### Procurement T

#### 1. We meet- plan creates incentives and secures a market for nuclear energy

#### 2. We meet- paying them is the financial incentive

#### 3. Counter interpretation- financial incentives are disbursement of public funds or contingent commitments

Webb 93

(lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Ground- it is grounded in the literature and is the only way to intrinsically keep military affs in the topic which are key to beat states counterplans, and it links much harder to disads

#### Predictability- our evidence has a definitive list and an intent to define, and is supported in the literature

#### Limits- only adds procurement affs to their list, but limits out all indirect incentive effects their allows

#### Education- key to talk about different actors use of energy and how energy’s connection to the military, and no aff makes sense where the government is the consumer

#### Reasonability key to prevent a race to the most limiting definition

### Capital

#### Nuke lobbies stronger than the opposition

Squassoni ‘12

[Sharon Squassoni serves as director and senior fellow of the Proliferation Prevention Program at CSIS. Prior to joining CSIS, Ms. Squassoni was a senior associate in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. From 2002-2007, Ms. Squassoni advised Congress as a senior specialist in weapons of mass destruction at the Congressional Research Service. “The Future of Nuclear Power in the US.” Federation of American Scientists, February 2012. ETB]

Concerns about contamination of the soil and water by radioactivity lay relatively dormant in recent years because of the strong support of the U.S. government for nuclear power and the portrayal of nuclear energy as “clean, green and secure.” Marketing campaigns by the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) portraying nuclear energy as “clean air” energy and by the NEI-funded the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition were likely influential.16 On the whole, opponents of nuclear energy generally have had less money to spend on media campaigns, and their message is less pithy. ey have stressed that nuclear power is not the solution to climate change and that it is dangerous, polluting, unsafe, and expensive. The accident at Fukushima returned safety and waste concerns to headline news. Shortly after the accident, a Gallup poll showed 44 percent of the public in favor (in contrast to 59 percent the previous year) and 47 percent opposing nuclear power.17 Figure 6 below shows the results of a Pew Research Center poll conducted about a week after Fukushima.18

#### Nuke power is bipart

Taylor ‘11

[Jerry Taylor and Peter Van Doren are senior fellows at the Cato Institute. Mr. Van Doren is also editor of Cato's Regulation magazine. <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nuclear-power-dock> ETB]

The unfolding nuclear emergency in Japan has prompted a reconsideration of nuclear power here in the United States. Surprisingly, the political faith in nuclear power appears to be relatively unshaken at the moment, with opinion leaders on both the left and right cautioning against overreaction and politicians in both parties swearing continued fealty to the federal campaign to jump-start new construction orders.

### A2- Prolif Good- Top Level

#### Prolif will be rapid and destabilizing- absent strong US nuclear leadership, states will just buy unsafe tech from countries unconcerned with proliferation.

#### States buying tech are twice as likely to strike pre-emptively or abandon nuclear discipline

Clark 97

(Mark T., associate professor of political science and director of the national security studies program at California State University “Deterrence in the Second Nuclear Age-book reviews: Neorealism versus Organizational Theory,” <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0365/is_n1_v41/ai_19238111>)

Sagan's critique is a healthy antidote to Waltz's optimism. In his view, there are two principal arguments that suggest pessimism about any future with a greater number of nuclear-armed adversaries. From his study of militaries, Sagan finds that their organizational behavior inclines them towards deterrence failure. It is not that militaries want war but that, of all groups in a society, they are the most likely to believe war is probable and are most inclined to adopt preventive or preemptive strategies. Military officers are more skeptical of nonmilitary solutions to conflicts than are their civilian counterparts, according to Sagan. It also makes sense, in classical military terms, to adopt preventive or preemptive strategies, since no military prefers to fight on its adversary's terms. Taking the offensive alleviates some of these problems. Secondly, Sagan argues that newly armed nuclear states will lack the positive mechanisms of civilian control. Here, Sagan's critique is very strong. By examining the history of the U.S. nuclear safety record he is able to document many near accidents and bureaucratic snafus that could have led to catastrophic accidents, and in this way he points out the weakness in Waltz's arguments. Sagan comments: Waltz asked why should we expect new nuclear states to experience greater difficulties than did the old ones? The evidence of the number of near-accidents with U.S. nuclear weapons during the Cold War suggests that there would be reason enough to worry about nuclear accidents in new nuclear states even if their safety difficulties were "only" as great as those experienced by old nuclear powers (p. 80). He adds six reasons why new nuclear powers are unlikely to compile the safety record of the United States. But if the problem is acute for newly emergent nuclear powers that develop their programs indigenously, it will be doubly so for those that inherit or buy their programs. They will lack even the discipline that a new nuclear nation will accrue by investing enormous amounts of time, talent, and treasure into developing its nuclear program.

#### 50 years of studies conclude high risk of deterrence breakdown - few warrants from Kroenig ‘12

#### - optimists don’t understand the risks of nuclear coercion, nuclear blackmail, and nuclear crises

#### - new proliferators are more likely to adopt high-alert status and delegate launch authority

#### - rational actors may use nukes to prove willingness to escalate

#### Prefer our evidence- its empirical and future predictive- their ev is only about past instances of prolif

#### 1% risk of prolif being bad outweighs their offense

Knopf 02

(Jeffrey W, Department of National Security Affairs, Teaches at Naval Postgraduate School, Ph.D. in Political Science from Stanford University. “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate” Security Studies 12, no. 1 (autumn 2002): 41—96. Published online Aug. 03 2006)

Even some nonpessimists acknowledge this point. Peter Lavoy, in a review of the Waltz-Sagan debate that sides with Waltz on many of the issues, nonetheless concludes on a cautionary note: Policymakers must worry about exceptions to the rule. [O]ne exception would dwarf the significance of the theory. Even if Waltz is correct 99 percent of the time, the 1 percent of exceptional cases is what U.S. policymakers must worry about. 23 Richard Betts argues that this concern also follows from a classical realist outlook, which he takes pains to distinguish from Waltz’s neo- or structural realist approach. Betts notes further that it is not clear what else might happen once there is even a single exception to the prediction of stability and that this is a further reason for caution. As he puts it, the ramifications of the first breakage of the half-century taboo on nuclear use are too unpredictable to tempt us to run the experiment.

### A2- Prolif Key to Deterrence

#### High risk for deterrence breakdown- that’s above

#### Squo solves deterrence claims- no reason increasing the number of nuclear states is critical. There are no current disputes that prolif would de-escalate

#### Even rational actors may miscalculate or have a strong incentive for nuclear escalation- that’s Kroenig ‘12

#### Their ev doesn’t assume great powers wars that prolif could trigger- only our ev takes current strategic interests into account- that’s the last two Kroenig cards

#### Risk of accidents and miscalc is uniquely high now- Cold War style deterrence won’t happen

Evans 9

Gareth Evans 9, President of the International Crisis Group &#38;#38; Former Foreign Minister of Japan (Co-chair of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and Professorial fellow in the School of Social and Political Sciences @ University of Melbourne) &#38;#38; Yoriko Kawaguchi (Co-chair of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament), “Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers,” International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, December 15, 2009, pg. reference/reports/ent/ downloads.html

3.1 Ensuring that no new states join the ranks of those already nuclear armed must continue to be one of the world’s top international security priorities. Every new nuclear**-armed** state will add significantly to the inherent risks – of accident or miscalculation as well as deliberate use – involved in any possession of these weapons, and potentially encourage more states to acquire nuclear weapons to avoid being left behind. Any scramble for nuclear capabilities is bound to generate severe instability in bilateral, regional and international relations. The carefully worked checks and balances of interstate relations will come under severe stress. There will be enhanced fears of nuclear blackmail, and of irresponsible and unpredictable leadership behaviour. 3.2 In conditions of inadequate command and control systems, absence of confidence building measures and multiple agencies in the nuclear weapons chain of authority, the possibility of an accidental or maverick usage of nuclear weapons will remain high. Unpredictable elements of risk and reward will impact on decision making processes. The dangers are compounded if the new and aspiring nuclear weapons states have, as is likely to be the case, ongoing inter-state disputes with ideological, territorial, historical – and for all those reasons, strongly emotive – dimensions. 3.3 The transitional period is likely to be most dangerous of all, with the arrival of nuclear weapons tending to be accompanied by sabre rattling and competitive nuclear chauvinism. For example, as between Pakistan and India a degree of stability might have now evolved, but 1998–2002 was a period of disturbingly fragile interstate relations. Command and control and risk management of nuclear weapons takes time to evolve. Military and political leadership in new nuclear-armed states need time to learn and implement credible safety and security systems. The risks of nuclear accidents and the possibility of nuclear action through inadequate crisis control mechanisms are very high in such circumstances. If this is coupled with political instability in such states, the risks escalate again. Where such countries are beset with internal stresses and fundamentalist groups with trans-national agendas, the risk of nuclear weapons or fissile material coming into possession of non‑state actors cannot be ignored. 3.4 The action–reaction cycle of nations on high alerts, of military deployments, threats and counter threats of military action, have all been witnessed in the Korean peninsula with unpredictable behavioural patterns driving interstate relations. The impact of a proliferation breakout in the Middle East would be much wider in scope and make stability management extraordinarily difficult. Whatever the chances of “stable deterrence” prevailing in a Cold War or India–Pakistan setting, the prospects are significantly less in a regional setting with multiple nuclear power centres divided by multiple and cross-cutting sources of conflict.

### A2- Prolif Solves Conventional War

#### Prolif makes conventional wars more likely because great powers will be blackmailed to get involved, empirically proven by the Yom-Kippur War. Bigger risk of offense from the aff because these could trigger great power wars that go nuclear. That’s the last two Kroenig cards

#### Nuclear states would still fight wars with non nuclear states- makes the impact inevitable

#### Nuke war leads to extinction

Krieger 4/30/12

(David, holds MA and Ph.D. degrees in ¶ political science from the University of Hawaii as well as a J.D. from the Santa Barbara ¶ College of Law, Assistant professor at University of Hawaii, founder of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and has served as its ¶ president since 1982. He is a councilor on the World Future Council, chair of the Executive ¶ Committee of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility, ¶ and a member of the Executive Committee of the Middle Powers Initiative. “NUCLEAR WEAPONS¶ AND A¶ SUSTAINABLE FUTURE” Nuclear Peace Foundation, <http://www.wagingpeace.org/menu/resources/publications/2012_prepcom.pdf>, SEH)

Nuclear war would preclude a sustainable future. It would destroy the global environment, leading to ¶ the extinction of many forms of plant and animal life. Complex forms of life, such as humans, would be ¶ particularly at risk. A nuclear war fought with existing nuclear arsenals could leave the Earth ¶ uninhabitable for humans. ¶ Leading atmospheric scientists, who warn of the utterly catastrophic effects nuclear war would have ¶ upon global climate and the environment, argue, “The combination of nuclear proliferation, political ¶ instability and urban demographics may constitute one of the greatest dangers to the stability of society ¶ since the dawn of humans. Only abolition of nuclear weapons will prevent a potential nightmare.”¶ 23¶ The ¶ scientists call for immediate reductions in US and Russian arsenals to a few hundred nuclear weapons to ¶ “reduce the possibility of nuclear winter and encourage the rest of the world to continue to work toward ¶ the goal of elimination.”¶ 24¶ ¶ It is necessary to ensure that nuclear weapons will not be used again as instruments of war, risking the ¶ destruction of civilization, nuclear famine and the extinction of most or all humans and other forms of ¶ complex life. Exposing the dangers of launch-on-warning nuclear policies and the dysfunctional and ¶ counterproductive nature of nuclear deterrence theory is essential for awakening policy makers and the ¶ public to the imperative goal of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. It is a goal that demands ¶ boldness by all who seek a sustainable future for humanity and the planet. The non-nuclear weapon states ¶ that are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty have both the right and the responsibility to assert ¶ leadership in assuring that the nuclear weapon states fulfill their obligations for good faith negotiations ¶ for complete nuclear disarmament.

### A2- Small Arsenals Solve

#### ( ) Small arsenals don’t deter—perceived as weak

James 2k [Carolyn C., prof at Department of Political Science at Iowa State University, “Nuclear Arsenal Games: Coping with Proliferation in a World of Changing Rivalries”, Canadian Journal of Political Science, ebsco]

Mini-arsenal presents more specifically a minimal nuclear capability and its relation to crisis behaviour. This is perhaps the most complex, and therefore difficult, level to describe. First, a mini-arsenal state is capable of acquiring, at best, two or three, crude Hiroshima or Nagasaki-style warheads. Fat Man, the bomb dropped on Nagasaki, was about 20 kilotons, the more powerful of the two used by the United States in 1945. This pales in comparison to thermonuclear weapons, that are measured in megatons. India, Israel and Pakistan, which can project significant nuclear threats, are beyond this category since the arsenals they are believed to possess contain qualitatively and quantitatively much more destructive power. Second, the most critical distinction of the mini-arsenal is that, while potential damage may be extreme, destruction of stute or society is not assured. A strike from a mini-arsenal state may be survivable-militarily, politically and socially. This perception, which may be held both by the mini-arsenal state leadership and its potential enemies, is expected to result in preferences and behaviour that do not match actions of states with more deadly arsenals. Leadership that is more willing to risk domestic populations may consciously choose to escalate wars to nuclear levels if the state and its government may survive. Of the four levels of nuclear capability, mini-arsenal dyads promise to be the most unstable during crises as the deadliest of cost-benefit analyses are expected to take place.

### Elections

#### Obama’s already pushed SMRs – that’s the NYT evidence

#### N/U Obama budget- NYT ev

#### Obama has pushed SMR policy not just budget

Kramer ‘12

(David J. Kramer was educated at Tufts University, receiving his B.A. in Soviet Studies and Political Science, and then at Harvard University, receiving his M.A. in Soviet Studies. “Romney, Obama surrogates spell out candidates’ energy policies” September 2012 Accessed online at http://www.physicstoday.org/resource/1/phtoad/v65/i9/p20\_s10, TSW)

The Obama administration’s support for nuclear power is evident from the $7 billion loan guarantee from DOE to back construction of two new reactors at an existing nuclear power plant in Georgia, Reicher noted. “There’s serious money going into small modular reactors and serious policy work going on in how to reform the licensing process” at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expedite approval.

**Romney Win- Factors**

**Romney will win- factors**

**Morris 9-14**

Dick is a former advisor to Bill Clinton and Trent Lott, “Why Romney Will Win,” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/14/why_romney_will_win_115452.html>

Now that both conventions are over, the dimensions of the likely Romney triumph are becoming clear. Both through an analysis of the polling and an examination of the rhetoric, the parameters of the victory are emerging.¶ Start with the polling. It appears that **the bulk of the Obama post-convention bounce has been in blue states where his left-oriented convention stirred up the enthusiasm of an already committed group of voters. Among likely voters** identified **in The Washington Post poll** -- taken after the conventions -- **Obama holds a slim one-point edge**. And an analysis of Rasmussen's state-by-state likely voter data indicates a tie in the the battleground states. ¶ But it's not really a tie at all. **All pollsters are using 2008 models of voter turnout**. Some are combining '04 and '08 but skewing their samples to '08 numbers. African Americans cast 11 percent of the national vote in '04, but their participation swelled to 13 percent in '08. These 2 million new black voters backed Obama overwhelmingly. Will they come out in such numbers again? Will college and under 30 voters do so as well? Will Latino turnout be at historic highs? All these questions have to be answered "yes" for the polling samples so widely published to be accurate.¶ For example, **when a poll shows an Obama lead among likely voters of, say 47-45, it is based on an assumption that blacks will cast 13 percent of the vote**. But the lack of enthusiasm among **Obama's base for his candidacy and their doubts about the economy make an 11 percent black turnout more likely. In this event, Romney would actually win in this sample by 46-45**.¶ And then there is the enthusiasm gap. All recent polling suggests that Republican- and GOP-leaning Independents are 13 points more enthusiastic and following the race more closely than their Democratic counterparts. If the grassroots do their job, this will yield a stronger Romney vote.¶ Finally, when **every poll among every sample has Obama below 50 percent of the vote, it is most likely that the undecided have, in fact, decided not to back his re-election**.¶ But to crawl out of the statistical weeds, let's examine the state of the partisan dialogue. Former President Bill **Clinton made a huge blunder when he accepted the Republican challenge and flatly** -- and loudly -- **asserted that we are, in fact, better off than we were four years ago. Polls show that only about 33 percent of voters agree**, while close to half do not see the world that way.¶ Finally, both parties seemed happily to embrace the same formulation of the difference between them. Both agreed that the Republican Party is based on a philosophy of individual responsibility. Obama articulated it as, "You're on your own." Republicans put it differently: "We'll get government off your back." Democrats said theirs was a party that would lend you a hand.¶ Gallup measured these two options, and voters chose "leave me alone" over "lend me a hand" by 54-35.¶ Over the long haul, these are the questions that will dominate voting intentions. The function of the conventions is to formulate and articulate each party's view of the world. The fact that they were so similar and that each was willing to trust its fate to the question of, "Are you better off?" means that the Romney message will have a very strong advantage. The decision of the Democrats to embrace this choice and not to move to the center will make it impossible for them either to re-elect their president or to command a majority in the new Senate.

**Romney Will Win- Racism & Economy**

**Romney will win- Economy & Racists**

**Tien-Beck 9-1**

Charles is Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa, “Nowcasts for and against Obama: Models Collide,” <http://themonkeycage.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/nowcastingseptember.pdf>

**We conclude**, then, **on the basis of the Jobs Model,** that President **Obama will go ¶ down to defeat**. **This defeat will be the product of a relatively weak approval level, ¶ brought down in part by racial intolerance,** as we have argued elsewhere (Tien, Nadeau, ¶ and Lewis-Beck, 2012). But, **still more importantly, it will be product of a weak ¶ economy, for which as incumbent he is shouldering the blame**. In particular, **the ¶ economy overall has experienced anemic growth, with jobs creation itself at a post-World ¶ War II low. These are difficult numbers for any President to overcome**.

"Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

**Romney will win- factors**

**Morris 9-14**

Dick is a former advisor to Bill Clinton and Trent Lott, “Why Romney Will Win,” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/14/why_romney_will_win_115452.html>

Now that both conventions are over, the dimensions of the likely Romney triumph are becoming clear. Both through an analysis of the polling and an examination of the rhetoric, the parameters of the victory are emerging.¶ Start with the polling. It appears that **the bulk of the Obama post-convention bounce has been in blue states where his left-oriented convention stirred up the enthusiasm of an already committed group of voters. Among likely voters** identified **in The Washington Post poll** -- taken after the conventions -- **Obama holds a slim one-point edge**. And an analysis of Rasmussen's state-by-state likely voter data indicates a tie in the the battleground states. ¶ But it's not really a tie at all. **All pollsters are using 2008 models of voter turnout**. Some are combining '04 and '08 but skewing their samples to '08 numbers. African Americans cast 11 percent of the national vote in '04, but their participation swelled to 13 percent in '08. These 2 million new black voters backed Obama overwhelmingly. Will they come out in such numbers again? Will college and under 30 voters do so as well? Will Latino turnout be at historic highs? All these questions have to be answered "yes" for the polling samples so widely published to be accurate.¶ For example, **when a poll shows an Obama lead among likely voters of, say 47-45, it is based on an assumption that blacks will cast 13 percent of the vote**. But the lack of enthusiasm among **Obama's base for his candidacy and their doubts about the economy make an 11 percent black turnout more likely. In this event, Romney would actually win in this sample by 46-45**.¶ And then there is the enthusiasm gap. All recent polling suggests that Republican- and GOP-leaning Independents are 13 points more enthusiastic and following the race more closely than their Democratic counterparts. If the grassroots do their job, this will yield a stronger Romney vote.¶ Finally, when **every poll among every sample has Obama below 50 percent of the vote, it is most likely that the undecided have, in fact, decided not to back his re-election**.¶ But to crawl out of the statistical weeds, let's examine the state of the partisan dialogue. Former President Bill **Clinton made a huge blunder when he accepted the Republican challenge and flatly** -- and loudly -- **asserted that we are, in fact, better off than we were four years ago. Polls show that only about 33 percent of voters agree**, while close to half do not see the world that way.¶ Finally, both parties seemed happily to embrace the same formulation of the difference between them. Both agreed that the Republican Party is based on a philosophy of individual responsibility. Obama articulated it as, "You're on your own." Republicans put it differently: "We'll get government off your back." Democrats said theirs was a party that would lend you a hand.¶ Gallup measured these two options, and voters chose "leave me alone" over "lend me a hand" by 54-35.¶ Over the long haul, these are the questions that will dominate voting intentions. The function of the conventions is to formulate and articulate each party's view of the world. The fact that they were so similar and that each was willing to trust its fate to the question of, "Are you better off?" means that the Romney message will have a very strong advantage. The decision of the Democrats to embrace this choice and not to move to the center will make it impossible for them either to re-elect their president or to command a majority in the new Senate.

#### New Military Base Spending is popular

**Bloomberg 9/4**

(Danielle Ivory, “Virginia Leads Swing States at Risk Over Cliff: BGOV Barometer” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-04/virginia-leads-swing-states-at-risk-over-cliff-bgov-barometer.html>, SHE)

For some swing-state voters, the presidential election may come down to who they want holding the net if their economies go over the fiscal cliff.¶ The BGOV Barometer shows that the battlegrounds of Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania are among 19 states and the District of Columbia that depended on U.S. government contracts for more than 3 percent of their 2011 gross domestic product. The states are vulnerable to $1.2 trillion in automatic 10-year budget reductions, called sequestration, that will begin in January if Congress and the White House fail to agree on a deficit-reduction plan. ¶ President Barack Obama and his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney , need the 42 electoral votes represented by Virginia, Colorado and Pennsylvania as they compete for the 270 it takes to win. Their lines of attack on the automatic cuts, which along with tax increases make up the fiscal cliff, may help determine the outcome in those swing states.¶ “It’s going to increasingly become an issue in this election,” said Todd Harrison , a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments in Washington. “Both sides want to run against sequestration.¶ “Maybe that’s what this boils down to,” Harrison said in an interview. “Whose approach do you prefer for avoiding sequestration?”¶ The government spent more than $500 billion on federal contracts in 2011. Agencies awarded $58.9 billion in orders that year for work performed in Virginia.¶ ‘Tentacles Everywhere’¶ Federal awards represented 14 percent of the economy in the state, home to the Pentagon and headquarters of top federal contractors such as McLean-based SAIC Inc. (SAI) The company was the top recipient of awards in Virginia, receiving $3 billion for work in the state. SAIC performs computer and engineering services for agencies including the Department of Defense .¶ Federal awards support economies outside the state, so a contract in Virginia might have implications for a lawyer or consultant in Ohio or Texas, Ric Brown, the state’s finance secretary, said in an interview. “It has tentacles everywhere,” he said.¶ Contractors performing work in Colorado won $10.2 billion in U.S. awards last year, which represented 3.8 percent of the state’s economy. Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT), based in Bethesda, Maryland , won the most in contracts, $2.41 billion, for work in the state. The company is the No. 1 U.S. defense contractor.¶ ‘Held Hostage’¶ Agencies last year awarded $17.7 billion in contracts for work in Pennsylvania. The state relied on the awards for 3.1 percent of its economy. Bechtel Group, based in San Francisco , was the top recipient of contracts in the state with $1.99 billion in awards.¶ The three swing states also have direct federal employees and military bases that require additional government funding. Nevada, Florida, Wisconsin, Ohio and Iowa -- swing states with 69 electoral votes -- may be less vulnerable because they derived less than 3 percent of their economy from federal contracts.

**Top Political Scientists Agree the infusion of spending is popular**

**Krinner & Reeves ’12**

Douglas is Associate Professor of Political Science at Boston University and Andrew is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boston University, “The Influence of Federal Spending on Presidential Elections,” <http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSR%2FPSR106_02%2FS0003055412000159a.pdf&code=1c7ae66018f9fe746798fcc5c0bfb3b2>

This research thus suggests two ways in which the uneven distribution of grant spending across the country¶ might inﬂuence presidential voting patterns. First, r**esidents of counties that receive an infusion of election year grant spending may be more likely to perceive**¶ **direct personal beneﬁts from federal spend**ing than¶ residents of counties that did not receive increased¶ grant spending. Such voters might judge the administration more responsive to their needs, evaluate its¶ performance more favorably, and become increasingly¶ likely to vote for the incumbent party. Second, **past**¶ 350American Political Science Review Vol. 106, No. 2¶ **research suggests that voters need not personally receive federal beneﬁts to be inﬂuenced by increased**¶ **federal spending in their community**. Rather, **through**¶ **personal networks of family and friends, as well as local**¶ **news coverage of the impact of recent federal spending**¶ **in their communities, voters in high-spending communities may perceive the incumbent administration in a**¶ **more favorable light**. Thus, **regardless of whether voters actually hold the president functionally responsible**¶ **for such increased beneﬁts** (to themselves or their communities) or whether voters are simply retrospective,¶ **for many Americans increased grant spending in their**¶ **home county may increase their likelihood of voting**¶ **for the incumbent party’s candidate in the upcoming**¶ **election.**

#### Energy isn’t a key issue in the election

#### Voters won’t change their minds- new study proves

Bartles 9-21

Larry is Professor of Political Science at Vanderbilt, “There go the Undecided Voters,” <http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2012/09/21/there-go-the-undecided-voters/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+themonkeycagefeed+%28The+Monkey+Cage%29&utm_content=Google+Reader>

Lynn Vavreck has an informative piece on the New York Times Campaign Stops blog today tracing shifts in presidential voting intentions from late 2011 through early September. The data are from the Cooperative Campaign Analysis Project, which interviewed nearly 44,000 people last December and has subsequently been reinterviewing 1,000 per week. (Top monkey John Sides is a collaborator in the CCAP study, and I received access to some of these data for an earlier Campaign Stops post that Vavreck and I wrote together.)¶ Through most of the spring and early summer, more than half of the survey respondents who were undecided last December were still declining to choose a candidate, with the rest breaking slightly for Mitt Romney over Barack Obama. Since around mid-June, more of these previously undecided voters have begun to commit, with Obama gaining and, in the last few weeks, surpassing Romney among those who were originally undecided. According to Vavreck, “These decisions seem largely to have been motivated by party identification.”¶ Meanwhile, both candidates have managed to retain the vast majority of prospective voters who supported them last December. Over the course of 2012, Obama has held 96% of those who supported him in 2011 and added 3% of those who originally said they would vote Republican. For his part, Romney has held 94% of those who intended to vote Republican and added 2% of those who intended to vote for Obama. (Vavreck notes that the 2008 CCAP study found almost as much stability in candidate preferences, with Obama holding 90% of his early supporters and John McCain holding 92% of his.)¶ To readers versed in election studies, these findings will seem very reminiscent of those from the first scholarly analysis of campaign effects: “conversion is, by far, the least frequent result and activation the second most frequent manifest effect of the campaign.” However, whereas Lazarsfeld and his colleagues in 1940 studied 600 prospective voters in Erie County, Ohio, Vavreck and her colleagues in 2012 have 44,000 nationwide. That’s real scientific progress.

#### DOD energy programs don’t link

Davenport 12

Coral Davenport, energy and environment correspondent for National Journal. Prior to joining National Journal in 2010, Davenport covered energy and environment for Politico, and before that, for Congressional Quarterly. In 2010, she was a fellow with the Metcalf Institute for Marine and Environmental Reporting. From 2001 to 2004, Davenport worked in Athens, Greece, as a correspondent for numerous publications, including the Christian Science Monitor and USA Today, covering politics, economics, international relations and terrorism in southeastern Europe. She also covered the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, and was a contributing writer to the Fodor’s, Time Out, Eyewitness and Funseekers’ guidebook series. Davenport started her journalism career at the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton, Massachusetts, after graduating from Smith College with a degree in English literature. National Journal, 2/10/12, White House Budget to Expand Clean-Energy Programs Through Pentagon, ProQuest

The White House believes it has figured out how to get more money for clean-energy programs touted by President Obama without having it become political roadkill in the wake of the Solyndra controversy: **Put it in the Pentagon**. While details are thin on the ground, lawmakers who work on both energy- and defense-spending policy believe the fiscal 2013 budget request to be delivered to Congress on Monday probably won't include big increases for wind and solar power through the Energy Department, a major target for Republicans since solar-panel maker Solyndra defaulted last year on a $535 million loan guarantee. But they do expect to see increases in spending on alternative energy in the Defense Department, such as programs to replace traditional jet fuel with biofuels, supply troops on the front lines with solar-powered electronic equipment, build hybrid-engine tanks and aircraft carriers, and increase renewable-energy use on military bases. While Republicans will instantly shoot down requests for fresh spending on Energy Department programs that could be likened to the one that funded Solyndra, many support alternative-energy programs for the military. "I do expect to see the spending," said Rep. Jack Kingston, R-Ga., a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, when asked about increased investment in alternative-energy programs at the Pentagon. "I think in the past three to five years this has been going on, but that it has grown as a culture and a practice - and it's a good thing." "If Israel attacks Iran, and we have to go to war - and the Straits of Hormuz are closed for a week or a month and the price of fuel is going to be high," Kingston said, "the question is, in the military, what do you replace it with? It's not something you just do for the ozone. It's strategic." Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who sits on both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said, "I don't see what they're doing in DOD as being Solyndra." "We're not talking about putting $500 million into a goofy idea," Graham told National Journal . "We're talking about taking applications of technologies that work and expanding them. I wouldn't be for DOD having a bunch of money to play around with renewable technologies that have no hope. But from what I understand, there are renewables out there that already work." A senior House Democrat noted that this wouldn't be the first time that the **Pentagon has been utilized to advance policies that wouldn't otherwise be supported**. "They did it in the '90s with medical research," said Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif., ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In 1993, when funding was frozen for breast-cancer research programs in the National Institutes of Health, Congress boosted the Pentagon's budget for breast-cancer research - to more than double that of the health agency's funding in that area. **Politically, the strategy makes sense**. Republicans are ready to fire at the first sign of any pet Obama program, and renewable programs at the Energy Department are an exceptionally ripe target. That's because of Solyndra, but also because, in the last two years, the Energy Department received a massive $40 billion infusion in funding for clean-energy programs from the stimulus law, a signature Obama policy. When that money runs out this year, a request for more on top of it would be met with flat-out derision from most congressional Republicans. Increasing renewable-energy initiatives at the Pentagon can also help Obama advance his broader, national goals for transitioning the U.S. economy from fossil fuels to alternative sources. As the largest industrial consumer of energy in the world, the U.S. military can have a significant impact on energy markets - if it demands significant amounts of energy from alternative sources, it could help scale up production and ramp down prices for clean energy on the commercial market. Obama acknowledged those impacts in a speech last month at the Buckley Air Force Base in Colorado. "The Navy is going to purchase enough clean-energy capacity to power a quarter of a million homes a year. And it won't cost taxpayers a dime," Obama said. "What does it mean? It means that the world's largest consumer of energy - the Department of Defense - is making one of the largest commitments to clean energy in history," the president added. "That will grow this market, it will strengthen our energy security." Experts also hope that Pentagon engagement in clean-energy technology could help yield breakthroughs with commercial applications. Kingston acknowledged that the upfront costs for alternative fuels are higher than for conventional oil and gasoline. For example, the Air Force has pursued contracts to purchase biofuels made from algae and camelina, a grass-like plant, but those fuels can cost up to $150 a barrel, compared to oil, which is lately going for around $100 a barrel. Fuel-efficient hybrid tanks can cost $1 million more than conventional tanks - although in the long run they can help lessen the military's oil dependence, Kingston said Republicans recognize that the up-front cost can yield a payoff later. "It wouldn't be dead on arrival. But we'd need to see a two- to three-year payoff on the investment," Kingston said. Military officials - particularly Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, who has made alternative energy a cornerstone of his tenure - have been telling Congress for years that the military's dependence on fossil fuels puts the troops - and the nation's security - at risk. Mabus has focused on meeting an ambitious mandate from a 2007 law to supply 25 percent of the military's electricity from renewable power sources by 2025. (Obama has tried and failed to pass a similar national mandate.) Last June, the DOD rolled out its first department-wide energy policy to coalesce alternative and energy-efficient initiatives across the military services. In January, the department announced that a study of military installations in the western United States found four California desert bases suitable to produce enough solar energy - 7,000 megawatts - to match seven nuclear power plants. And so far, those **moves have met with approval from congressional Republicans**. Even so, any request for new Pentagon spending will be met with greater scrutiny this year. The Pentagon's budget is already under a microscope, due to $500 billion in automatic cuts to defense spending slated to take effect in 2013. But even with those challenges, clean-energy spending probably won't stand out as much in the military budget as it would in the Energy Department budget. Despite its name, the Energy Department has traditionally had little to do with energy policy - its chief portfolio is maintaining the nation's nuclear weapons arsenal. Without the stimulus money, last year only $1.9 billion of Energy's $32 billion budget went to clean-energy programs. A spending increase of just $1 billion would make a big difference in the agency's bottom line. But it would probably be easier to tuck another $1 billion or $2 billion on clean-energy spending into the Pentagon's $518 billion budget. Last year, the Pentagon spent about $1 billion on renewable energy and energy-efficiency programs across its departments.

#### No regional escalation.

Maloney 7

(Suzanne, Senior Fellow – Saban Center for Middle East Policy, Steve Cook, Fellow – Council on Foreign Relations, and Ray Takeyh, Fellow – Council for Foreign Relations, “Why the Iraq War Won’t Engulf the Mideast”, International Herald Tribune, 6-28, <http://www.brookings.edu/views/op-ed/maloney20070629.htm>)

Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, [and] could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight.

#### No global escalation

Dyer 2

(Gwynne, former appointments to the Royal Military College Sandhurst and Oxford University, former member of three different armed services, Winter, "The Coming War," Queen's Quarterly, Expanded Academic ASAP)

All of this indicates an extremely dangerous situation, with many variables that are impossible to assess fully. But there is one comforting reality here: this will not become World War III. Not long ago, wars in the Middle East always went to the brink very quickly, with the Americans and Soviets deeply involved on opposite sides, bristling their nuclear weapons at one another. And for quite some time we lived on the brink of oblivion. But that is over. World War III has been cancelled, and I don't think we could pump it up again no matter how hard we tried. The connections that once tied Middle Eastern confrontations to a global confrontation involving tens of thousands of nuclear weapons have all been undone. The East-West Cold War is finished. The truly dangerous powers in the world today are the industrialized countries in general. We are the ones with the resources and the technology to churn out weapons of mass destruction like sausages. But the good news is: we are out of the business.

#### No nuclear escalation

Vause 4

(CNN analyst, 4/21, cnn.com)

The argument goes that the neighborhood has changed. Saddam Hussein is no longer a threat, Israel has peace treaties with Jordan and Egypt, and nuclear weapons are no use against Palestinian terror attacks. After all, you can't nuke Bethlehem, without Israel being exposed to nuclear fallout. Those who want disarmament say Israel's very existence is no longer under threat, and they say the presence of an Israeli nuclear stockpile, real or perceived, is destabilizing because it promotes an arms race among Arab nations. "For us it really is a matter of to be or not to be. It is not a simple scope. And everyone that knows Israel knows that Israel is so far from being aggressive," says Peres.

### 2ac- Renewables DA

#### Only trades off with FF

Loudermilk 2011

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375>)

Pursuing a carbon-free world Realistically speaking, a world without nuclear power is not a world full of increased renewable usage, but rather, of fossil fuels instead. The 2007 Japanese Kashiwazaki-Kariwa nuclear outage is an excellent example of this, as is Germany’s post-Fukushima decision to shutter its nuclear plants, which, despite immense development of renewable options, will result in a heavier reliance on coal-based power as its reactors are retired, leading to a 4% increase in annual carbon emissions. On the global level, without nuclear power, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity generation would rise nearly 20% from nine to eleven billion tons per year. When examined in conjunction with the fact that an estimated 300,000 people per year die as a result of energy-based pollutants, the appeal of nuclear power expansion grows further.¶ As the world copes simultaneously with burgeoning power demand and the need for clean energy, nuclear power remains the one consistently viable option on the table. With this in mind, it becomes even more imperative to make nuclear energy as safe as possible, as quickly as possible—a capacity which SMRs can fill with their high degree of safety and security. Additionally, due to their modular nature, SMRs can be quickly constructed and deployed widely. While this is not to say that small reactors should supplant large ones, the US would benefit from diversification and expansion of the nation’s nuclear energy portfolio.

#### Key to renewables penetration

Loudermilk 2011

(Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Limitations of renewables Renewable energy technologies have made great strides forward during the last decade. In an increasingly carbon emissions and greenhouse gas (GHG) aware global commons, the appeal of solar, wind, and other alternative energy sources is strong, and many countries are moving to increase their renewable electricity generation. However, despite massive expansion on this front, renewable sources struggle to keep pace with increasing demand, to say nothing of decreasing the amount of energy obtained from other sources.¶ The continual problem with solar and wind power is that, lacking efficient energy storage mechanisms, it is difficult to contribute to baseload power demands. Due to the intermittent nature of their energy production, which often does not line up with peak demand usage, electricity grids can only handle a limited amount of renewable energy sources—a situation which Germany is now encountering. Simply put, nuclear power provides virtually carbon-free baseload power generation, and renewable options are unable to replicate this, especially not on the scale required by expanding global energy demands.¶ Small nuclear reactors, however, like renewable sources, can provide enhanced, distributed, and localized power generation. As the US moves towards embracing smart grid technologies, power production at this level becomes a critical piece of the puzzle. Especially since renewable sources, due to sprawl, are of limited utility near crowded population centers, small reactors may in fact prove instrumental to enabling the smart grid to become a reality.¶

#### Renewables fail

Forsberg 2011

(Charles Forsberg, executive director of the MIT Nuclear Fuel Cycle Study in the Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering at MIT and former Corporate Fellow at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 6, 2011, “What alternatives to nuclear energy?,” Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/nuclear-energy-different-other-energy-sources#rt8801>)

For those opposed to nuclear energy, the belief is that there are alternative energy sources -- a faith in alternatives, ironically, as strong as some of the early advocates for nuclear power in the 1950s. But no such options exist in a world that will soon have 10 billion people (see Forsberg, "Mutually Assured Energy Independence"). That fundamental reality dictates the need for nuclear energy.¶ Climate change, fossil fuels, and famine. We have fossil fuels; however, the burning of fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere with the potential for large changes in (1) climate and (2) pH (acidity) of water and soil. Both threaten agricultural productivity, because the changing climate moves agriculture to less productive soils. A consistent climate is critical in the formation of fertile soils -- a several-thousand-year process. Climate change also may entail rebuilding much of man’s infrastructure, which is designed for specific climate and sea-level conditions. Betting on fossil fuels is a high-risk strategy for world agriculture and food supplies. While carbon dioxide sequestration will work in a few locations, it's unlikely to be a universal solution.¶ Renewables: latitude counts. We live on a globe circling the sun that creates seasons. That reality means that renewable systems must address how to store energy on a daily, weekly, and seasonal basis. It also drives the design of future energy systems.¶ At MIT, we examined electricity-storage requirements for California assuming three energy futures: (1) all electricity produced by nuclear reactors operating at constant output, (2) all electricity produced by wind assuming California wind conditions and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) wind model, and (3) all electricity produced by solar using the NREL solar-trough model that includes limited energy storage. Table 1 shows the fraction of electricity that has to go into storage at times of excess electricity production to provide electricity when demand exceeds supply.¶ The hourly storage requirements were determined by using the hourly demand curves for electricity and the hourly electricity outputs of solar or wind or nuclear in California. The weekly storage requirements assumed that smart grids, pumped storage, and other technologies could result in each week having a uniform electricity demand, but different weeks have different electricity demands. It is thus a measure of the seasonal storage requirements that needs to be identified, assuming different energy sources with seasonal storage requirements measured in 10s to 100s of gigawatts per year depending upon the electricity prod uction technology.¶ Two-thirds of our electricity is base-load electricity; base-load nuclear energy has low electricity storage requirements. The storage requirements for solar and wind, however, are higher. In fact, the situation is even worse than indicated in Table 1, because the calculations assumed perfect storage systems. Real seasonal storage systems have just 50 percent efficiency but may ultimately increase to 70 percent. In other words, serious wind and solar energy initiatives require massive seasonal storage systems.¶ There are seasonal energy storage technologies being developed, such as nuclear-geothermal gigawatts per year and hydrogen systems. In a nuclear-geothermal energy storage system at times of low electricity demand, nuclear energy is used to heat a 500-meter cube of rock a kilometer or more underground to create an artificial geothermal heat source for peak power production. However, there is no way to insulate rock a kilometer underground. The heat losses are only a few percent on a large system but prohibitive in smaller systems -- that is, it is a technology that only couples to large-scale nuclear energy.¶ The potentially viable seasonal electricity storage technologies (including hydrogen) either couple to nuclear plants or involve synergistic combinations of nuclear and renewables -- but viable storage technologies do not couple efficiently to wind and solar. Renewable advocates point to Denmark and Germany -- countries whose wind systems depend upon Scandinavian hydro. However, there is not enough hydro worldwide to make a serious dent in the storage challenge. An all-renewables world will remain unaffordable -- even if the cost of renewables drop because of the larger challenge of energy storage to match production with demand.¶ Conclusions. Our energy challenge requires nuclear and renewables -- technologies that are complementary in many applications. Energy is over 10 percent of the global GNP, so economics matters because mankind needs more than energy to prosper. The risks of nuclear energy are small compared with the alternatives of oil wars, climate change, or unaffordable energy.

#### Can’t solve grid adv- andres and breetz

#### Nuke war turns warming- causes massive ozone and biosphere destruction and nuclear winter

#### The sun causes global warming – Mars proves

**National Geographic News 2007** Mars Melt Hints at Solar, Not Human, Cause for Warming, Scientist Says Kate Ravilious for National Geographic News February 28, 2007 <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/02/070228-mars-warming.html>

Simultaneous warming on Earth and Mars suggests that our planet's recent climate changes have a natural—and not a human-induced—cause, according to one scientist's controversial theory. Earth is currently experiencing rapid warming, which the vast majority of climate scientists says is due to humans pumping huge amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Mars, too, appears to be enjoying more mild and balmy temperatures. In 2005 data from NASA's Mars Global Surveyor and Odyssey missions revealed that the carbon dioxide "ice caps" near Mars's south pole had been diminishing for three summers in a row. Habibullo Abdussamatov, head of space research at St. Petersburg's Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory in Russia, says the Mars data is evidence that the current global warming on Earth is being caused by changes in the sun. "The long-term increase in solar irradiance is heating both Earth and Mars," he said. Solar Cycles Abdussamatov believes that changes in the sun's heat output can account for almost all the climate changes we see on both planets. Mars and Earth, for instance, have experienced periodic ice ages throughout their histories. "Man-made greenhouse warming has made a small contribution to the warming seen on Earth in recent years, but it cannot compete with the increase in solar irradiance," Abdussamatov said. By studying fluctuations in the warmth of the sun, Abdussamatov believes he can see a pattern that fits with the ups and downs in climate we see on Earth and Mars.

#### Empirics strongly confirm that there's no impact

Stampf 7 (Olaf, Staff Writer for Spiegel Online, “Not the End of the World as We Know It,” May 5th, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html)

Keeping a cool head is a good idea because, for one thing, we can no longer completely prevent climate change. No matter how much governments try to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, it will only be possible to limit the rise in global temperatures to about 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) by the end of the century. But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

### Counterplan

#### Conditionality

#### It skews the 2AC strategy because we can’t stick them to a single position. 2ac is key to aff strategy and all other speeches. Outweighs neg flex because they can always react in the block while we can’t catch up in the 1ar

#### Encourages argumentative irresponsibility because they’ll go for whatever we under covered, leading to poor advocacy skills. And it undercuts research depth which is key to topic education

#### Dispo solves their offense and allows to the aff to make strategic decisions against 1nc strat

#### Funding counteplans are a voting issue- skew the 2ac by forcing us to debate against the 1ac, almost huge amount of programs that be potentially cut makes it unpredictable and impossible to gain offense against

#### No link- no reason why plan trades off with modernization could come from somewhere else

#### Modernization budget will be cut now - Mandated cuts

Weisgerber 2/12

(Marcus Weisgerber of Defense News which is a global newsweekly on politics, business and technology of defense. Defense News serves an audience of senior military, government and industry decision-makers throughout the world “2013 DoD Modernization Budget Falls 7% Below Prior Projections” Feb. 12, 2012 - 11:36AM http://www.defensenews.com/article/20120212/DEFREG02/302120003/2013-DoD-Modernization-Budget-Falls-7-Below-Prior-Projections, TSW)

The Pentagon has proposed slashing its 2013 modernization budget more than 7 percent from its spending projections a year ago, according to a U.S. Defense Department document obtained by Defense News.¶ Funds used to buy and develop new weapons, projected to total $193.3 billion in February 2012, will fall to $178.8 billion, down $14.5 billion, in DoD’s 2013 spending request, which will be sent to Congress on Feb. 13.¶ The so-called modernization budget is the sum of the procurement and research-and-development accounts in both the base budget and overseas contingency operations budget.¶ A year ago, the Pentagon projected spending $117.6 billion and procurement and another $75.7 on research and development (R&D). The new plan calls for spending $109.1 billion on procurement and $69.7 billion on R&D efforts.¶ The decline is attributed to the Pentagon’s plan to cut $487 billion from planned spending projections over the next decade. The first five years of those savings, totaling about $259 billion, will be outlined in DoD’s 2013 budget proposal.¶ The Budget Control Act of 2011, designed to lower the U.S. government deficit, mandated these defense cuts.¶ In early January, the Pentagon unveiled new strategic guidance, which officials said would help shape the cuts to defense spending. That guidance, the product of a months-long review, call for DoD to focus more on the Pacific region, while maintaining a focus on the Middle East.¶ Since the Pacific is such a vast, maritime region, spending on the Navy and Air Force programs is expected to be higher than Army and Marine Corps efforts.¶ Still, the funds requested for major mission sectors, such as aircraft and shipbuilding, in 2013 is down from what DoD asked for in 2012.¶ The Pentagon is requesting $47.6 billion for aircraft programs, down from a $54 billion 2012 request. The shipbuilding request is more than $1 billion less than last year’s $24 billion request.¶ The 2013 request includes $10.9 billion for ground systems. In 2012, DoD asked Congress to approve $16 billion for this type of equipment.¶ DoD’s 2013 budget request includes $11.9 billion for science-and-technology-related R&D nearly the same amount the Pentagon asked for in 2012.

#### DOD budget is forced to be cut by 11% can’t save modernization - Sequestration Transparency Act

LOSEY and MEDICI 9/7

(STEPHEN LOSEY and ANDY MEDICI of Federal Times.¶ Now together with FederalTimes.com, the site that government managers rely upon for news and information about managing their staffs, the latest technology, and financial and career decisions, this invaluable news service offers more news at your fingertips.¶ We recognize that government executives have unique information needs. FederalTimes.com is fine-tuned to meet these needs. “White House misses sequestration deadline; DoD will see 11% cut” ¶ Sep. 7, 2012 - 09:25AM http://www.federaltimes.com/article/20120907/DEPARTMENTS01/309070001/White-House-misses-sequestration-deadline-59-DoD-will-see-11-cut?odyssey=tab%7Ctopnews%7Ctext%7CDepartments, TSW)

The Obama administration has missed a key deadline to submit a report on how it would implement $109 billion in across-the-board budget cuts scheduled to take effect Jan. 2.¶ The administration was supposed to send to Congress by Sept. 6 detailed information on every account that would be affected under sequestration, including how much money would be cut from every program, project and activity level.¶ But that day, the administration told Federal Times the report will come “late next week.” The administration said it needed more time to address the complex issues involved in planning for sequestration.¶ Washington is hungry for details on how the government plans to absorb these cuts, which are required by last year’s Budget Control Act unless Congress and the administration agree on a path to reducing budget deficits by $1.2 trillion through 2021. Congress last month passed the Sequestration Transparency Act mandating the report. But there have been few official details released so far.¶ Frank Kendall, undersecretary of Defense for acquisition, technology and logistics, said at a conference Sept. 5 that the Pentagon would have to cut 11 percent of its budget next year. And the across-the-board nature of these cuts would be “devastating,” he said, and leave the Defense Department with almost no flexibility.¶ Sequestration “doesn’t allow us to prioritize,” Kendall said, according to a Pentagon release. “It doesn’t allow us to find the things that are least important to us. It doesn’t allow us to avoid some of the damage that will be done by this kind of a mechanism.”¶ Kendall said any budget-cutting plan the Pentagon could prepare would be irrelevant.¶ “If we have a budget, there are roughly 2,500 lines in that budget, and we have cut each of them [by] about 11 percent,” Kendall said.¶ And because sequestration was designed to hit Defense and non-defense agencies’ budgets equally, other agencies also would likely face roughly 11 percent cuts next year.¶ The cuts would even hit the Pentagon’s war-fighting operations in Afghanistan, Kendall said. And they would be in addition to $487 billion in cuts the department is already making over the next decade.¶ Obama has said he plans to use what little flexibility exists in the sequestration rules to exempt military personnel from sequestration cuts, which will force the cuts to fall harder on other areas. About 108,000 Defense civilian employees could lose their jobs next year if sequestration takes effect, according to a report last month by the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.¶ On Sept. 6, the office of House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, posted a blog asking if Obama would comply with the transparency law and release the report on time.¶ “The administration has repeatedly ignored requests from Congress for sequester information, even as top officials admit the defense cuts the White House demanded — in an effort to ensure the president wouldn’t face another debt limit vote before the election — would jeopardize our national security,” Boehner’s office said. “Now it’s time for President Obama to obey the law he signed and tell the American people how he plans to implement (or replace) these devastating cuts.”

### No Impact – China military sucks

#### China doesn’t come close to US military

Chapman 2/19

(Steve Chapman writes a twice-weekly column on national affars, which is syndicated in some 50 newspapers across the country, and writes editorials on legal issues, economics, and foreign relations. He attended Harvard University, where he was on the staff of The Harvard Crimson, and graduated with honors in 1976. He has been a fellow at the American Academy in Berlin and the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, and has served on the Visiting Committee of the University of Chicago Law School. “China as the enemy: The dangers of exaggerating the threat” February 19, 2012 <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-02-19/news/ct-oped-0219-chapman-20120219_1_south-china-sea-beijing-current-trade-surrender>, TSW)

For one thing, it's no match for us militarily. The United States spends between two and nine times as much on defense as China. We have 11 aircraft carriers; they have one — which they bought, used, from Ukraine. We have nearly 3,700 modern combat aircraft to their 307.¶ "We don't view China as a direct threat," Vice Adm. Scott Van Buskirk, then the commander of the U.S. 7th Fleet, said last year. "To look at China through the lens of an adversary would be counterproductive."¶ It's true that China has been upgrading its defense forces. But that's what you would expect of a country that has gotten much richer in the past few decades.¶ It's also what you would expect of a country surrounded by neighbors with which it has had military conflicts — including Russia, Japan, India and Vietnam. Not to mention that it has 9,000 miles of coastline on the Pacific Ocean, which is effectively owned and operated by the U.S. Navy.¶ Like any normal regional power, China aspires to have some capacity to dictate to others rather than be dictated to. That ambition could bring it to blows with the United States over Taiwan or over free passage in the South China Sea.¶ Rising powers often collide with established powers, which means there is certainly potential for China to clash with the United States. But the two sides have proved able to peacefully manage their chief disagreement, Taiwan, decade after decade.¶

#### China military 20 years behind US – PLA general concedes

Xinhua 2/21

(Xinhua is the official press agency of the People's Republic of China and the biggest center for collecting information and press conferences in China. “Scholar disputes Jane's report on Chinese military” 2012-02-21 00:03:50 <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-02/21/c_131421249.htm>, TSW)

A Chinese military scholar on Monday disputed a global research group's report on China's defense budget growth, saying the motivation of the report was to play up China's military threat.¶ The IHS Jane's report said China's military budget will double by 2015, making it more than the rest of the Asia Pacific region's combined.¶ China's military spending will reach 238.2 billion U.S. dollars in 2015 compared with 119.8 billion in 2011, according to the report.¶ Li Zhaoxing, spokesman for the annual session of China's national legislature, announced in March last year that the country's defense budget in 2011 was 601 billion yuan (91.5 billion U.S. dollars), an increase of 12.7 percent from that of 2010.¶ China's defense budget in 2010 increased by 7.5 percent from that of 2009, according to official statistics.¶ Professor Ma Gang with the People's Liberation Army (PLA) National Defense University said the IHS Jane's report was sensational and lacked a rational and factual basis.¶ "The report's prediction that China's military budget will gain an annual increase of 18.75 percent in the upcoming five years was purely speculative," Ma said.¶ "The facts have proved that China's military budget increase has gone up and down over the past years and will not always keep growing fast," Ma said.¶ The Chinese government has repeated that its military budget increase over the past decade made up for restrained military construction in the 1980s.¶ According to China's official record, the country's military budget increase ratios in the past six years were 14.7 percent, 17.8 percent, 17.5 percent, 18.5 percent, 7.5 percent and 12.7 percent.¶ However, from 1979 to 1989, China's military spending had experienced an average annual decrease of 5.83 percent.¶ Chen Bingde, the PLA's Chief of the General Staff, has said that China's military hardware lagged 20 years behind that of the U.S. and other military powers.¶ China's military budget for 2011 accounted only 1.5 percent of the country's gross domestic product, in comparison with U.S.'s 4.8 percent and the U.K.'s 2.7 percent.¶ More over, the proportion of China's military budget in the country's total fiscal budget had dropped from 8.66 percent in 1998 to 6.94 percent in 2009.

#### Status quo naval forces and tech can keep the peace, even at reduced levels
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We propose reducing the Navy to eight carrier battle groups and six expeditionary strike groups. We would terminate the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program after four vessels, propose an alternative low-cost frigate or corvette in its place and cut the number of destroyers and submarines that the Navy operates. The Navy we would maintain is plenty capable given the dearth of current naval challengers and the strike power provided by modern carrier air wings. As Secretary of Defense Gates has noted, no enemy, or foreseeable combination of enemies, has the capability to challenge today’s Navy, on the seas or under them.13 This would remain the case even with the reduced Navy that we propose. Under a strategy of restraint, the Navy would operate as a surge force that deploys to fight, rather than attempting to stamp out trouble by maintaining a presence around the world. This force is more than sufficient for that purpose.