### UQ

#### **Gaining in polls**

Silver 10/5 (fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/20x12/10/05/oct-5-day-after-debate-strong-swing-state-polls-for-romney/)

On Friday, Mitt Romney had his best day in state-level polling since at least the party conventions, something that very probably reflects improvement in his standing following the presidential debate in Denver on Wednesday.¶ Two automated polling firms, Rasmussen Reports and We Ask America, released polls in Ohio, Florida and Virginia on Friday. All of these polls were conducted on Thursday, the day after the Denver debate.¶ In the Rasmussen Reports polls, Mr. Romney trailed Barack Obama by 1 point in Ohio. But he led him by 1 point in Virginia and by 2 points in Florida.¶ These are very good numbers for Mr. Romney as compared with the ones we were seeing recently, although part of that is because Rasmussen has shown more favorable numbers for him in these states throughout the year. As compared with Rasmussen Reports’ previous polls of the same states, the margin in Ohio held steady, but Mr. Romney gained 2 points in Virginia and 4 in Florida, for an average gain of 2 points among the three states.¶ The We Ask America polls suggested that Mr. Romney made much larger gains. He led in all three states in its polls — and gained an average of 7 points from We Ask America’s prior polling of the same states.¶ Mr. Romney’s bounce has been less apparent in national tracking polls so far. The Rasmussen Reports national tracking poll held steady, showing a 2-point lead for Mr. Obama. Mr. Obama actually gained 1 point in the Gallup national tracking poll, however, and about 1.5 percentage points in the online tracking poll conducted by the RAND Corporation.¶ Another online tracking poll, from Ipsos, suggested a strong trend for Mr. Romney, however.¶ The Ipsos polls are confusing because it has released polls covering various time intervals in the past few days, but they tell a potentially interesting story if you work through them carefully.¶ In a poll of about 500 voters that Ipsos conducted immediately after the debate, late Wednesday night and early Thursday morning, Mr. Obama still led by 5 points. However, Mr. Obama’s lead was just 2 points in a poll Ipsos released Friday, which included interviews from Monday night (before the debate) through Friday morning.¶ The inference I make from these Ipsos polls is that Mr. Romney must have polled very well in the most recent interviews it conducted, late Thursday and early Friday morning, quite possibly leading Mr. Obama, in order to have made up so much ground.¶ It may have been that Mr. Obama’s problems were growing worse throughout the day on Thursday as criticism of his debate performance was amplified. That would also help to explain Mr. Romney’s very strong performance in the We Ask America polls on Thursday.

#### Even tiny shifts matter – our link is low threshold and linear

Silver 12 (Nate, 5/15, chief pollster for New York Times’ 538 election polling center. Regarded as top-level pollster based on distinct mathematical [models http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/)](modelshttp://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/a-30000-foot-view-on-the-presidential-race/%29)

The last thing to remember is that when an election is quite close, it does not take very much to shift the race from one candidate being a 60/40 favorite to it being about even.¶ At the betting market Intrade, Mr. Obama’s odds of re-election have consistently been around 60 percent. While, on the one hand, it is good not to overreact to new data at this early stage of the race, it is also worth remembering that even a one-point shift in a president’s approval ratings, or a modest change in the economic forecasts, can move a president’s re-election odds at the margin.

#### **Silver’s model is too conservative for now – doesn’t take into account debates**

Silver 10/5 (http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/oct-5-day-after-debate-strong-swing-state-polls-for-romney/)

My subjective view is that, despite the somewhat mixed messages that the polls gave about the magnitude of Mr. Romney’s bounce, this is still too conservative. The forecast model is pretty “smart” about distinguishing random movements in the polls from real ones, and so can be fairly conservative in interpreting the data. However, it does not have the advantage of knowing that the shifts may have come for a good reason — in this case, Mr. Romney’s strong performance in the debate.¶ So I would bet on Mr. Romney right now given the odds the model offers — but I’d have done so more confidently before the morning’s jobs report.¶ It’s going to take a few more days for the forecast model to catch up to the news, and I don’t think there’s any alternative but to keep an open mind about the polls for right now.

### Links

#### Nuclear power sparks mass public backlash.

CSI 12. [Civil Society Institute, “SURVEY: AMERICANS NOT WARMING UP TO NUCLEAR POWER ONE YEAR AFTER FUKUSHIMA” March 7 -- http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm]

One year after the disaster at the Fukushima nuclear reactors in Japan, Americans continue to want to keep the brakes on more nuclear power in the United States, according to a major new ORC International survey conducted for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI).¶ To gauge any shift in public attitudes, the new survey was benchmarked to an earlier poll carried out by ORC International in March 2011 for CSI. Conducted February 23-26 2012, the new survey of 1,032 Americans shows that:¶ • Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. This contrasts sharply with pre-Fukushima surveys by Gallup and other organizations showing a 60 percent support level for nuclear power.¶ • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) say they are now more supportive than they were a year ago "to using clean renewable energy resources - such as wind and solar - and increased energy efficiency as an alternative to more nuclear power in the United States." This finding edged up from the 2011 survey level of 76 percent.¶ • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) would support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors" in favor of wind and solar power. This level of support was up from the 74 percent finding in the 2011 survey.¶ • In response to a new question in the 2012 survey, more than six in 10 Americans (61 percent) said they were less supportive of nuclear power as a result of reports in the U.S. during 2011 and so far in 2012 of nuclear reactors that had to be shut down due such factors as natural disasters, equipment failure and radioactive leaks.¶ • About two thirds (65 percent) of Americans now say they would oppose "the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of [their] home." This figure was roughly the same as the 67 percent opposition level in the March 2011 survey.¶ Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "It is clear that Fukushima left an indelible impression on the thinking of Americans about nuclear power. The U.S. public clearly favors a conservative approach to energy that insists on it being safe in all senses of the word - including the risk to local communities and citizens. These poll findings support the need for a renewed national debate about the energy choices that America makes."¶ Peter Bradford, former member of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, former chair of the New York and Maine utility regulatory commissions, and currently adjunct professor at Vermont Law School on "Nuclear Power and Public Policy, said: "This survey is another piece of bad news for new nuclear construction in the U.S. For an industry completely dependent on political support in order to gain access to the taxpayers' wallets (through loan guarantees and other federal subsidies) and the consumers' wallets (through rate guarantees to cover even canceled plants and cost overruns), public skepticism of this magnitude is a near fatal flaw. The nuclear industry has spent millions on polls telling the public how much the public longs for nuclear power. Such polls never ask real world questions linking new reactors to rate increases or to accident risk. Fukushima has made the links to risk much clearer in the public mind. This poll makes the consequences of that linkage clear."¶ Pollster Graham Hueber, senior researcher, ORC International, said: "I would summarize these findings as follows: We see here a lasting chill in how the public perceives nuclear power. The passage of one year since the Fukushima nuclear reactor crisis in Japan has neither dimmed concerns in the U.S. about nuclear power nor has it made Americans more inclined to support an expanded federal focus on promoting more nuclear reactors in the U.S."¶ Robert Alvarez, senior scholar, Institute for Policy Studies, where he is currently focused on nuclear disarmament and environmental and energy policies, and former senior policy advisor, U.S. Secretary of Energy, where he coordinated the effort to enact nuclear worker compensation legislation, said: "Nuclear power remains expensive, dangerous, and too radioactive for Wall Street. This survey shows why the industry has no future unless the U.S. government props it up and forces the public to bear the risks."

#### People believe nuclear contributes to warming

Fukae 10 (Chiyokazu Fukae Institute of Social Research Institute of Nuclear Safety System, Incorporated, May 17-21 “MISUNDERSTANDING REGARDING TO GLOBAL WARMING AND NUCLEAR POWER” Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Nuclear Engineering. http://asmedl.org/getabs/servlet/GetabsServlet?prog=normal&id=ASMECP002010049309000403000001&idtype=cvips&gifs=yes&ref=no)

It is surmised that many people have confusion with global warming and other global environmental issues such as ozone layer depletion, resulting in misunderstanding. The idea that nuclear power generation causes global warming was strongly influenced by incorrect perceptions such as: heat of thermal discharge or radioactive materials accelerates global warming. These misunderstanding have an influence that reduces the perception of the effectiveness of nuclear power in preventing global warming. It has become evident that behind such misunderstanding is a negative image of nuclear power. When asked about the relations between nuclear power and global warming, some people without a specific ground view nuclear power as evil due to misunderstanding and fear that nuclear power emits radioactive materials constantly or in the event of an accident and fail to understand that nuclear power is beneficial in terms of global warming. In other words, the intuitive impression brought about by the negative image of nuclear power led to their evaluation of nuclear power regarding global warming. The tendency is strong in young people. It is important to ensure that objective information on energy and environmental issues is given at school, including the merits and demerits of nuclear power so that young people become able to properly consider and select future energy sources.

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power – viewed as too risky

Ramana 11 (Princeton University Program on Science and Global Security Physicist, 11, M.V. August 3, “Nuclear power and the public,” <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/nuclear-power-and-the-public>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

Japan is by no means alone. Around the world, nuclear energy has declined in popularity. In the United States, for example, a Washington Post-ABC poll conducted in April 2011 found that 64 percent of Americans opposed the construction of new reactors. Another poll, conducted by CBS News in March 2011, soon after the Fukushima crisis began, found that only 43 percent of those polled would approve of building new reactors, down from a 57 percent approval rating in 2008. Support for nuclear power was similar or lower in countries as varied as Chile (12 percent), Thailand (16.6 percent), Australia (34 percent), and the United Kingdom (35 percent). Even in France, which relies on nuclear power for about three-quarters of its electricity, one poll found that a majority (57 percent) were in favor of abandoning nuclear energy. These approval ratings are not strictly comparable because the polls were conducted by different agencies, asking different questions and providing different kinds of information prior to asking the questions. Nevertheless, there is little doubt among those who study public opinion on nuclear power that, by and large, it does not command much support. Nuclear power wasn't always so unpopular. For example, in the United States in 1977, when CBS News conducted its first poll on nuclear power, 69 percent of those surveyed expressed support for building more nuclear plants. Just two years later, after the Three Mile Island accident, public support had plummeted to 46 percent, and it dropped further to 34 percent after the 1986 Chernobyl accident. Since the 1980s, a majority of the US population has consistently opposed the construction of new nuclear reactors. Not coincidentally, there has been practically no nuclear construction in the United States since Three Mile Island. The public perceives nuclear power as a very risky technology. In some cases, association with nuclear facilities is even subject to stigma. The nuclear industry has tried a variety of strategies to break down public resistance to nuclear power, but they haven't worked well. With growing public concern about global warming, the industry is experimenting with a new strategy -- playing up the climate mitigation potential of nuclear power. While this has increased the benefit side of the equation for nuclear power, it hasn't decreased the risk perception associated with the technology, and nuclear power remains a reluctant choice at best. Renewable energy technologies offer the same benefits, making it unlikely that a large-scale "nuclear renaissance" will materialize.

#### Opposition is staunch and bipartisan – would flip multiple votes to Romney

ABC News 11(April20, “Nuclear Power: Po Nuclear Power: Opposition Spikes After Japan Earthquake,” <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nuclear-power-opposition-grows-japan-earthquake-abc-news/story?id=13412262#.UAnUlWHZATY>, d/a 7-20-12, ads)

Americans by a 2-1 margin oppose building more [nuclear power plants in the United States](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/japan-nuclear-emergency-sparks-worries-united-states/story?id=13133047" \t "external), an 11-point spike in opposition from a few years ago. In the aftermath of Japan's nuclear plant crisis, 64 percent in this ABC News/Washington Post poll oppose new nuclear plant construction, while 33 percent support it. "Strong" opposition now far outstrips strong support, 47-20 percent. Opposition is up from 53 percent in a 2008 poll, and strong opposition is up even more, by 24 points. The results reflect the significant [challenges facing the nuclear power industry](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/us-nuclear-power-plants-safe/story?id=13256973" \t "external), which had been reaching for greater acceptance on the basis of factors including high oil prices, environmental concerns prompted by the Gulf oil spill a year ago and efforts to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Opposition is not merely a not-in-my-back-yard phenomenon. The[survey](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/nuclear-power-opposition-grows-japan-earthquake-abc-news/story?id=13412262), conducted for ABC News by [Langer Research Associates](http://www.langerresearch.com/), finds that 67 percent of Americans oppose construction of a nuclear plant within 50 miles of their home -- not significantly different than the number who oppose it regardless of location. Resistance is bipartisan, with majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents alike opposed to new nuclear plant construction. Still, there are differences among groups; opposition is higher among Democrats (75 percent, vs. 59 percent of Republicans and independents combined), women (73 percent, vs. 53 percent of men) and liberals (74 percent, vs. 60 percent of moderates and conservatives). Support for building more nuclear plants has fluctuated in the past, showing sensitivity to nuclear crises. Starting at 61 percent in the mid-1970s, support fell sharply after the Three Mile Island accident in 1979 and bottomed out at just 19 percent in May 1986 after the Chernobyl crisis (which began 25 years ago next week).

#### Women oppose nuclear power

Pew Research Center 11 (March 21, “Opposition to Nuclear Power Rises amid Japanese Crisis”, http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1934/support-nuclear-power-japan-gas-prices-offshore-oil-gas-drilling)

There has long been a wide gender gap in views of increased use of nuclear power and these differences persist amid the crisis in Japan. By greater than two-to-one (63% to 26%), women oppose promoting the increased use of nuclear power. A narrow majority of men (53%) favor the increased use of nuclear power, while 42% are opposed.

#### Women are key to the election.

Goodman and Rozell 12 (Paul & Mark, Former Chairman of the DP of Va & professor of public policy, George Mason University, Will women finally determine presidential vote?, Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76275.html>)

The 2004 exit poll data produced controversial results. The adjusted data suggest Sen. John Kerry likely carried the women’s vote narrowly. But he lost in the Electoral College because of Bush’s far stronger support among men. So these current polls reveal a potentially historic wrinkle: The women’s vote could now be definitively decisive in electing the president. For 220 years, picking the president has remained, at least in terms of statistically provable results despite the 19th Amendment, a man’s prerogative. But this may finally change in 2012. Meanwhile, the latest polls suggest another important shift: Younger women may be the kingmakers — offsetting Romney’s gain among older white men angry at their fate in this struggling economy. Whatever you thought you knew about women and the gender gap — think again. The battle of the sexes, with an intergenerational female undercard, may finally redefine presidential politics 92 years after the passage of the 19th Amendment

#### The base and environmentalists backlash to the plan

Koch 10 (Wendy is a writer for USA Today. “Obama's call for nuclear power plants angers supporters,” 1/30, http://content.usatoday.com/communities/greenhouse/post/2010/01/obamas-call-for-new-nuclear-power-plants-triggers-outrage/1#.UElvKI1lScw)

President Obama's call Wednesday, in his State of the Union Address, for a "new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants" was panned by some environmentalists and Democratic backers.¶ It was considered the worst part of his 71-minute speech by 10,000 members of MoveOn, a non-profit progressive advoacy group that has raised millions of dollars for Democratic political candidates. They had signed up to evaluate the speech live and every few seconds would hit a button to reflect how they felt about it, ranging from "awful" to "great."¶ "The most definitive drop in enthusiasm is when President Obama talked about nuclear power and offshore drilling," says Ilyse Hogue, MoveOn's director of political advocacy. "They're looking for clean energy sources that prioritize wind and solar."¶ Greenpeace, an environmental group, was also disappointed. "Despite his statement, the president knows better," Daniel Kessler, the group's press officer, says in a commentary posted on its website. He adds:¶ Nuclear power is neither safe nor clean. There is no such thing as a "safe" dose of radiation and just because nuclear pollution is invisible doesn't mean it's "clean." For years, nuclear plants have been leaking radioactive waste from underground pipes and radioactive waste pools into the ground water at sites across the nation.

#### Turn out key to either side – comparatively more important than swing votes

Zogby 12. [John, political pollster, “What Obama needs to be re-elected” Forbes -- May 30 -- http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnzogby/2012/05/30/what-obama-needs-to-be-re-elected/]

As we get closer to Election Day, the unaffiliated and undecided sliver of the electorate will be scrutinized ad naseum. Estimates of $1 billion may be spent on advertising, much of it trying to convince less than 10% of voters that Barack Obamaor Mitt Romney will be the worse choice for President.¶ But in our hyper-polarized electorate, the more decisive factor will be turn out from voters who would be expected to choose one party over the other. We already see both Obama and Romney concentrating on their respective base voters. That’s why Obama has come out for same-sex marriage and hammered Republicans about holding down interest rates on student loans. Meanwhile, Romney has yet to make any overt moves to the middle for fear of losing support from conservatives. As you will read below, small percentage decreases in turnout of base voters can account for millions of votes.

### A2: Jobs link turn

#### Energy key to the election

Thomas 12 03/21/12 Ken Thomas White House reporter with The Associated Press, covering Obama 2012. “Obama Energy Policy: President, GOP Plunge Into Politics Of Gas Prices”

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/21/obama-energy-policy-gop-gas-prices\_n\_1370615.html

MALJAMAR, N.M. — Wooing a nation of increasingly angry motorists, President Barack Obama and his Republican rivals are all plunging into gas-pump politics, seeking the upper hand as energy becomes a driving issue in the election campaign.

#### Nuclear doesn’t create enough jobs to be popular – and only areas it is popular are strongly Republican

Tucker 12 (William Tucker is the author of Terrestrial Energy: How Nuclear Power Will Lead the Green Revolution and End America's Energy Odyssey. 4/16/2012 “WILLIAM TUCKER: Nuclear’s Problem — Too Much Energy, Not Enough Jobs” http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-nuclear%E2%80%99s-problem-%E2%80%94-too-much-energy-not-enough-jobs/)

Well then, what about the 104 reactors that operate around the country? Don’t they generate some political support? The average reactor employs about 650 people and is extremely popular in its home territory. Bisconti Research has found that support for nuclear increases to around 85 percent in communities that host reactors. But this support tends to be highly localized and reactors create little ancillary employment. Replacing the fuel rods, for instance, requires only six tractor trailers arriving once every 18 months. Illinois gets almost half its electricity from nuclear and even Barack Obama was known to say a few nice things about it while he was Senator from Illinois. But most states with large nuclear complexes are equally committed to coal. Even in a state that is highly dependent on nuclear, the work force is so small as to be inconsequential. Vermont gets 60 percent of its electricity form Vermont Yankee, yet its efforts to close down the reactor have generated very little pushback. Vernon, the tiny town of 2,000 that supplies all this energy, is 100 percent in favor of keeping the reactor. But its interests are completed swamped by 623,000 other Vermonters who only get clean, cheap energy from nuclear and think they can do the same by covering the green mountains with 45-story windmills. The only place where nuclear has built a true constituency is in the South. This is partly because of the many military veterans in the region, since a large portion of the nuclear workforce has come up through the Nuclear Navy. South Carolina is probably the most pro-nuclear state in the country with Georgia and Tennessee also strongly in favor. It is no accident that the four new reactors licensed for construction will be built in Georgia and South Carolina. Areva is also completing its plutonium recycling plant at the Savannah River Site. But all these states are pretty much locked up for Republicans and have very little impact at the national level. So nuclear’s weakness is plain to see. It does very poorly at creating the kind of widespread employment that builds political constituencies. It is only good at producing energy.

#### Media spin and public confidence in alt energy ensures no perception of need

Bisconti 10 (Ann S. Bisconti, Ph.D., President, Bisconti Research Inc, Winter, 10, [http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/publications/perspectiveonpublicopinion/winter-2010/](http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/publications/perspectiveonpublicopinion/winter-2010/-http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/publications/perspectiveonpublicopinion/winter-2010/))

Women historically have softer and more changeable opin- ions about nuclear energy than men. The media and policy focus on alternative energy sources may have reduced the perception of need for nuclear energy, especially among women, by raising hopes and expectations that the nation can rely on abundant supplies of electricity from these alternatives.

### Blame

#### Incumbents get the blame.

Trent and Friedenberg 8. [Judith, Professor of Communication in the Department of Communication at the University of Cincinnati, Robert, Professor of Communication @ Miami of Ohio University, “Communicative Styles and Strategies of Political Campaigns” Political Campaign Communication: Principles and Practices, Sixth Edition -- p. 104-105]

Disadvantages to Incumbency Campaigning But under what conditions can incumbents lose? In other words, are there burdens of the style as well as benefits? It seems to us that incumbency campaigning has at least four major disadvantages. First, and maybe most important, incumbents must run (at least in part) on their record. While they may cast blame elsewhere or minimize the scope or significance of problem areas within their administration, an effective challenger can make certain that the record of the incumbent (and shortcomings can be found in virtually all records) forms the core of the campaign rhetoric. The incumbent can be kept in a position of having to justify and explain – answering rather than charging, defending rather than attacking. Being forced to run on one’s record can be a severe handicap, particularly in the hands of a skilled challenger. ¶ The second and related burden faced by many incumbents is simply that the public may blame them for all problems – whether or not they were at fault. Incumbents are in the public eye, and, if the city sanitation workers refuse to pick up the garbage for a week or if the public transportation system is shut down because of weather, an accident, or striking employees, they are held accountable. At the very least, the question of competency or job effectiveness is raised in the public mind, waiting perhaps for the skilled challenger to capitalize on it.

#### Obama gets the blame - attempts to deflect to other policymakers fail

Nicholas and Hook 10 (Peter and Janet, Tribune Washington Bureau, July 30, "Obama the Velcro president", http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730)jn

Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC’s “The View,” drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. “Stylistically, he creates some of those problems,” Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. “His favorite pronoun is ‘I.’ When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn’t get fixed or things happen.” A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable – such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Il.) said: “The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It’s naïve to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office.”

#### The president receives all the credit or blame whether they deserve it or not—Clinton proves.

Thomasson 1 (B.A. from Indiana University, Dan, 9-7-01, “Don't count Bush out on economy”, The Times Mail, http://www.tmnews.com/stories/2001/09/07/archive.251309.tms?printf=1)

There is only one certainty in American presidential politics. The incumbent will receive the blame or credit for whatever happens on his watchwhether or not he deserves either. That is particularly true of the economy, and if the economy is good, Americans will respond with their votes, even, as one veteran observer predicted, if the president is a suspected ax murderer. The best modern example of this political truth was Clinton, who survived scandal and impeachment largely because of unprecedented economic growth for which he had little if any responsibility. In fact, he had no more idea how to explain the historically high growth than Alan Greenspan who now admits he doesn't understand why suddenly the sky is falling, if it truly is.

### A2: NEI link turn

#### Their polling is biased – doesn’t take into account expansion of reactors and is conducted by industry pollsters

Mariotte 12 (Michael, Executive director and the chief spokesperson for NIRS, has testified in the United States Senate and before the U.S. House of Representatives on nuclear power, a graduate of Antioch College, Jun 5th, “Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say” <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say>)

Conclusion 3: On new reactors, how one asks the question matters.¶ Gallup and the Nuclear Energy Institute ask the same question: “Overall, do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the U.S.?”¶ This question doesn’t really get to the issue of support for new nuclear reactors, although NEI typically tries to spin it that way. Although a question of support for current reactors wasn’t asked in any recent poll we saw, the public traditionally has been more supportive of existing reactors than new ones, and the question above could easily be interpreted as support for existing reactors, or even simple recognition that they exist. The results may also be skewed by the pollsters throwing nuclear in as “one of the ways,” without a context of how large a way.¶ Nonetheless, despite asking the same question, Gallup and NEI can’t agree on the answer. NEI, for example, in November 2011 asserted that 28% of the public strongly favors nuclear power with an additional 35% somewhat in favor. NEI found only 13% strongly opposed and another 21% somewhat opposed. A May 2012 NEI poll did not publicly break down the numbers into strongly vs somewhat, but claimed a similar 64-33% split between support for nuclear power and opposition.¶ Gallup, asking the same question in March 2012, found a narrower split. A smaller number was strongly in favor (23%, a drop of 5%) and a larger number strongly opposed (24%, increase of 3%)—overall an 8-point anti-nuclear swing among those with strong opinions. Those in the middle were 34% somewhat favor vs 16% somewhat opposed. The 2012 numbers were slightly worse for nuclear power than the identical question asked in March 2011, just before Fukushima.¶ But other polls suggest that Gallup and NEI may be asking the wrong question. For example, the LA Times reported on a Yale-George Mason University poll in April 2012 that found that support for new nuclear power had dropped significantly, from 61% in 2008 to 42% today.¶ Even Rasmussen in its May 2012 poll found that only 44% support building new reactors. That was good news for Rasmussen since it found that only 38% oppose them, with a surprising 18% undecided (surprising because no other poll we saw had such a high undecided contingent for any nuclear-related question).¶ Meanwhile the March 2012 ORC International poll found that:¶ “Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. Those who say they are more supportive of nuclear power a year after Fukushima account for well under a third (28 percent) of all Americans, little changed from the 24 percent who shared that view in 2011.”¶ But perhaps the most telling, and easily the most interesting, poll comes from a March 2012 poll from the Yale Project on Climate Change Communications. Participants were asked, “When you think of nuclear power, what is the first word or phrase that comes to your mind?”¶ 29% of those polled said “disaster.” Another 24% said “bad.” Only about 15% said “good” and that was the only measurable group that had anything positive to say. That poll also found that, “…only 47 percent of Americans in May 2011 supported building more nuclear power plants, down 6 points from the prior year (June 2010), while only 33 percent supported building a nuclear power plant in their own local area.”¶ Conclusions¶ Americans are not exactly wild about the idea of building new nuclear reactors. Polls asking the question different ways arrive at different results; at the lowest common denominator it is safe to say the country is divided on the issue. But Americans clearly don’t want to pay for construction of new reactors. And the reality is that no utility wants to or even can spend its own money building new reactors—they’re just too expensive. Congress, State legislatures and Public Service Commissions would do well to heed that warning, especially since it crosses all party and political lines.¶ It is also clear that the American public does not see nuclear power as a “clean energy” source (nor, for that matter, “clean” coal or natural gas fracking). Congressional or state efforts to include these technologies in a “clean energy standard” or a clean energy bank concept are bound to fail.

### Cp

#### Empirically proven weaker central control is key to Russian stability

Petrov 4 (Nikolai , advisor and analyst for the Russian Presidential Administration, worked at the Carnegie Moscow Center as a senior consultant and scholar-in-residence. And earned his Ph.D. from Moscow State University, “Other Sacrifices”, Carnegie Moscow Center, December http://www.carnegie.ru/en/pubs/media/71824.htm, AD: 7/5/9) LS

Numerous democratic institutions have already fallen victim to the war on terrorism. Now it's federalism and the Constitution under attack. A revision of Russia's territorial administration structure is the focal point of the "response measures" produced by the Kremlinafter the tragedy of the school hostage siege in Beslan. Regional borders play a sound organizing role in Russia, forming and developing the whole socio-territorial fabric. This role would have been less important were it not for the extensive centralization replicated at all levels from Moscow to some godforsaken district center. This system is consistent with the mobilization model for politics and the economy. Relations between the federal government and the regions have been dramatically revised in Moscow's favor during the war on terrorism years. Regional leaders lost their Federation Council membership and moved out of federal politics in general; the financial independence of the regions was substantially weakened, Moscow took over regional courts and law enforcement agencies; and direct elections for regional leaders were abolished only recently. There have been sweeping changes in security and law enforcement as well. Centralized and unitary, like everything else in Russia, this field was taken over by the regions in the 1990s because the weak federal government couldn't even afford enough funding for these activities, let alone oversight. A great deal has been done over the last several years to fortify and reorganize the law enforcement agencies and withdraw them from regional control again. The system of horizontal rotation for senior officers in security and law enforcement, abandoned in the Brezhnev era, has been reintroduced. This system assures their loyalty to Moscow. And yet, the system does backfire every now and then. Seeking to minimize the dependence of senior officers on regional elites, Moscow appoints people who don't "belong" - and who are patently unable to maintain control of the situation, as evidenced by the recent crisis in the Caucasus. The lack of horizontal coordination between numerous security and law enforcement agencies in Russia is one of the problems the Kremlin has encountered. With an emphasis on vertical subordination, any interdepartmental coordination or cooperation requires permission from above. But all too often, nothing can be achieved without horizontal cooperation. All this takes time, and there is never enough time in a crisis. This is what happened in Beslan, even though the office of head of a counter-terrorism commission with broad powers had been introduced in the Caucasus (nationwide, in fact) barely a month earlier. Things weren't much better during the Moscow theater hostage-taking two years ago, where casualties among hostages were caused by the lack of coordination between the organizations participating in the hostage rescue operation. And how are things in other countries which have also encountered the terrorist threat? Is Russia's approach consistent with what is being done abroad? Yes, in terms of reforming security and law enforcement bodies and promoting interdepartmental cooperation. No, in terms of centralizing political power. The United States is a vivid example. It restructured its secret services in the wake of September 11, but it didn't try to force all of society into marching columns. Does Russia have its own unique path? Do Russia's own past experiences indicate that centralization is helpful? The year of 2004 stands as evidence to the contrary. The measures concerning security and law enforcement are a matter for the authorities, but restrictions on democracy and federalism demand broad public debate. The authorities should formulate their goals and objectives, set deadlines, and outline oversight mechanisms. Instead, our society is being offered more reforms - without so much as an attempt at an explanation. In the meantime, any reform implies a loss of control - at least temporarily. Excessive centralization implies the risk of losing control over the entire system. This is the risk of having too many powers and being unable to perform all functions. In any case, there is the risk of losing public oversight for the activities of the authorities. A unitary state does not mean a stable state; a centralized state does not mean a strong state. Total surveillance over the citizenry may do away with terrorism - after all, surveillance over crime is perfect in jails. But is our society prepared to pay this price? Dismantling federalism is leading to a loss of oversight, and weakening the state - in the face of the terrorist threat. It's a lie that regional leaders can be appointed in federations. Appointment (and dismissal) of regional leaders by the head of state, a state with a weak parliament, bears no resemblance to federalism. We are told that Russia is at war. It is; but this is an argument that should be used by the opponents of unitarism. Centralization may be effective during a war against another country, but not a war on terrorists. A strictly-organized simple mechanism is only effective against another mechanism of the same kind, not against acts of sabotage.

#### Devolution key to Russian economy

**Kupchan 2k** (Clifford, deputy coordinator of U.S. assistance to the New Independent States at the

U.S. Department of State, “Devolution Drives Russian Reform”, The Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The Washington Quarterly 23:2 pp. 67–77 http://www.twq.com/spring00/232kupchan.pdf, Spring, AD: 7/5/9) LS

Devolution has hastened the breakup of the Soviet economic system and has created conditions under which private entrepreneurship has a chance to take root and grow. The centrally planned economy of the former Soviet Union left Russia with collective agriculture and huge enterprises, some of which employed entire cities. Few of these enterprises can be salvaged or restructured to function in a market economy. Their immediate closure, however, would result in massive unemployment and is simply not an option. Russia’s economic future thus depends on the emergence of new productive activities. Devolution promotes market reform and new productive activities in several ways. It has allowed the creation of successful regional models of economic reform. The process gives progressive ideas at the regional level a better chance of being turned into policy. Indeed, the policies of forward-leaning regional leaders are creating a canon of success stories and models for other regional governments. The best example is Governor Prusak in Novgorod. Reform in Novgorod has produced a more favorable tax climate, more transparent budget procedures, streamlined licensing procedures, and clear land titling. As a result, the number of new small businesses and foreign investment has dramatically increased. Samara, where roughly 20 percent of the workforce is employed by small business, is also a success story. Governor Titov has strongly championed small business and passed a groundbreaking law permitting the privatization of agricultural land. The Siberian region of Tomsk is also implementing many of these same reforms.

#### Russian economic decline causes nuclear war

Filger 9 (Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

In Russia historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation’s nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

#### Decentralization has increased democracy, political freedom and checked corruption

Kupchan 0(Clifford, deputy coordinator of U.S. assistance to the New Independent States at the

U.S. Department of State, “Devolution Drives Russian Reform”, The Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The Washington Quarterly 23:2 pp. 67–77 http://www.twq.com/spring00/232kupchan.pdf, Spring, AD: 7/5/9) LS

In the Russian case, devolution has had a generally positive effect on reform. It has produced some of the expected general effects of devolution, plus some beneficial effects unique to the political process in Russia. Devolution has promoted institutions that enhance pluralism and check central power, increased political freedoms, and strengthened civil society. Given Russia’s long authoritarian history, these are not small achievements. The flow of power to Russia’s regions (and to a lesser extent, its cities) has promoted diverse regional interests and checks on central power in four different areas. First, democratically elected governors have been effective at articulating regional interests. By law, all of Russia’s governors had to stand for election by the end of 1996; many gubernatorial elections will occur again in the year 2000. The elections produced stronger, legitimized governors who often oppose the government’s policies and are an alternative repository of power. Second, mechanisms to represent regional interests in Russia’s parliament have helped check the center. Each of the governors automatically receives a seat in the Federation Council (upper house), which is a bastion of regional interests. Also, regional governors played a key role in the December 1999 Duma elections (lower house). Candidates backed by strong governors generally did well. As a result, the new Duma is likely to be more regionally oriented. Third, the governors and Moscow have negotiated an ad hoc form of federalism which succeeds in channeling regional demands to Moscow and balancing the interests of both sides. Forty-six regions now have bilateral accords with the central government. To be sure, some regions have negotiated more favorable economic arrangements than others. While a more standardized format for federal relations would be preferable, this asymmetric system has the virtue that it basically works. Finally, devolution has in certain cases led to the empowerment of mayors. Strong mayors serve as a check on both regional and central power. This trend is especially encouraging because the mayors tend to be younger and more reform-minded. Mayor Sergei Zhilkin of Togliatti, who is committed to educating his younger constituents in business skills, is a good example of a reform-oriented mayor whose power serves to balance other levels of government. Taken together, these four trends promote democracy by institutionalizing the expression of regional interests and checks on central power. Structural checks impede the rebirth of authoritarianism and leave the political arena open for a variety of pluralist interests to grow. Given the weakness of the central government, it will be a very long time before any Russian president will be able to reverse these gains. Moreover, since devolution has been a primary agent in weakening the authoritarian state, it has helped create and protect “political space” in Russia. Basic freedoms essential to democracy, and unheard of in the Soviet Union only eight years ago, are now virtually taken for granted. Examples include ready access to the Internet, unrestricted contacts with foreigners, freedom to travel, freedom of artistic expression, and increased—if incomplete—freedom of religion. Many Russian universities, including those in the regions, are centers of creative and spontaneous thought.3 Since devolution checks central power, and since the center is currently and is likely to continue to be very weak, this political space will be very difficult to take away.

#### Russian democracy key to prevent terrorism and nuclear war

Mendelson 9 (Sarah, is director of Human Rights and Security Initiative, CSIS, “US-Russian Relations and the Democracy and Rule of Law Deficit”, The Century Foundation, http://www.tcf.org/Publications/InternationalAffairs/US-RussianRelationsandtheDemocracyandRuleofLawDeficit.pdf, AD: 7/5/9) LS

What does any of this have to do with the Obama administration? The democracy and rule of law deficit in Russia has a range of security and human rights implications for the United States and our allies in Europe. For example, the Obama administration comes to office with a number of arms control goals. These plans may be complicated by the absence of Russian military reform that, in turn, correlates with abuse inside the army. (They are also complicated by continued government reliance on nonconventional forces: in September 2008, President Medvedev committed to modernizing the nuclear arsenal.30) Serious, joint counterterrorism efforts with the United States, Europe, and Russia are likely to remain illusive as long as the police and security services are corrupt and abusive, and the media, a potential source to expose that corruption, is largely controlled by the government. Even at the nongovernmental, track-two level, it is now difficult to have the sort of transatlantic policy dialogue on terrorism that has been common among other nations and societies since 2001.31 The most dire evidence suggests that security service personnel or contractors have been deployed abroad, in European cities, to eliminate Kremlin enemies. In the most famous example, British authorities have sought the extradition from Moscow of former KGB bodyguard and current Duma member Andrew Lugovoi for the murder by Polonium poisoning of Alexander Litvinenko in London in November 2006.32 Kremlin proxies, such as Chechnya’s Ramzan Kadyrov, may have agents doing the same on his behalf on the streets of Austria, also with apparent impunity.