilometers. With midair refueling, the range can be extended further. The F-15I can carry a very wide range of weapons such as various guided missiles and bombs, as well as iron bombs. All in all, the plane can carry about 10 metric tons of munitions. The F-16I has an extended flight range that reportedly allows Israeli forces to attack targets well within Iran without having to refuel. Use of CFT extends its effective mission range up to 50 percent. The baseline model has a combat radius of 1,370 kilometers with two 907-kilogram bombs and two air-to-air missiles, with 3,936-liter external tanks. Assuming an air attack, the question is how will the aircraft fly from their bases in Israel to a target located 322 kilometers inside Iran? They could go either through Saudi Arabia or Iraq, possibly even using Jordanian airspace as well. Either route is a one-way trip of about 1,931 kilometers. To overfly Saudi Arabia the strike aircraft depart southern Israel, enter Saudi airspace from the Gulf of Aqaba or Jordan, fly 1,287 kilometers of Saudi airspace to the Gulf and then 483 kilometers into Iran. Since the Israeli air force does not operate stealth aircraft, there is a reasonable expectation that at some point the aircraft will be detected over Saudi Arabia. Whether Saudi defences could — or would — be able to stop the Israelis is uncertain. Given Saudi fears over Iran's nuclear program, perhaps they would turn a blind eye and claim ignorance. If they chose to traverse Iranian airspace, the strike aircraft depart southern Israel, cross 483 to 644 kilometers of Saudi airspace or a combination of Jordanian and Saudi airspace, and enter Iraqi airspace as soon as possible, continue across 805 kilometers of Iraq to the Persian Gulf and then on to the target. Entering Iran from Iraqi airspace would be politically delicate. Although U.S. troops are no longer there, traversing Iraqi airspace would not be possible without the knowledge, and most likely the permission, of the United States. The key question is whether Israel's fighter-bombers can conduct this mission without refuelling. Combat radius — the distance an aircraft can fly and return without refueling — is difficult to calculate, and depends on weapons payload, external fuel tanks, mission profile, etc. The best "guesstimate" of the combat radius of the F-15I and F-16I, outfitted with conformal fuel tanks, two external wing tanks and a decent weapons load, is almost 1,609 kilometers. Either of the two possible flight routes above is about 322 kilometers further than that. To make up for the shortfall, the aircraft could be fitted with an additional external fuel tank, but this will require a reduction in the weapons load. Given the accuracy of the weapons in the Israeli inventory, that might not be problematic. However, if the aircraft are detected and intercepted, the pilots will have to jettison the tanks in order to engage their attackers. Dropping the tanks will prevent the aircraft from reaching their target. Air refuelling is a limitation for the Israelis. In recent years Israel has acquired five C-130 and four to seven Boeing 707 tanker aircraft. However, the tankers would have to refuel the fighters in hostile airspace. The 707 is a large unarmed aircraft and would be very vulnerable to air defences. Theoretically, the Israelis could do this, but at great risk of failure. If they decide to attack Natanz, they will have to inflict sufficient damage the first time — they probably will not be able to mount follow-on strikes at other facilities.

## Waste

#### They say waste safe from meltdowns – fuel pools have no backup power, containment structures or similar security to the rest of the plant, making them particularly vulnerable. That’s Alvarez. Empirically this has lead to meltdowns with Fukushima. That’s Kinitisch.

#### 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.

#### Their radiation impact is garbage. We have alternative sources of radiation like everyday food or CAT scans. No reason why nuclear waste is key.

#### No IL to their extinction impact. No reason why waste in this specific situation matters.

#### They say on-site safe from terrorism – comparatively waste is the LEAST safe part of the nuclear plant due to security measures. That’s Rogers. Don’t need tech ability to use a dirty bomb. That’s Bunn.

#### They say on-site is safe from prolif – there’s less security at nuclear power plants due to the assumption that radioactivity provides natural protection, which studies say is false. That’s Bunn.

## Renewables

#### No shift towards renewable – venture capitalists are not interested.

Jacobius, Staff Writer, 9-17

[Arleen, “Clean-tech investing littered with mines”, Pensions and Investments,

http://www.pionline.com/article/20120917/PRINTSUB/309179992/clean-tech-investing-littered-with-mines]

Clean technology managers are redoubling their efforts to attract capital, but investors will have to pick through a landscape of failed offerings to find the managers with winning strategies.¶ Six years ago, institutional investors began making large commitments to the sector. They bet that rising fuel costs and dwindling natural resources would create a huge investment opportunity in alternative energy.¶ The California Public Employees' Retirement System has made $1.1 billion in private equity commitments to the sector, including $480 million through its CalPERS Clean Energy and Technology Fund, $500 million in clean energy and technology funds and $200 million in its environmental technology program; the California State Teachers' Retirement System has about $667.5 million invested in clean tech; and the New York State Common Retirement Fund has more than $500 million committed to the sector.¶ So far, not all investments have worked out as planned, industry insiders said. Investors are still waiting for their clean-tech portfolios to produce expected returns. The reason is that many clean-tech investments are still sitting in managers' portfolios waiting for an exit.¶ Some venture capital managers will not be able to continue supporting these companies, sending executives at these firms off in search of other sources of capital, said Tracy Lefteroff, global managing partner of the venture capital practice at PricewaterhouseCoopers U.S. who is based in the firm's San Jose, Calif., office.¶ “I think there is a lot of interest in clean technology but not enough of profitable liquidity events to maintain a high level of investment or to attract new money,” Mr. Lefteroff said.

#### No shift to renewable – public’s not interested.

Shahan 7-2 (Zachary, Writer at Clean Technica, "80% Clean, Renewable Energy by 2050: More Than Possible, But Need More Political Will (& Public Demand)," http://cleantechnica.com/2012/07/02/80-clean-renewable-energy-potential-2050-us/)

Now, as anyone in this industry should know, technology isn’t the main challenge these days. Having adequate support for a clean energy transition in top levels of political leadership is. This report may help to open the eyes of some. The increasing costs of climate-related disasters might do the same. But more than anything, I think we simply need the public to put pressure on politicians to make this possibility a reality. The NREL study above focused on an 80% by 2050 scenario, but it looked at scenarios up to 90% penetration and down to 30% penetration. Unfortunately, without strong action, we could hit the very sad and societally disastrous 30% scenario. Again, it’s not about the technology. It’s about the political will and the public demand. The public has shown time and time again that it supports clean energy, but it hasn’t demanded it very much yet. Until we do, we can be sure dirty energy companies will keep pumping everything they can into a political system that listens far too much to Big Money (when not forced to do otherwise).

#### Nuclear and renewables don’t compete—they’re complimentary

Scandurra and Romano ‘11

(Giuseppe and Antonio Angelo, Department of Statistical Mathematics and Economics at the University of Napoli, “The investments in renewable energy sources: do low carbon economies better invest in green technologies?”, Munich Personal RePEc Archive, 2011, http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/34216/2/MPRA\_paper\_34216.pdf)

If it can have some statistical significance, the estimates in the low carbon economies are generally higher, in absolute value, than in the high carbon sample, except the autoregressive parameters. In fact, the influence of investments in renewable energy source is stronger in the high carbon countries than to the other countries (low carbon). The former try to invest mostly in renewable sources in order to reduce their footprint and respect the international agreement that they ratified. Significant is the inverse relationship between renewable investments and share of nuclear consumption. Probably, the continuous base load electricity ensured by nuclear power plants and the absence of greenhouse gas emission allow these countries to invest in additional renewable energy in a complementary way, in order to reach an optimal energy mix and to ensure the subsidies for investment in renewable energy.

#### Renewables fail – intermittency and Germany proves.

Gue, Energy Markets Analyst, ‘10

[Elliot, “Nuclear Power: A Better Investment than Alternative Energy,” Investing Daily, 10-11-10, http://www.investingdaily.com/13512/nuclear-power-a-better-investment-than-alternative-energy]

Renewable and alternative energies are the centerpiece of many governments’ energy policies. Germany has been a market leader in wind and solar. Generous feed-in tariffs effectively guarantee attractive returns for new alternative energy projects for 20 years. Despite relatively modest wind and solar resources, Germany is among the fastest-growing markets in the world for both technologies.¶ Although alternative energies hold some longer-term promise, blind and seemingly unwavering confidence in these solutions near-term benefits is misplaced.¶ By their very nature, wind and solar power are intermittent energy sources; when the wind isn’t blowing or the sun isn’t shining, natural gas-fired plants provide for much of the shadow capacity that keeps the electricity flowing. This pie graph breaks down Germany’s electricity mix from 1998 to 2008.¶ As you can see, thermal sources–primarily gas and coal–have lost share in Germany’s electricity grid over the past decade, though they still accounts for more than half of the nation’s net power generation. Natural gas consumption is up roughly 8 percent over this period, but coal use has flattened or declined.¶ Although Germany’s generous subsidies have increased its wind-power capacity significantly, this renewable energy accounts for just 6 percent of total generation. The country’s investments have produced a relatively small increase in electricity generated from wind power.¶ Wishful thinking aside, current wind- and solar-power technologies don’t offer a real alternative to fossil fuels.

#### Even if funding continues – lack of innovation kills renewables.

Stepp, Senior Policy Analyst @ Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, ‘12

[Matthew, “Boom and Bust: Renewable Energy's Future?”, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/boom-and-bust-renewable-energy.php>, DZ]

But even if much of this funding continues, the nascent clean tech industry is on a potential path of stagnation. In absence of long-term, significantly larger subsidies (which are politically unlikely), government support for clean energy R&D are central to developing and deploying competitive clean tech. In other words, clean tech growth nationwide (and globally) will be determined not by subsidies, but by innovation that can lead to technologies that are better and cheaper than fossil fuels.¶ Yet, our policy choices often don’t reflect this reality. According to ITIF’s Energy Innovation Tracker, the U.S. is investing roughly $6 billion in clean energy R&D in FY2012 – on average a third what leading experts think the U.S. should be investing. In fact, the bulk of the federal government’s historic investment in clean energy – nearly three quarters of the $150 billion – is going to the deployment of existing technologies that are not cost-competitive with fossil fuel sources of energy. While these deployment incentives expand domestic supply chains and are spurring incremental innovations, the policies are acting like blunt force tools propping up lower-risk technologies while playing little role in incenting innovation and technologies to put clean energy on a path to subsidy independence. By not orienting the significant federal investment in clean tech towards spurring innovation while grossly underfunding R&D, the U.S. is failing to jump start and accelerate the clean tech innovations needed to create a robust, long-term sustainable industry. Even if the expiring tax incentives are extended as is, the long-term stagnation of the industry will still occur due to a lack of innovation. If we want a global clean tech revolution driven by the marketplace, we need to bring the equivalent of “Moore’s law” (the prediction that computing power would double every 24 months while costs would fall by half) to clean energy. Nothing less will work.

#### No impact – newest data says we’re more likely to suffer from an ice age than global warming

Rose 1/29 (David, Daily Mail Online, “Forget global warming - it's Cycle 25 we need to worry about (and if NASA scientists are right the Thames will be freezing over again)”, 2012, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2093264/Forget-global-warming--Cycle-25-need-worry-NASA-scientists-right-Thames-freezing-again.html?ito=feeds-newsxml) Nisarg

The supposed ‘consensus’ on man-made global warming is facing an inconvenient challenge after the release of new temperature data showing the planet has not warmed for the past 15 years. The figures suggest that we could even be heading for a mini ice age to rival the 70-year temperature drop that saw frost fairs held on the Thames in the 17th Century. Based on readings from more than 30,000 measuring stations, the data was issued last week without fanfare by the Met Office and the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit. It confirms that the rising trend in world temperatures ended in 1997. Meanwhile, leading climate scientists yesterday told The Mail on Sunday that, after emitting unusually high levels of energy throughout the 20th Century, the sun is now heading towards a ‘grand minimum’ in its output, threatening cold summers, bitter winters and a shortening of the season available for growing food. Solar output goes through 11-year cycles, with high numbers of sunspots seen at their peak. We are now at what should be the peak of what scientists call ‘Cycle 24’ – which is why last week’s solar storm resulted in sightings of the aurora borealis further south than usual. But sunspot numbers are running at less than half those seen during cycle peaks in the 20th Century. Analysis by experts at NASA and the University of Arizona – derived from magnetic-field measurements 120,000 miles beneath the sun’s surface – suggest that Cycle 25, whose peak is due in 2022, will be a great deal weaker still. According to a paper issued last week by the Met Office, there is a 92 per cent chance that both Cycle 25 and those taking place in the following decades will be as weak as, or weaker than, the ‘Dalton minimum’ of 1790 to 1830. In this period, named after the meteorologist John Dalton, average temperatures in parts of Europe fell by 2C. However, it is also possible that the new solar energy slump could be as deep as the ‘Maunder minimum’ (after astronomer Edward Maunder), between 1645 and 1715 in the coldest part of the ‘Little Ice Age’ when, as well as the Thames frost fairs, the canals of Holland froze solid.

#### Nuclear power is key to solve for warming

#### a.) Top economist concedes, renewables can’t compete and other tech is not moving fast enough.

Harvey, Environment Correspondent, ‘12

[Fiona, “Nuclear power is only solution to climate change, says Jeffrey Sachs”, The Guardian, 5-3-12,

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/may/03/nuclear-power-solution-climate-change>, RSR]

Combating climate change will require an expansion of nuclear power, respected economist Jeffrey Sachs said on Thursday, in remarks that are likely to dismay some sections of the environmental movement. Prof Sachs said atomic energy was needed because it provided a low-carbon source of power, while renewable energy was not making up enough of the world's energy mix and new technologies such as carbon capture and storage were not progressing fast enough. "We won't meet the carbon targets if nuclear is taken off the table," he said. He said coal was likely to continue to be cheaper than renewables and other low-carbon forms of energy, unless the effects of the climate were taken into account.

#### b.) Reduces catastrophic emissions that result in 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.

## CP

#### Perm ban nuclear power in all instances but the affirmative. <Insert justification here>. Resolves the net benefit. <Insert reasoning here>

#### Doesn’t solve the aff:

#### a.) Advantage one. Even if we adopt the recommendations, we would still have the waste sitting around either on-site or in Yucca.

#### b.) Advantage two. Nuclear power necessary to solve for peak oil 1.) Reprocessing displaces oil from the energy market. That’s Szabo. 2.) Nuclear power key to the hydrogen economy which displaces oil from the transportation sector. That’s Choppin.

#### c.) Solvency. Federal incentives necessary to send a signal to the private industry to overcome de facto ban. That’s Selyukh.

#### Doesn’t solve:

#### Reprocessing key to the effectiveness of waste storage – reduces the heat output and volume.

Dennis, et al., ‘9

[Kate; Jason Rugolo; Lee Murray; and Justin Parrella, Graduate Students at Harvard, “The case for reprocessing”, Bulletin for Atomic Scientists, November/December 2009, RSR]

For long-term geologic storage, reductions in waste volume are important. But it is not just the space that the waste would physically take up that is vital, the heat output of the waste also must be taken into consideration, as does the space between waste packages necessary to prevent overheating in the repository. While it is true that high-level waste from reprocessing is hotter than non-reprocessed spent fuel, this does not completely nullify the decrease in waste volume achieved by reprocessing. The heat emitted from post-reprocessing waste decreases by approximately 70 percent during its first 30 years. In other words, such waste initially can be stored either aboveground in well-ventilated storage buildings (as Areva does), or it can be stored in geologic repositories with space between packages left empty and then filled over the years as heat output decreases. In contrast, spent fuel rods that are directly disposed in repositories cool more slowly and require larger geologic repositories. One estimate, which appears in the book Megawatts and Megatons by Richard Garwin and Georges Charpak, suggests that even with the increased heat output of high-level wastes from reprocessing, the amount of space required for a geologic repository can be reduced by one-half if the waste is reprocessed. Overall, Garwin and Charpak argue against reprocessing but acknowledge several benefits that we believe outweigh the economic burdens, the most important being that reprocessing can effectively double the capacity of a Yucca Mountain-sized permanent repository.

#### Reprocessing good:

#### a.) ****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

#### b.) Lack of federal reprocessing hurts relations with South Korea – cornerstone of relations.

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**."

## 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.”

#### Low probability of miscalculation or war – history proves.

Lowther, Defense Analyst at the Air Force Research Institute, ‘9

[Adam, Air Force Research Institute, August 2009, “Challenging Nuclear Abolition”,

<http://www.afa.org/EdOp/2010/Logic_of_Nuclear_Arsenal.pdf>, RSR]

With more than 60 years of nuclear weapons experience, there is also a low probability of political miscalculation. Neither the president of the United States nor his counterpart in Moscow has ever “miscalculated” and launched a nuclear weapon. Rather than expecting miscalculation, a better approach may be to assist other nuclear powers in developing the sound practices that have led to six decades of American and Russian restraint.

#### Relations resilient – security issues irrelevant to alliance.

Bader, John C. Whitehead Senior Fellow in International Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center, ‘12

[Jeffrey, “China and the United States: Nixon's Legacy after 40 Years,” Brookings, 2-23,

<http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0223_china_nixon_bader.aspx>, RSR]

The element in the relationship that is unrecognizable from the time of Nixon’s trip, of course, is the economic. The U.S. business community has been the anchor of U.S.-China relations for the last 30 years, as we have built up an annual trade relationship of over $500 billion, with huge U.S. investments in China and growing Chinese investment here. The business community, however, is now divided in the face of Chinese competition, some conducted in ways in conflict with Western norms. Pressure inside the United States for strong action against Chinese economic practices has been building. In the years ahead economic frictions may prove a greater challenge to a smooth relationship than the international security issues that have been the historic core of U.S.-China relations.