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## Case

### Solvency

#### They say no nuclear renaissance – Obama is already pushing nuclear power via new subsidies, meaning that it’s back on the agenda. That’s Worthington.

### No war – China won’t risk it all and no flashpoints.

Bremmer, President of the Eurasia Group, ‘10

[Ian, “Gathering Storm: America and China in 2020”, July/August 2010, World Affairs Journal,

http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/articles/2010-JulyAugust/full-Bremmer-JA-2010.html]

In addition, **Beijing has no incentive to mount a global military challenge to U.S. power.** China will one day possess a much more substantial military capacity than it has today, but **its economy has grown so quickly over the past two decades, and its living standards improved so dramatically, that it is difficult to imagine the kind of catastrophic, game-changing event that would push Beijing to risk it all** by posing the West a large-scale military challenge. **It has no incentive to allow anything less than the most serious threat to its sovereignty to trigger a military conflict that might sever its expanding network of commercial ties with countries all over the world—and with the U**nited **S**tates, **the E**uropean **U**nion, **and Japan, in particular. The more familiar flash points are especially unlikely to spark a hot war: Beijing is well aware that no U.S. government will support a Taiwanese bid for independence, and China need not invade an island that it has largely co-opted already, via an offer to much of Taiwan’s business elite of privileged access to investment opportunities on the mainland.**

#### Romney will win – prediction of trend between now and election day

Trende 9/20 (Sean, Senior Elections Analyst for RealClearPolitics, Part 2: Why Romney Wins, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/20/state\_of\_the\_race\_part\_2\_why\_romney\_wins\_115513-2.html)

But if we look at the data a different way, we realize that Obama has to pull off some unprecedented feats of his own if he hopes to win. The September time frame is a bit tricky for comparison purposes, because the incumbent party convention occurred in mid-August until 2004. So a challenger who trailed his opponent in September was doing so after the convention bounces had pretty much settled.¶ So let’s instead use data that Nate Silver has helpfully compiled identifying where candidates stood a given number of weeks before and after a convention, regardless of when that convention occurred. Table 1 shows the incumbent party’s lead in the polls two weeks after its convention -- roughly where we are today -- and the ultimate result. Years with incumbents are in boldface:¶ As you can see, no incumbent party has ever held on to the White House while leading by fewer than four points two weeks after its convention; no incumbent president has ever won re-election while leading by fewer than five points (more on the 2004 comparisons later). In other words, winning under these circumstances would be unprecedented (note also that Ronald Reagan was actually tied with Jimmy Carter in a simple poll average at this point in 1980).¶ Perhaps an even better way to look at this is Table 2:¶ This lists the races where incumbent presidents sought re-election since 1968. It then shows how those races broke between two weeks after the incumbent president’s convention and Election Day. On average, they moved 3.7 points toward the challenger (positive numbers indicate movement in that direction; negative numbers show movement toward the incumbent). If you eliminate 1976, as Cohn suggests (since Jerry Ford was a pseudo-incumbent), the average movement is six points toward the challenger.¶ Indeed with the exception of 1992 -- a difficult race from which to draw conclusions given Ross Perot’s on-again/off-again participation in the race -- every contest with an incumbent has broken at least three points toward the challenging party from this point in the race through Election Day.¶ And given the frequent comparisons to 2004, it’s worth bearing in mind where that race stood at this point. George Bush led by 6.8 points as opposed to Barack Obama’s current 2.9 percent. His bounce peaked at 50.4 percent, as opposed to Obama’s 49 percent. If Obama continues to run behind Bush on either metric by similar margins through Election Day, he loses.

#### **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.”

#### Saudis won’t flood the market—they’ll just invest in renewables

AL-SALEH et al 2008 (Yasser Al-Saleh, Paul Upham and Khaleel Malik, all from the Manchester Institute for Innovation Research, Renewable Energy Scenarios for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Oct http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wp125.pdf)

These scenarios envision a future in which global environmental concerns become significantly stronger and environmental actions become more coordinated. Greenhouse gas emissions are vigorously scrutinised with performance targets being completely agreed on and respected around the world. Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) has become a widely-adopted technology, and technological advancements in fuel cells and hydrogen storage are attributed to a strong market growth for hydrogen fuels in transport applications. As a result of environmental movements towards carbon-neutral and carbon-free technologies, the rate of climate change is slowed (yet not reversed). Given the availability of oil resources in Saudi Arabia, a ‘market flooding’ strategy that might drive oil prices down makes a lot of sense in a world where environmentally-friendly options are strongly favoured. Nevertheless, adopting such a hostile strategy, which Saudi Arabia has constantly avoided, would mean that maintaining good relations with other oil-producers could become an increasingly difficult challenge. For a country like Saudi Arabia that is blessed with very high levels of direct solar radiation, but is increasingly faced with an increased demand for electricity and water as well as a low revenue stream (owing to low oil prices), solar thermal seems to be an attractive choice worth considering.

#### High oil prices are bad for the economy – ten reasons.

Guardian 12 (“Oil prices: 10 reasons to be fearful,” March 2, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/economics-blog/2012/mar/02/oil-prices-10-reasons-to-be-fearful>) KJS

1. Higher petrol prices: Given the typical relationship between petrol prices on the forecourt and the price of crude oil, if the latter did move up to $150 a barrel, we could expect the price of petrol a litre to move up from around £1.34 to over £1.50 – a new record high by a significant margin. That is bad news for both inflation and consumer confidence. 2. Higher household energy bills: Gas and electricity prices typically take a steer from the price of oil. If oil rises sharply, it is more likely than not that household energy bills will rise at some point. Indeed, the price of gas traded in the wholesale market has risen by at least 10% over the period since oil has been surging. Timing is key. In continental Europe, particularly France, when oil prices move, household energy bills typically adjust very promptly. By contrast, in the UK, price hikes are unusual at the end of winter. This is because utility providers will get lots of bad press, but not much increase in profit margins as households switch off their central heating for summer. If, however, elevated oil prices persist until the autumn, then utility bill hikes at that point will become more likely. 3. Higher food prices: A fair proportion of the cost of food is distribution, fuel for farm vehicles and petro-chemicals. Furthermore, the emergence of bio-fuels means that higher oil prices has tended to exert upward pressure on agricultural commodity prices, since these can be used as a substitute for oil. Higher agricultural prices typically mean higher food prices in household shopping baskets. 4. Risk of persistently high inflation: All in all, we calculate that in a scenario where oil prices surge to $150 per barrel, CPI inflation in the UK would be at least 1% higher at the end of this year than we have assumed in our base case. That would mean inflation ends the year a little above 3% rather than the near 2% that we and most other forecasters assume. 5. The value of savings is eroded: If inflation out-paces interest rates, then it means the 'real' value of savings will fall. For example, with interest rates around 0.5% but inflation running at 4%, the real return on savings is falling. 6. High inflation makes it hard for the Bank of England to support economic growth through low interest rates: The Bank of England's target for CPI inflation is 2% year-on-year with a tolerance threshold of 1% either side of that. If inflation looks likely to persist above that level, then it is less likely that the Bank of England will support economic growth with further policy easing (i.e. quantitative easing) and might even have to raise interest rates more quickly than were it not for elevated oil prices. Having said that, the Bank does have some wiggle room. For example, inflation was close to 5% when the Bank engaged in the latest round of quantitative easing. 7. High street retailers suffer: Consumers don't have much choice about whether or not to pay for food or energy. They need to eat and they need to heat their homes. Hence increased expenditure on these as their prices rise leaves less spare cash to spend on 'fun stuff' i.e. discretionary goods such as TVs and clothing. 8. Inflation hurts economic growth: The causality between growth and inflation has run in reverse over the last year. High inflation has dampened growth. Conventional wisdom might have argued that weak growth would have led to slow inflation. The great hope for 2012 is that slowing inflation will help growth to resume an upward trajectory. More specifically, if inflation falls sharply it will reverse the squeeze on household spare cash, in turn helping to revive consumer spending. If oil rises to $150 a barrel we will probably still see a slowdown in inflation and a recovery in growth, though not quite as impressive as would have been the case with lower energy prices. 9. The government's austerity programme suffers: There are a number of channels through which higher oil prices will impact the public finances: a. The government will face a higher interest burden on the portion of the national debt that is linked to inflation; b. Slower economic growth will reduce tax receipts and could raise government outlays on unemployment benefits; c. The government may choose to increase winter fuel subsidies to the elderly against a backdrop of higher energy costs; and d. It is harder for the government to implement the planned increase in petrol duty given the risk of public backlash. 10. Fuel protests and disruptions: Public anger at the rising cost of fuel could provoke blockades and strikes. Panic buying and queues at petrol stations are not good for sentiment and overall business activity.

### Waste

#### Huge framing issue at the top – all of their meltdown D is to the PLANT itself not to the waste on site.

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

#### Our ev assumes the motivation for a terrorist threat. Even if they don’t want extinction, a small attack would lead to mass retal.

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

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

### Peak Oil

#### They say 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.

#### They say peak oil doesn’t cause resource wars – shortages in oil will cause countries to fight over the hotly contested commodity. That’s Howard.

## States

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

#### 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.

#### 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**."

#### South Korean nuclearization leads to East Asian prolif.

Chanlett-Avery and Squassoni 6 (Emma (Analyst in Asian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade) and Sharon (Specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division), “North Korea’s Nuclear Test: Motivations, Implications, and U.S. Options”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL33709.pdf)

Many regional experts fear that the nuclear test will stimulate an arms race in the region. Geopolitical instability could prompt Northeast Asian states with the ability to develop nuclear weapons relatively quickly to move forward, creating a cascading effect on other powers in the region. One scenario envisioned would start with a Japanese decision to develop a nuclear weapons program in the face of a clear and present danger from North Korea. South Korea, still wary of Tokyo’s intentions based on Japan’s imperial past, could follow suit and develop its own nuclear weapons program. If neighboring states appear to be developing nuclear weapons without drawing punishment from the international community, Taiwan may choose to do the same to counter the threat from mainland China. In turn, this could prompt China to increase its own arsenal, which could have impact on further development of programs in South Asia. Alternatively, South Korea could “go nuclear” first, stimulating a similar chain of reactions. Most nonproliferation experts believe that Japan, using existing but safeguarded stocks of plutonium, could quickly manufacture a nuclear arsenal. South Korea and Taiwan would take longer, although there is evidence of past experiments with plutonium processing for both countries.24

#### East Asian arms race will cause extinction.

Ogura and Oh 97 (Toshimaru and Ingyu, Professors of Economics, April, “Nuclear clouds over the Korean peninsula and Japan,” 1997Accessed July 10, 2008 via Lexis-Nexis (Monthly Review))

North Korea, South Korea, and Japan have achieved quasi- or virtual nuclear armament. Although these countries do not produce or possess actual bombs, they possess sufficient technological know-how to possess one or several nuclear arsenals. Thus, virtual armament creates a new nightmare in this region - nuclear annihilation. Given the concentration of economic affluence and military power in this region and its growing importance to the world system, any hot conflict among these countries would threaten to escalate into a global conflagration.

## DA

#### Romney will win – most accurate polls

Chambers 9/18 (Dean, Arlington Conservative, “Mitt Romney likely election win indicated by polls from key swing states”, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-likely-election-win-indicated-by-polls-released-today-from-key-swing)

Two national polls of the presidential race show Mitt Romney leading over President Obama while most of the others show the opposite. Most of the others and not those two polls are wrong because those polls are skewed by over-sampling Democrats. The Rasmussen Reports Daily Presidential Tracking Poll released today shows Romney with a 47 percent to 45 percent lead while the QstarNews Poll released yesterday shows Romney with a larger lead, 55 percent to 45 percent over the president. The UnSkewed Average of polls released today shows Romney with a 7.8 percent lead.¶ Romney's strength in the credible and accurate national polls also is reflected in the limited but available relatively non-skewed polling data in the key swing states. If Mitt Romney wins at least four of the states mentioned below, it will be impossible for Barack Obama to reach the needed 270 electoral votes, therefore Romney's election is quite likely. Below are some of the key swing states to have been recently polled. The map above shows these five states and their value in electoral voters in dark red.¶ Ohio (18 electoral votes): Election observers almost universally agree that both candidate need Ohio to get elected. Many are also believing a number heavily-skewed mainstream media polls showing Obama winning this state. A Rasmussen Reports survey of 500 likely voters released a few days ago for Ohio shows it nearly tied at Obama 47 percent, Romney 46 percent. A poll by Gravis Marketing earlier this month showed the race at Obama 47 percent, Romney 43 percent. Obama can't win this state with 47 percent, nor will be get many of the undecided voters in Ohio, who will break for Romney and allow him to carry this state as George W. Bush did in 2004 running against John Kerry.¶ Florida (29 electoral votes): Mitt Romney has lead in most of the credible polls in Florida for most of this year. A Gravis Marketing poll released today shows Romney leading 48 percent to 47 percent. The latest Rasmussen Reports poll of Florida released a few days ago shows Obama leading 48 percent to 46 percent for Romney. Wit most of the undecided voters going for Romney, there are few odds of this state not going for Romney in November.¶ Virginia (13 electoral votes): The last Rasmussen Reports poll of Virginia released a few days ago show race nearly tied with Obama at 49 percent and Romney at 48 percent. A Gravis Marketing poll released earlier this month shows a Romney 49 percent to 44 percent lead. As with Florida and Ohio, the undecided voters will clearly tip this state to Romney in November.¶ Colorado (9 electoral votes): The Rasmussen Reports poll of Colorado released today shows Romney leading 47 percent to Obama's 45 percent. A recent Denver Post/SurveyUSA poll released a few days ago shows Obama leading 47 percent to 46 percent over Romney. The state has welcomed Romney has a visitor several times and he will no doubt visit there several more times before election day, leading to winning the state.¶ Michigan (16 electoral votes): This state is a bit of a challenge for Mitt Romney, but given that it's somewhat of a home state for him that is suffering through the worst of the economic downturn more than most states, it should be one he can win. The Marketing Research Group poll released today shows Obama leading by just six percent, 47.5 percent to 42.3 percent over Mitt Romney. A recent poll by Democrat-leaning firm Baydoun/Foster shows Obama leading by only 46 percent to 44 percent. The Obama campaign has tried to hit Romney hard with his opposition to the bailouts of General Motors and Chrysler to score political points in Michigan, while just recently the administration rejected a proposal by General Motors to buy-back government-owned stock and remove the federal govenrment from their governance. Skillful use of that and related issues by Romney could allow him to neutralize any advantage Obama has in Michigan regarding the domestic auto industry. That could help Mitt Romney win Michigan if he plays this effectively.¶ Those five states are worth 85 electoral votes and could help either candidate on their road to the White House. The winner of a majority of them will probably win the election, and any candidate winning at least four of them is likely the next president. Mitt Romney seems likely today to win at least four if not all five of them. If Romney wins Michigan, it's game, set and match. Learn to say President Mitt Romney. If he can score an upset win in Pennsylvania, he'll be winning by a landslide.

#### Turn: Nevada – Romney wins now because of Nevada – Obama can’t turn out voters.

Parnes 9-12 (Amie, Obama, Romney locked in tight race in Nevada, The Hill, 12 September 2012, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/248893-obama-romney-tight-race-nevada, da 9-13-12)

“The stakes are high, the election is going to be close and the president will be fighting for every vote,” an Obama campaign aide said. Romney’s campaign says the economic arguments will win over state voters to his side, providing a gateway to 270 electoral votes. The governor must win a majority of the eight or nine battleground states being contested by the two campaigns and cannot afford to give up Nevada’s votes. Romney campaign aides — who expect to have about a dozen field offices set up before Election Day — predict Obama’s team will have a problem turning out voters. “No state has borne the brunt of the president’s policies like Nevada,” said Mason Harrison, the Romney campaign’s Nevada communications director. “Despite the fact that President Obama has spent the entire summer trying to distract from his failed economic record, he hasn’t been able to convince Nevadans that they are better off than they were almost four years ago.” Obama won the state by 12 points in 2008, but even some Democrats express worry that they wouldn’t have the same outcome this time around given the economy. “The situation definitely isn’t as good as it was in 2008,” the Democratic strategist said. “There’s still big economic uncertainty there, and there are still big problems with housing. People are just taking more sober assessments of this race than they were in 2008.

#### Plan flips Nevada – provides a specific solution to Yucca.

Sanchez, Roll Call Staffer, 8-9 (Humberto, Mitt Romney Tries to Neutralize Yucca Mountain Issue in Quest for Nevada, Roll Call, 9 August 2012, http://www.rollcall.com/news/Mitt-Romney-Tries-to-Neutralize-Yucca-Mountain-Issue-in-Quest-for-Nevada-216786-1.html, da 9-16-12)

Damore thinks Romney’s stance on Yucca is emblematic of his cautious political strategy where he seems to be unwilling to take definitive positions on specific issues for fear of alienating voters. Damore added that Sharron Angle, who ran against Reid in 2010, used the same strategy and came up short in a state where voters are yearning for specific solutions. Nevada has the highest unemployment rate and is first in home foreclosures. “He’s falling into the trap that Sharron Angle fell into,” Damore said. “Everybody knows what the problems are; you don’t have to point out the problems. It’s what are your solutions, and he hasn’t articulated anything.”

#### 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 9/18 (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.”

#### No difference between Obama and Romney for Russia relations

Shevtsova and Kramer 9/11 (Lilia Shevtsova, an AI editorial board member, is senior fellow at the Carnegie Moscow Center. David J. Kramer, a former Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, is president of Freedom House in Washington, DC., Obama vs. Romney: Who Would Putin Pick?, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=1312)

Still, Kremlin pragmatists might assume that Romney, notwithstanding his tough rhetoric as a candidate, would be more moderate as a President and want to avoid the risk of confrontation with Russia. Thus the Kremlin might conclude that its new assertiveness will not provoke American retaliation under either President, enabling it to maintain bilateral ties while also cracking down at home without paying any price.¶ This leads us to conclude the Kremlin could be happy with either a second Obama term or a first Romney one: with Obama looking the other way while the Kremlin cracks down at home, or with Romney giving the Kremlin pretexts to hold up the U.S. as a threat. In both cases, the Kremlin believes that America needs Russia more than Russia needs America. As one of the leading Kremlin foreign policy experts and the Duma official Alexei Pushkov said, “ . . . after admission to WTO, this country [Russia] does not need the support of the White House very much while Americans need Moscow's support on Iran, Afghanistan, North Korea and on nuclear nonproliferation." ¶ At the end of the day, regardless of who wins the election, U.S.-Russian relations will be much cooler and figure less prominently in U.S. foreign policy calculations. Russian expert Fyodor Lukyanov offered this insight:¶ Reset-2 with the same content is impossible. Not because we have Putin and not Medvedev in the Kremlin. The moment when the interests of two sides coincided has passed. . . . Contrary to anticipations, the second Obama presidency could become a serious test for both—Russia and America.

#### 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.

## Remove FF Subsidies CP

#### Perm do both.

#### Links to elections. Fossil fuel subsidies popular - lobbyists

Karpinski, President of the League of Conservation Voters, and Kretzmann, Executive Director of Oil Change International, 11 (Gene and Steve, End subsidies to fossil fuel companies, The Hill Blog, 20 October 2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/188787-end-subsidies-to-fossil-fuel-companies, da 8-16-12)

Unfortunately what is popular with the public is not always so popular in Washington. The fossil fuel industry employs a virtual army of lobbyists -- in 2011 the oil and gas industry has already spent more than $75 million lobbying on federal policies. This lobbying is backed up by tens of millions in campaign cash to make sure that Members of Congress put the interests of the fossil fuel industry ahead of the American people. This past June the Senate failed to end handouts to the five biggest oil companies. Not surprisingly, those Senators voting against the repeal took five times more in campaign contributions from the oil industry than those who voted to end these handouts.

#### Can’t solve the aff.

#### Tax incentives are the only way to make it economically feasible for adoption. Leads to reductions of 13 million dollar per kilowatt hour. That’s Lagus.

#### 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.

#### Government investment necessary - provides appropriate risk mitigation and shortens the timeframe for completion. That’s IAEA.

#### 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.

#### Government investment in reprocessing is necessary to get private/consumer capital on board.

IAEA, ‘8

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

The design, construction and commissioning of a reprocessing plant is a financial venture requiring customers’ backing because of the associated high capital costs and long commissioning period. The commercial reprocessing plants operating today in Europe (such as UP2/UP3 and THORP) were underpinned by cost-plus contracts and provision of capital for their construction, which stemmed from legal and political imperatives to reprocess. As those plants have operated for many years, they have benefited from technological developments while much of the investment has now been amortized. As a consequence, costs have decreased substantially for the large commercial plants. In contrast, private investments in new reprocessing plants are only likely if and when there is a strong incentive for doing so, such as increasing nuclear fuel costs, disposal costs, or both, and also national government guarantees on financial returns [65].

## K

#### Our interpretation is that debate should be a question of the aff plan versus a competitive policy option or the status quo.

#### This is key to ground and predictablity – infinite number of possible kritik alternatives or things the negative could reject explodes the research burden. That’s a voting issue.

#### Focusing on statism and security is key to real world change.

Buzan 4 (Barry , December, Montague Burton Prof. of International Relations @ the London School of Economics and honorary prof. @ the University of Copenhagen, "Realism vs. Cosmopolitanism" <http://www.polity.co.uk/global/realism-vs-cosmopolitanism.asp>

**A.Mc.:** But would not a realist response be that the very issues David seeks to highlight are largely marginal to the central dilemmas of world politics: the critical issues of war and peace, life and death. **B.B.:** Again, that is a difficult question for realism because in traditional realism there was a rather clear distinction between 'high' and 'low' politics, high politics being about diplomacy and war, and low politics being about economics and society and many issues like the weather and disease. And because of the change in the importance of the different sectors that I mentioned earlier, this becomes problematic for realism. But the realists have been fairly agile. The realist line of defence would be that in most areas of world politics - again the emphasis on politics - states are still the principle authorities. And there is nothing that stops them from co-operating with each other. Thus, realists, or at least a good proportion of realists, can live quite comfortably with the idea of international regimes in which states, as the basic holders of political authority in the system, get together sometimes with other actors, sometimes just with other states, to discuss issues of joint concern, and sometimes they can hammer out of a set of policies, a set of rules of the game, which enable them to co-ordinate their behaviour. Now, this certainly does not feel like traditional power politics realism. You can think of it to some extent in terms of power politics by looking at issue power; who are the big players in relation to any big issue? Who are the people who have any kind of control? Who loses out?, etc.. There is, therefore, an element of power politics in this whole notion of regimes, and it does retain a strong element of state centrism. I think the realist would say: if you discount the state, where is politics? Where is it located? You cannot eliminate politics, as some liberals sometimes seem to do. To wish the state away, to wish politics away, is not going to generate results. The good dyed-in-the-wool realist would argue that power politics is a permanent condition of human existence. It will come in one form or another, in one domain or another, in relation to one issue or another, but it will always be there. It will be politics and it will be about relative power. And at the moment the state is still an important player in the game.

#### Perm solves – evaluating high-impact, low-probability events key to prevent catastrophe.

Blyth and Taleb, ‘11

[Mark (Professor of International Political Economy at Brown University) and Nassim (Distinguished Professor of Risk Engineering at New York University’s Polytechnic Institute), “The Black Swan of Cairo, Foreign Affairs, May/June 2011, 90(3), mss]

Why is surprise the permanent condition of the U.S. political and economic elite? In 2007-8, when the global financial system imploded, the cry that no one could have seen this coming was heard everywhere, despite the existence of numerous analyses showing that a crisis was unavoidable. It is no surprise that one hears precisely the same response today regarding the current turmoil in the Middle East. The critical issue in both cases is the artificial suppression of volatility--the ups and downs of life--in the name of stability. **It is** both **misguided and dangerous to push unobserved risks further into the statistical tails of the probability distribution of outcomes and allow these high-impact, low-probability "tail risks" to disappear from policymakers' fields of observation**. What the world is witnessing in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya is simply what happens when highly constrained systems explode. Complex systems that have artificially suppressed volatility tend to become extremely fragile, while at the same time exhibiting no visible risks. In fact, they tend to be too calm and exhibit minimal variability as silent risks accumulate beneath the surface. Although the stated intention of political leaders and economic policymakers is to stabilize the system by inhibiting fluctuations, the result tends to be the opposite. These artificially constrained systems become prone to "Black Swans"--that is, they become extremely vulnerable to large-scale events that lie far from the statistical norm and were largely unpredictable to a given set of observers. **Such environments eventually experience massive blowups**, catching everyone off-guard and undoing years of stability or, in some cases, ending up far worse than they were in their initial volatile state. Indeed, the longer it takes for the blowup to occur, the worse the resulting harm in both economic and political systems. Seeking to restrict variability seems to be good policy (who does not prefer stability to chaos?), so it is with very good intentions that policymakers unwittingly increase the risk of major blowups. And it is the same misperception of the properties of natural systems that led to both the economic crisis of 2007-8 and the current turmoil in the Arab world. The policy implications are identical: **to make systems robust, all risks must be visible and out in the open**--fluctuat nec mergitur (it fluctuates but does not sink) goes the Latin saying.

#### Case outweighs: by failing to solve the impending waste crisis, they allow waste on-site and Yucca Mountain to eventually blow up, leading to extinction. Rejecting scenario-planning won’t resolve problems on-site or at Yucca.

#### Complexity theory has zero validity as a means of interpreting real world events. Lack of empirical observations means complexity cannot interpret our social reality or improve policy making.

Rosenhead, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Management at the London School of Economics, ‘98

[Jonathan, “Complexity theory and management practice”, Science as Culture

<http://human-nature.com/science-as-culture/rosenhead.html>, RSR]

It hardly needs saying that there is no formally validated evidence demonstrating that the complexity theory-based prescriptions for management style, structure and process do produce the results claimed for them. These results are generally to do with long-term survival, a phenomenon not susceptible to study using short-term experimental methods. Such evidence as is adduced is almost exclusively anecdotal in character. The stories range from improving tales of successful corporate improvisation, to longer accounts of organisational death wishes or of innovation which bypasses the obstruction of the formal hierarchy; there are also approving quotations from business leaders. The problem with anecdotal evidence is that it is most persuasive to those who experienced the events in question, and to those who are already persuaded. For others it can be hard to judge the representativeness of the sample of exhibits. This is especially so if, even unintentionally, different standards of proof or disproof are used for different sides of an argument. Such distortions do occur in Stacey (1992). Thus the advantage of opportunistic policies is supported by presenting examples of success, while the perils of formal planning methods are driven home by examples of failure. Yet obviously opportunism has its failures, and analytic techniques even have their modest achievements – which are not cited. In the absence of a conclusive case based on evidence of organisational success, it is not surprising that great weight is placed on the authority of science. Wheatley (1992) has it in her title – "Leadership and the New Science". Merry (1995) relegates it to his sub-title, but in the plural: "Insights from the New Sciences of Chaos, Self-Organization and Complexity". Indeed ‘New Sciences’, always capitalised, runs through his book like the message in Blackpool rock. However all management complexity authors lean heavily on ‘science’ in their texts. These are liberally peppered with phrases like "Scientific discoveries have shown that…" or "The science of complexity shows that…". The illustrative examples provided are commonly of natural rather than social or managerial phenomena – the behaviour of molecules when the temperature of liquid rises, a laser beam, the weather… This invocation of (natural) science comes out clearly in a passage on page 11 of Stacey (1996). A list of Nobel and other eminent scientists who have developed "the science of complexity" is presented. So far this science has "focused primarily on the evolution of life and the behavior of chemical and physical systems". However "it is not only to natural systems that this science applies; as I will show in Chapter One, we too constitute such systems". These systems which "we" also constitute are complex adaptive systems – precisely those to which the findings of the "new science" apply. Or do they? If we are to accept the argument from scientific authority there are a number of links in the argument. First we have to accept that the "findings" do actually apply to the natural systems which natural scientists have investigated. Then we have to accept that these findings can be generalised to all such systems. Then we have to accept that organisations (let us leave individual humans out of it) do constitute systems of the same kind. And then we have to accept that findings can be transferred across from one domain to a quite different one. This could be a long haul! We should start with the least problematic element – the solidity of those natural science results in their own domains. There are indeed a considerable number of findings which have passed stringent tests of scientific validity. (We should ignore any ultra-Popperian objections that all scientific results can only be provisional, a spur to refutation – or we will have no solid ground to stand on.) Stewart (1989) provides a good source of such examples – the weather (of course), ecological cycles, fluid dynamics, chemical clocks… Experiments are only possible in some cases, but in all observations of real world events fit patterns consistent with aspects of complexity theory. What follows from this is that complexity theory is a field within which some surprising and diverse results have been found, leading on to some further intriguing conjectures. What does not follow is that any such result necessarily applies to all situations which share some of its structural features (for example, mathematical structure). Many of the ‘results’ cited in the complexity literature are not, however, firmly grounded in this way on empirical observations. They are the outputs of computer simulations. Typically some simple laws of behaviour and interaction are postulated, and the computer is used to see how the operations of these laws would translate into long-term development or macro-behaviour. For example Kauffman (1993, 1995) models how an organism might evolve through an ‘adaptive walk’ of mutations across available alternatives, depending on the degree of cross-coupling of the organism’s component parts. Krugman (1996) shows how aggregate patterns of land use (eg the formation of multiple business districts, racial segregation) could result from individual responses to purely local conditions. Stacey (1996) reports a wide variety of simulations, mostly produced under the auspices of the Santa Fe Institute, in which simple rules of individual behaviour generate replications of the flocking of birds, the trail-laying of ants, the dynamics of organism-parasite systems…In each case the computer tracks the way in which such simple laws, if they were to hold, could produce patterned order. Evidently such demonstrations, absorbing though they may be, cannot constitute proofs that these laws are indeed the cause of the observed behaviour. Indeed Kauffman (1993) in the introduction to his 700 page volume, stresses that "this is not a finished book …Premises and conclusions stand open to criticism." Krugman (1996) adopts an informal approach, and allows himself to include "a few wild speculations". That is well and good – but it would be as well if the ‘not proven’ dimension of complexity theory was prominently acknowledged in this way by all those involved in extrapolating its results into new territory. Mittleton-Kelly (1997) recognises a further need for circumspection which arises in essaying to transfer complexity theory formulations from the natural to the social domain. Behaviour in the former may be assumed to be governed by laws; in the latter, awareness of a claimed law may itself generate changed behaviour. In this crucial respect, social systems (including organisations and their managements) are fundamentally different from all other complex systems. It can be seen from this that scientific authority is an unsafe ground for asserting that specific results from complexity theory necessarily apply to organisations, or that complexity-based lessons constitute imperatives for management practice. Krugman (1996), on the concluding page of his exploration of the relevance of complexity theory for economics, states "at this point I have no recommendations to offer." By contrast in the management complexity literature there is a tendency to make just such unwarranted statements – both generalisations and prescriptions. Both tendencies can be amply illustrated from a single work – Stacey (1992).

#### Floating PIKs are bad: moot 9 minutes of 1AC offense and focus us to argue against ourself. Voter for fairness and education.

#### Vague alts are bad: we can’t pin them down on what they’re doing and it allows them to be shifty in the block. Voter for fairness.

#### Turn: Our scenario-evaluations are crucial for ethically responsible politics. Theoretical kritik is insufficient—we need realistic as if stories to generate changes in practice.

Williams, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales at Aberystwyth, ‘5

[Michael, The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations, p. 165-167]

Moreover, the links between sceptical realism and prevalent post-modern themes go more deeply than this, particularly as they apply to attempts by post-structural thinking to reopen questions of responsibility and ethics.80 In part, the goals of post-structural approaches can be usefully charactised, to borrow Stephen White’s illuminating contrast, as expressions of ‘responsibility to otherness’ which question and challenge modernist equations of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’. A responsibility to otherness seeks to reveal and open the constitutive processes and claims of subjects and subjectivities that a foundational modernism has effaced in its narrow identification of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’.81 Deconstruction can from this perspective be seen as a principled stance unwilling to succeumb to modernist essentialism which in the name of responsibility assumes and reifies subjects and structures, obscures forms of power and violence which are constitutive of them, and at the same time forecloses a consideration of alternative possibilities and practices. Yet it is my claim that the willful Realist tradition does not lack understanding of the contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary, its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a wilfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act – the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by – at least initially – reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of *limitation*: a wilful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited – both epistemically and politically – in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterized as one of *modus vivendi*.82 If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a nonor apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann’s incisive questions concerning postmodern constructions of identity, action, and responsibility.83 As Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities are inescapably *indebted* to otherness, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are ‘sedimented’ and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice and not just in philosophic practice the essentialist dynamics it confronts.84 Here, a responsibility to act must go beyond deconstruction to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices. To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward ‘blackmail of the Englightenment and a narrow ‘modernist’ vision of responsibility.85 While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might viably be mobilized in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities. It requires, as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling ‘as if’ stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, I submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such ‘stories’ within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success, and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations toward responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dicohotomies.

#### Rational planning is better than any alternative because it uses external evidence as a check on dishonest and violent ideology. Instead we should seek to improve planning through new voices and perspectives.

Lynn, Sid Richardson Research Professor in the LBJ School of Public Affairs at UT Austin, ‘99

[Laurence, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, ““A Place at the Table: Policy Analysis, Its Postpositive Critics, and the Future of Practice”, 18:3, GZ]

Policy analysis, says Torgerson, is "haunted" by its original "dream" which, as he tells it, bearing "the unmistakable imprint of the positivist heritage," is of the abolition of politics (p. 34, emphasis added). "Professional policy analysis," he says, "is not really of this world-this all-too-human world of conflict, confusion, and doubt.... [T]he analyst . . . becomes one who performs remote operations on an essentially alien object" (p. 35). Because the goals of policy are matters of value, not facts and logic, goals cannot be included within the scope of what the policy analyst knows about. As a result, conventional policy analysis is "blinded to political reality" (p. 37). The policy analysts' "dream," he says, must be seen for the nightmare that it is: Huxley's Brave New World, Orwell's 1984. Writing in 1986, Torgerson was optimistic that the "spell of positivism" might be broken by the postpositive turn in social science. The policy analyst is succumbing to the temptation to join society and develop the "participatory potential" of policy analysis. Intellectual sustenance for this movement was being provided by Majone's thinking on policy analysis, which helps shatter "the technocratic expectation of precise and certain solutions" (p. 44). New fields such as impact assessment, says Torgerson, invite broader evaluation of technocratic solutions. Postpositive policy analysts will come to have "an acute awareness of their own frailty and fallibility" and will "make their humanity apparent" (p. 51).

#### Our scenario planning is an essential part of the creative process that is called for by complexity and is essential to communication and mobilizing collective action while disrupting deterministic thinking.

McDaniel, et. al, ‘3

[Reuben (Charles and Elizabeth Prothro Regents Chair in Health Care Management, McCombs School of Business, The University of Texas at Austin); Michelle Jordan (Elementary School Teacher, Blanton Elementary School, Austin Independent School District, Austin, Texas); and Brigitte Fleeman (Research Associate, Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin), “Surprise, Surprise, Surprise! A Complexity Science View of the Unexpected” Health Care Management Review, July/Sept 2003, RSR]

Scenario planning often is used to whittle down possible futures to the most likely, to try and conceive of and develop scenarios that actually could happen.65,66 The assumption is that "everyone working in health care must be able to predict the future in order to prepare for it."67(p.43) Thinking about the future is important in CAS but thinking should not be based on confidence that you can predict the future and, therefore, be ready for it. Scenario planning should be about learning how to think in the face of unexpected events-not about learning what to expect. The success of scenario planning is not a function of how well you have predicted possible futures, but of how well you practice dealing with the unexpected. Scenario planning hones the skills of adapting to surprises and the unexpected. We don't know what is going to happen in the future, but still we must act. Scenario planning can help facilitate collective mobilization 68 by enhancing communication through common vocabulary, sharing views, and a wide appreciation of the significant influence of events outside the manager's control.67 Scenario planning can force managers to confront uncertainty § Marked 07:20 § by giving them several different future outlooks,69 helping them visualize a broader world of possibilities, and sparking creative, "what-if" thinking.66 Flexible strategic responses need to be developed. In appropriately done scenario planning, "unspoken assumptions about the future are surfaced, mental models are challenged, and more often than not, the blinders to creativity and resourcefulness are lifted."66(p.71)