### ASPEC

#### (\_\_) We Meet. We specify everything required by the resolution in the plan.

#### (\_\_) We Meet. We specify the USFG. Normal means is Congress passes, president signs, Supreme Court declines cert. if someone challenges the restrictions part of the aff, Executive agencies act for the incentives part of the aff.

#### (\_\_) Counter intep: “The” in front of USFG signals a proper name, the plan uses that name.

#### Now, Defense.

#### (\_\_) Cross-ex checks abuse. There’s no right to pre-cx agent spec.

#### (\_\_) No right to an agent CP.

#### (\_\_) No resolutional requirement for specification.

#### (\_\_) 2AC clarification is both legitimate and good. It’s a constructive speech and the 1AR is already too hard, eliminating 2AC clarification makes it impossible.

#### Now Offense.

#### (\_\_) O-spec is worse. Their interp legitimates the aff specifying to the agency level to fund the incentives, making DA and CP links impossible, given 10 different agencies that do energy restrictions.

#### (\_\_) Their interp is arbitrary. While the 1NC only demands a generic “branch” of the USFG, every argument they make could also justify the agency level specification.

#### (\_\_) Our interp increases neg ground, we now link to Congress, Executive, and Supreme Court DAs.

#### (\_\_) Their interp makes agent CP’s a central feature of the topic. That decreases the depth of education on energy restrictions. They should lose the round if they can’t win that agent CPs are uniquely good on this topic.

#### (\_\_) We're the heart of the topic—the plan is all the topical parts of the best solvency advocate. Their interp guts the best aff for coastal states. No abuse here, do some neg work.

### Immigration

**Budget fights outweigh---consumes agenda**

**Helderman 1/1** Rosalind S, "After a 'fiscal cliff' deal, what next?", 2013, www.washingtonpost.com/politics/after-a-fiscal-cliff-deal-what-next/2012/12/31/b9d9a452-5384-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_story.html?wprss=rss\_politics

**Assuming the deal is approved** by the House, **it will** nevertheless **give way to a nearly continuous series of fights that will consume the first part of the year, even as** President **Obama might hope to shift Congress’s attention to immigration** reform **and gun control**.¶ “**It’s become less** like **a** fiscal **cliffhanger and more like a journey over the fiscal mountains**,” said Rep. Jeff Fortenberry (R-Neb.).¶ **The next big deadline is likely to come around the end of February**, when the Treasury Department will exhaust the measures now in place **to extend the** nation’s $16.4 trillion **debt ceiling**. At that point, the government will not be able to pay its bills unless Congress votes to raise the nation’s legal borrowing limit.¶ **Republicans hope to use that** moment **to force Obama and congressional Democrats to agree to major spending cuts in return** for the increase — **in what could be a sequel to the contentious face-off over the debt limit in** the summer of **2011**.¶ Provided Monday’s deal is approved, **in** early **March would come another deadline: the $110 billion cut in spending**, half from the Pentagon, **delayed as part of this deal**.¶ **A month** or so **later** — on March 27 — **a short-term measure that funds government agencies will lapse. Without a renewal, the government will shut down, setting up another possible showdown**.¶ “**Round two’s coming**,” said Sen. Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.). “**And we’re going to have one hell of a contest about the direction and the vision of this country**.”¶ Many **Republicans believe they’ll have more leverage** then than they do now **because the debate over tax rates on the wealthy will be settled.**

**Gun fights thump**

**Price 1/3**

[Bob, Bob Price is a political commentator for TexasGOPVote.com. He is an expert about issues related to border security and illegal immigration. “Immigration Reform Program Announced by Obama Administration” <http://texasgopvote.com/issues/fix-immigration/immigration-reform-program-announced-obama-administration-004981>]

The order in which these two issues are addressed could have a lot to do with their outcome. **If the President pushes for gun control first, he will fire up many Democrats and nearly all Republicans** against him **at the expense of much political capital making immigration reform almost impossible** as a next step. However,  **if he pushes the immigration reform first, he may well re-awaken the Tea Party groups causing them to become mobilized** and activated which would further endanger any gun control legislation.

**Immigration reform won’t pass – Democratic strategy to intentionally fail**

**Munro 12/31/12**

(Neil Munro “Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest” 1:44 AM 12/31/2012 <http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/?print=1>, TSW)

**President Barack Obama promised** Dec. 30 **to introduce an immigration bill during 2013**, but activists on all sides of the debate are trying to understand his strategy.¶ He **may be gunning** **for** a **victory in the mid-term** elections by **introducing a bill** **so radical** that **it will spark** an emotional **controversy** from whites, which would then spur many angry Latinos to vote Democratic in the 2014 midterm elections, said Robert de Posada, former head of a GOP-affiliated group, The Latino Coalition.¶ “The word that I’ve heard from many, i**s [that he will] submit a very, very liberal plan that most Republicans will not support, that most southern and moderate Democrats will not support**,” he said.¶ **When the bill fails,** **“they can announce once again that they tried [and that Latinos] need to rally in the next election**,” said Posada, who helped President George W. Bush win 40 percent of the Latino vote in 2004, during the housing boom.¶

**Immigration reform won’t pass – not at the top of the docket, Obama focused on energy**

**Munro 12/31/12**

(Neil Munro “Obama promises new immigration plan but keeps endgame close to his vest” 1:44 AM 12/31/2012 <http://dailycaller.com/2012/12/31/obama-promises-new-immigration-plan-but-keeps-endgame-close-to-his-vest/?print=1>, TSW)

“I’ve said that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority,” he told interviewer David Gregory, who is now under police investigation for violating D.C. law by brandishing a 30-bullet magazine on his Dec. 23 show.¶ “I will introduce legislation in the first year to get that done,” Obama said.¶ “I think we have talked about it long enough. We know how we can fix it. We can do it in a comprehensive way that the American people support. That’s something we should get done.”¶ Gregory did not challenge any of Obama’s claims, nor did he question Obama about how his bill would impact the high unemployment rate among low-skilled Americans, especially African-Americans, in a an increasingly high-tech economy.¶ However, **Obama’s** language **suggested** that increased Latino **immigration is a lower priority** for him **than other measures, and that he’s concerned any revamp would fail because of** public **opposition**.¶ Many **previous** immigrationreform **bills** have **died when** leading **supporters** quietly **backed away amid** furious **public opposition** to what was perceived as an attempt at a general amnesty. In 2007, then-Sen. **Obama voted against a temporary-worker provision in a pending immigration bill, helping kill the overall legislatio**n.¶ During his first term as president, Obama declined to push a comprehensive immigration bill, despite promising such a revamp while on the 2008 campaign trail.¶ In his NBC interview, **Obama showed more enthusiasm about other priorities**.¶ “**We’ve got a huge opportunity around energy,**” he said, “**The most immediate thing I’ve got to do** … is make sure that taxes are not going up on middle class families,” he claimed. Another priority, he added, is “rebuilding our infrastructure, which is broken.”¶ Obama also touted his new project to counter gun-violence. “Anybody who was up in Newtown, who talked to the parents, who talked to the families, understands that, you know, something fundamental in America has to change … you know, that was the worst day of my presidency,” he told Gregory.¶ “I will put forward a very specific [anti-violence] proposal based on the recommendations that Joe Biden’s task force is putting together as we speak,” he said.¶

**No vote till June**

**Foley & Stein 1/2**/2013

(Elise & Sam, HuffPost writers, “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform_n_2398507.html> - Kurr)

It remains unclear what type of **immigration policies** the White House plans to push in January, but **turning them into law could be a long process**. Aides expect it will take about **two months to write a bipartisan bill, then another few months before it goes up for a vote, possibly in June**. A bipartisan group of senators are already working on a deal, although they are still in the early stages. **Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) will likely lead on the Democratic side in the House**. While many **Republicans have expressed interest in piecemeal reform, it's still unclear which of them plan to join the** push.

#### Plan’s popular- Bipart support

Pendidikan ‘11

Cinta writes for the Love and Like Education Blog, “Sanders is the Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research,” http://loveandlikeeducation.blogspot.com/2011/08/bernie-sanders-and-small-modular.html

Sanders is Sole Vote Against Small Modular Reactor Research¶ Bernie Sanders and Small Modular Reactors¶ Senator Bernie Sanders often speaks about his opposition to Vermont Yankee as having something to do with the age of the plant, the fact it is owned by Entergy, or his "state's rights" stance about regulating nuclear power plants.¶ Recently, however, Sanders made it clear that he is against nuclear power in any form and is proud of that opinion. On Senator Sanders website, he featured the fact that he was the only vote against "a pair of measures that would promote the development of small modular reactors."¶ One of these measures was the Nuclear Power Act S512. This act would authorize the Secretary of Energy to start a cost-shared program for development of small modular reactors (SMRs).¶ This act had strong bi-partisan support, being sponsored by 3 Republican and 4 Democratic Senators. The act requires research and development funds for SMRs. The Act is still in process, and does not have a firm dollar amount attached, but the dollar amount is likely to be small (in government terms, at least.). Current estimates are $100 million per fiscal year for four years, starting next year.¶ The act also requires that industry cost-share the expense. If industry doesn't think it is worth spending money on the research, the research will not receive government funding either.¶ As a background to the probable cost of this Act, we should note that President Obama requested $4.8 billion dollars for Department of Energy research, of which $3.2 billion is allocated for renewable energy and energy efficiency research. (This number has changed with the debt deal, but new numbers are not available at this time.)¶ Small Modular Reactors for The Future¶ Sander's opposition to this Nuclear Power Act will hurt America's chances to develop an important new exportable technology. Outside of Europe, the nuclear renaissance remains in full swing, with reactors being ordered and built in Arabia, China, India and Southeast Asia. Developing a strong set of SMR designs would be America's best chance to re-entering the world market for nuclear power.¶ SMRs are modular (assembled in a factory and delivered to the site), small (50 to 225 MW) and have many safety features, such as passive cooling. SMRs are expected to have a huge international market. They suitable for many places that do not have the population density or money for the current crop of huge reactors (1200 MW, built on site at great expense). SMRs would make nuclear power affordable and salable many places.¶ Westinghouse and Babcock & Wilcox have invested significant amounts of their own money in developing these products. The NRC is also active in assessing preliminary designs. At another Senate committee meeting on SMRs, Commissioner Magwood of the NRC said that he does not expect decisions made by the NRC to be the critical factor in the success or failure of SMRs. Magwood noted that SMRs have passive safety features and large water inventories; these would be considered during license review.¶ America Fallen Behind¶ America has fallen far behind the rest of the world in most nuclear technologies. Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) and Boiling Water Reactors (BWRs) were developed in this country. They are being sold all over the world, but not by United States companies. We're out of the running. Other countries licensed and improved our original technologies. Companies from France, Korea, Russia and China compete to build large reactors in China, Arabia, and Southeast Asia.¶ Three American companies have put millions of dollars into the development of SMRs: Westinghouse, Babcock & Wilcox, and NuScale (a small start-up). Many people in the nuclear industry feel that the race to develop the first successful SMR is a truly high-stakes race, being fought at the level of nationwide efforts. Luckily, SMR development has bi-partisan support, and Mr. Sanders was alone in his opposition to supporting American industry efforts to develop these plants.¶ Should Government Be Involved?¶ Of course, one can make a case that the government should get out of the energy research business altogether. If Senator Sanders wished to save tax dollars by cutting all energy-research programs, he might have a valid case. However, if the government does plan to spend money on energy research, cost-sharing with industry on a new nuclear technology is certainly a far better use of funds than many of the projects in the swollen DOE renewable budget.

#### DoD doesn’t link

**Appelbaum 12**

Binyamin, Defense cuts would hurt scientific R&D, experts say, The New York Times, 1-8, <http://hamptonroads.com/2012/01/defense-cuts-would-hurt-scientific-rd-experts-say>

Sarewitz, who studies the government's role in promoting innovation, said **the Defense Department had been** more successful **than other federal agencies because it is the** main user of the innovations that it finances**.** **The Pentagon, which spends billions** each year on weapons, equipment and technology, **has an** unusually direct stake in the outcome **of its** research and development **projects.**¶ "The central thing that distinguishes them from other agencies is that they are the customer," Sarewitz said. "You can't pull the wool over their eyes."¶ **Another factor is the Pentagon's relative insulation from politics, which has allowed it to sustain a long-term research agenda** in controversial areas**. No matter which party is in power,** **the Pentagon has continued to invest in clean-energy tech**nology, **for example,** in an effort to find ways to reduce one of its largest budget items, energy costs.

**Nuke lobby supports- guarantees bipart support**

**Samuelsohn ‘11** (Darren Samuelsohn, March 16, 2011, “Nuclear industry lobbyists' clout felt on Hill,” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0311/51367.html>)

Facing its biggest crisis in 25 years, the U.S. nuclear power industry can count on plenty of Democratic and Republican friends in both high and low places.¶ During the past election cycle alone, the Nuclear Energy Institute and more than a dozen companies with big nuclear portfolios have spent tens of millions of dollars on lobbying and campaign contributions to lawmakers in key leadership slots and across influential state delegations.¶ The donations and lobbying funds came at a critical moment for the nuclear industry as its largest trade group and major companies pushed for passage of a cap-and-trade bill.¶ While that effort failed, the money is sure to **keep doors open** on Capitol Hill as lawmakers consider any response to the safety issues highlighted by multiple nuclear reactor meltdowns in Japan in the aftermath of last week’s monster earthquake and tsunami.¶ “The bottom line is you’ve got a variety of industrial interests that care about nuclear power and have a heck of a lot of money to spend if their business and their bottom line is put in political jeopardy,” said Dave Levinthal, communications director at the Center for Responsive Politics. “As Congress is talking about potentially diving deeper, these companies bring a lot of resources and a heck of a lot of cash to bear if tDhis fight goes forward.”¶ NEI, the industry’s biggest voice in Washington, for example, spent $3.76 million to lobby the federal government and an additional $323,000 through its political action committee on a bipartisan congressional slate, including 134 House and 30 Senate candidates, according to data compiled by the CRP.¶ Alex Flint, NEI’s senior vice president for government affairs, said the spending is a byproduct of record high demand for his industry.¶ “The fact that the day after the election, both the president and [House Speaker John Boehner] said nuclear was an area where it’s something they can agree, it’s made us that much more in demand,” Flint said. “Our lobbying expenses have gone up more in large part because we have more people talking to more members of Congress.”

#### Winners win

Marshall and Prins ‘11

Bryan W. MARSHALL AND PRINS 11, Miami University, Department of Political Science AND Brandon C. PRINS, University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy, September 2011 “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Inﬂuence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, Presidential Studies Quarterly, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-5705.2011.03885.x/pdf, [Stolarski]

Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldﬁeld and Wildavsky 1989) Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

#### --Disad’s non-intrinsic to the plan - can pass the plan and vote to raise the pass \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ – rational decisionmaker calculus

#### --Introduction of the plan should have caused the link – controversy happens even if you vote neg

#### Political capital isn’t key

Dickinson 9 professor of political science at Middlebury College (Matthew, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” May 26, 2009 Presidential Power http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/]

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

### CP

**1. Perm do both**

**2. Court action would be unpopular leads to the disad**

**3. Doesn’t solve- DoD action key to be the first actor to spur the market, also makes sure SMR design is chosen by the DoD prevents unfavorable lockins keeping the military out of SMRs- that’s Loudermilk and Andres and Brets**

**4. Counterplan destroys plenary powers leads to extinction**

**SPIRO ‘2**

(Peter, Professor at Hofstra Law School, “Explaining the End of Plenary Power” 16 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 339, Winter, lexis)

Building on those two girders, one can describe how plenary power was generated by the international context from which it emerged. That context was historically characterized by the proto-anarchical nature of relations among states and the resulting need to centralize foreign policymaking in non-judicial institutions. Immigration policy inherently implicated foreign relations, and those relations were, up until recently, characterized by great instability and risk. In the late nineteenth century, nations still routinely made war on each other, for reasons of pure power projection; there was little in the way of a normative or institutional superstructure to act as a brake on conflict. That conflict posed a serious threat, not the least to the not-yet-superpower United States. In a world in which the use of force remained a legitimate means of extending state power, foreign relations were the ultimate high-stakes arena. The world that bore plenary power was also one that demanded unitary decisionmaking. In the face of potentially catastrophic downside risk, the state needed to centralize the formulation of foreign policy. The courts were least suited to assume that institutional task. As famously propounded in Curtiss-Wright, traditional foreign policymaking required speed, secrecy, and singular responsibility, qualities antithetical to judicial process. n42 Nor could the courts claim any substantive competence in the area. Foreign relations were an area that could not tolerate judicial freelancing. n43 In the worst scenario, a court would make the wrong call for want of accurate information and foreign policy expertise, leading us into conflict with another country with all the dangers such conflict posed. n44 Alternatively, the  [\*350]  courts would make their rulings and have them ignored by the political branches, diminishing critical institutional capital in the process. n45 Either way, there were powerful incentives for the courts to remain on the sidelines when it came to foreign relations.

**5. Agent counterplans steal the aff- destroys fairness**

**The CP is not textually competitive doesn’t garuntee DOD SMR adoption- which means it doesn’t solve any part of the AFF**

**CP devastates Court legitimacy**

**Hubbart 5**

(Phillip A., Adjunct Professor of Law, Former Judge – Third District Court of Appeal of Florida, Making Sense of Search and Seizure Law: A Fourth Amendment Handbook, p. 106)

Still, the framework of past Fourth Amendment decisions on a specific issue limits the choices that the Court can make in a given case, as the Court must necessarily make a reasoned case for accommodating the result it reaches in a way that logically appears within the scope of past case law. Stated differently, **as a practical matter no Court, no matter what its judicial philosophy, can rewrite the law announced in its past cases without losing public confidence. Theoretically, of course, it has the de jure power to do so by overruling, artificially distinguishing or outright ignoring its prior relevant cases, willy-nilly. But if it did so, it would bring upon itself an avalanche of public and professional criticism that it could not possibly withstand. Indeed, impeachment proceedings might very well follow. The doctrine of stare decisis necessarily means that the Court’s basic reasoning process must be deductive from, and therefore generally consistent with, its past relevant decisions**. Although this framework is somewhat flexible in nature, it clearly has its limits which, as a practical matter, restrict the Court’s decision-making process

**Causes terrorism**

**Shapiro 3**

(Jeremy, Associate Director and Research Associate – Brookings Institute, March “French Lessons: The Importance of the Judicial System in Fighting Terrorism <http://www.brookings.edu/fp/cusf/analysis/shapiro20030325.htm>)

**The unique nature of terrorism means that maintaining the appearance of justice and democratic legitimacy will be much more important than in past wars.** The terrorist threat is in a perpetual state of mutation and adaptation in response to government efforts to oppose it. The war on terrorism more closely resembles the war on drugs than World War II; it is unlikely to have any discernable endpoint, only irregular periods of calm. The French experience shows that ad-hoc anti-terrorist measures that have little basis in societal values and shallow support in public opinion may wither away during the periods of calm. **In the U.S., there is an enormous reservoir of legitimacy,** established by over 200 years of history and tradition**, in the judiciary. That** reservoir represents **an important asset that the U.S. government can profit from to maintain long-term vigilance in this type of war.**Despite the unusual opportunity for innovation afforded by the crisis of September 11, the U.S. government has not tried to reform American judicial institutions to enable them to meet the threat of terrorism. **To prevent the next wave of attacks,** however far off they might be, and to avoid re-inventing a slightly different wheel each time **will require giving life to institutions that can persist and evolve, even in times of low terrorist activity.** Given the numerous differences between the two countries, the U.S. cannot and should not simply import the French system, but it can learn from their mistakes. Their experience suggests a few possible reforms: A specialized U.S. Attorney tasked solely with terrorism cases and entirely responsible for prosecuting such cases in the U.S. Direct and formal links between that U.S. Attorney’s office and the various intelligence agencies, allowing prosecutors to task the intelligences agencies during judicial investigations Special procedures for selecting and protecting juries in terrorism cases and special rules of evidence that allow for increased protection of classified information in terrorist cases **Creating a** normal, civilian **judicial process that can** prosecuteterrorists and yet **retain legitimacy**is not merely morally satisfying. It **may** also **help to prevent terrorist attacks** in the long run. Not incidentally, it would demonstrate to the world a continuing faith in the ability of democratic societies to manage the threat of terrorism without sacrificing the very values they so desperately desire to protect.

**Obama gets blame for courts – election issue and Republican spin**

**Time, 9**

(“Obama's Supreme Move to the Center,” 1/26, <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,1818334,00.html>)

**When the Supreme Court issues rulings on hot-button issues** like gun control and the death penalty in the middle of a presidential campaign, **Republicans could be excused for thinking they'll have the perfect opportunity to paint their Democratic opponent as an out-of-touch social liberal**. But while Barack **Obama may be ranked as one of the Senate's most liberal members, his reactions to this week's controversial court decisions showed yet again how he is carefully moving to the center** ahead of the fall campaign. On Wednesday, after the Supreme Court ruled that the death penalty was unconstitutional in cases of child rape, Obama surprised some observers by siding with the hardline minority of Justices Scalia, Thomas, Roberts and Alito. At a press conference after the decision, Obama said, "I think that the rape of a small child, six or eight years old, is a heinous crime and if a state makes a decision that under narrow, limited, well-defined circumstances the death penalty is at least potentially applicable, that that does not violate our Constitution." Then Thursday, after Justice Scalia released his majority opinion knocking down the city of Washington's ban on handguns, Obama said in a statement, "I have always believed that the Second Amendment protects the right of individuals to bear arms, but I also identify with the need for crime-ravaged communities to save their children from the violence that plagues our streets through common-sense, effective safety measures. The Supreme Court has now endorsed that view." John McCain's camp wasted no time in attacking, with one surrogate, conservative Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas, calling Obama's gun control statement "incredible flip-flopping." McCain advisor Randy Scheunemann was even tougher in a conference call Thursday. "What's becoming clear in this campaign," Scheunemann said, is "that for Senator Obama the most important issue in the election is the political fortunes of Senator Obama. He has demonstrated that there really is no position he holds that isn't negotiable or isn't subject to change depending on how he calculates it will affect his political fortunes."  **Politicians are always happy to get a chance to accuse opponents of flip-flopping, but McCain's team may be more afraid of Obama's shift to the center than their words betray.** Obama has some centrist positions to highlight in the general election campaign on foreign policy and national security, social issues and economics. His position on the child rape death penalty case, for example, is in line with his record in Illinois of supporting the death penalty. He is on less solid ground on the gun ban as his campaign said during the primary that he believed the D.C. law was constitutional. A top legal adviser to Obama says both cases are consistent with his previous positions. "I don't see him as moving in his statements on the death penalty or the gun case," says Cass Sunstein, a former colleague of Obama's at the University of Chicago. Sunstein says Obama is "not easily characterized" on social issues, and says the Senator's support for allowing government use of the Ten Commandments in public, in some cases, is another example of his unpredictability on such issues. On the issue of gun control, he says Obama has always expressed a belief that the Second Amendment guarantees a private right to bear arms, as the court found Thursday. But Obama's sudden social centrism would sound more convincing in a different context. Since he wrapped up the primary earlier this month and began to concentrate on the independent and moderate swing voters so key in a general election, Obama has consistently moved to the middle. He hired centrist economist Jason Furman, known for defending the benefits of globalization and private Social Security accounts, to the displeasure of liberal economists. On Father's Day, Obama gave a speech about the problem of absentee fathers and the negative effects it has on society, in particular scolding some fathers for failing to "realize that what makes you a man is not the ability to have a child — it's the courage to raise one." Last week, after the House passed a compromise bill on domestic spying that enraged liberals and civil libertarians, Obama announced that though he was against other eavesdropping compromises in the past, this time he was going to vote for it. Whether Obama's new centrist sheen is the result of flip-flopping or reemphasizing moderate positions, the Supreme Court decisions have focused attention again on the role of the court in the campaign season. McCain himself is vulnerable to charges of using the Supreme Court for political purposes. Earlier this month, when the court granted habeas corpus rights to accused terrorist prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, McCain attacked the opinion in particularly harsh language, though advisers say closing the prison there is high on his list of actions to rehabilitate America's image around the world. Liberals are hoping that **despite Obama's moderate response to the Supreme Court decisions**, the issues alone will rally supporters to him. "**What both of these decisions say to me is that the Supreme Court really is an election-year issue**," says Kathryn Kolbert, president of People For the American Way. "We're still only one justice away from a range of really negative decisions that would take away rights that most Americans take for granted," she says. And **Obama's run to the center surely won't stop conservatives from using the specter of a Democratic-appointed Supreme Court to try to rally support**.

### AT Meltdown DA

#### No accidents

Loudermilk 11

(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, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs” Journal of Energy Security, May 2011, <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>)

Promoting safer nuclear power¶ The debate over nuclear energy over the years has consistently revolved around the central question “Is nuclear power safe?” Certainly, the events at Fukushima illustrate that nuclear power can be unsafe, however, no energy source is without its own set of some inherent risks on the safety front—as last year’s oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico or the long-term environmental consequences of fossil fuel use demonstrate—and nuclear power’s operating record remains significantly above that of other energy sources. Instead, accepting the role that nuclear energy plays in global electricity generation, especially in a clean-energy environment, a more pointed question to ask is “How can nuclear power be made safer?”¶ Although large reactors possess a stellar safety record throughout their history of operation, SMRs are able to take safety several steps further, in large part due to their small size. Due to simpler designs as a result of advancing technology and a heavy reliance on passive safety features, many problems plaguing larger and earlier generations of reactors are completely averted. Simpler designs mean less moving parts, less potential points of failure or accident, and fewer systems for operators to monitor. Additionally, small reactor designs incorporate passive safety mechanisms which rely on the laws of nature—such as gravity and convection—as opposed to human-built systems requiring external power to safeguard the reactor in the event of an accident, making the reactor inherently safer.¶ Furthermore, numerous small reactor concepts incorporate other elements—such as liquid sodium—as coolants instead of the pressurized water used in large reactors today. While sodium is a more efficient heat-transfer material, it is also able to cool the reactor core at normal atmospheric pressure, whereas water which must be pressurized at 100-150 times normal to prevent it boiling away. As an additional passive safety feature, sodium’s boiling point is 575-750 degrees higher than the reactor’s operating temperature, providing an immense natural heat sink in the event that the reactor overheats. Even should an accident occur, without a pressurized reactor no radiation would be released into the surrounding environment.¶ Even on the most basic level, small reactors provide a greater degree of security by merit of providing lower energy output and using less nuclear fuel. To make up for the loss in individual reactor generating capacity, small reactors are generally designed as scalable units, enabling the siting of multiple units in one location to rival the output capacity of a large nuclear plant. However, with each reactor housed independently and powering its own steam turbine, an accident affecting one reactor would be limited to that individual reactor.

#### No impact

Adams 12

Rod Adams 12, Former submarine Engineer Officer, Founder, Adams Atomic Engines, Inc., “Has Apocalyptic Portrayal of Climate Change Risk Backfired?”, May 2, <http://atomicinsights.com/2012/05/has-apocalyptic-portrayal-of-climate-change-risk-backfired.html?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AtomicInsights+%28Atomic+Insights%29>

Not only was the discussion enlightening about the reasons why different people end up with different opinions about climate change responses when presented with essentially the same body of information, but it also got me thinking about a possible way to fight back against the Gundersens, Caldicotts, Riccios, Grossmans and Wassermans of the world. That group of five tend to use apocalyptic rhetoric to describe what will happen to the world if we do not immediately start turning our collective backs on all of the benefits that abundant atomic energy can provide. They spin tall tales of deformed children, massive numbers of cancers as a result of minor radioactive material releases, swaths of land made “uninhabitable” for thousands of years, countries “cut in half”, and clouds of “hot particles” raining death and destruction ten thousand miles from the release point. Every one of those clowns have been repeating similar stories for at least two solid decades, and continue to repeat their stories even after supposedly catastrophic failures at Fukushima have not resulted in a single radiation related injury or death. According to eminent scientists – like Dr. Robert Gale – Fukushima is unlikely to EVER result in any measurable increase in radiation related illness. One important element that we have to consider to assess cancer risks associated with an accident like Fukushima is our baseline risk for developing cancer. All of us, unfortunately, have a substantial risk of developing cancer in our lifetime. For example, a 50-year-old male has a 42% risk of developing cancer during his remaining life; it’s almost the same for a 10-year-old. This risk only decreases when we get much older and only because we are dying of other causes. It’s true that excess radiation exposure can increase our cancer risk above baseline levels; it’s clear from studies of the survivors of the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of people exposed to radiation in medical and occupational settings, and of people exposed to radon decay products in mines and home basements. When it comes to exposures like that of Fukushima, the question is: What is the relative magnitude of the increased risk from Fukushima compared to our baseline cancer risk? Despite our fears, it is quite small. If the nuclear industry – as small and unfocused as it is – really wanted to take action to isolate the apocalyptic antinuclear activists, it could take a page from the effective campaign of the fossil fuel lobby. It could start an integrated campaign to help the rest of us to remember that, despite the dire predictions, the sky never fell, the predicted unnatural deaths never occurred, the deformations were figments of imagination, and the land is not really irreversibly uninhabitable for generations. The industry would effectively share the story of Ukraine’s recent decision to begin repopulating the vast majority of the “dead zone” that was forcibly evacuated after the Chernobyl accident. It would put some context into the discussion about radiation health effects; even if leaders shy away from directly challenging the Linear No Threshold (LNT) dose assumption, they can still show that even that pessimistic model says that a tiny dose leads to a tiny risk. Aside: My personal opinion is that the LNT is scientifically unsupportable and should be replaced with a much better model. We deserve far less onerous regulations; there is evidence that existing regulations actually cause harm. I hear a rumor that there is a group of mostly retired, but solidly credentialed professionals who are organizing a special session at the annual ANS meeting to talk about effective ways to influence policy changes. End Aside. Most of us recognize that there is no such thing as a zero risk; repeated assertions of “there is no safe level” should be addressed by accepting “close enough” to zero so that even the most fearful person can stop worrying. The sky has not fallen, even though we have experienced complete core meltdowns and secondary explosions that did some visible damage. Nuclear plants are not perfect, there will be accidents and there will be radioactive material releases. History is telling me that the risks are acceptable, especially in the context of the real world where there is always some potential for harm. The benefits of accepting a little nuclear risk are immense and must not be marginalized by the people who market fear and trembling.

### Russia Nuke Exports DA

**SMRs inevitable- question of timeframe and DOD adoption —DOE just massively increased payments for SMRs, but it fails.**

**DoD Energy Blog 11**

DoD Energy Blog, 2/16/11, Good Things in Small Packages:Small Reactors for Military Power Good Things in Small Packages:Small Reactors for Military Power, dodenergy.blogspot.com/2011/02/good-things-in-small-packagessmall.html

They conclude that **DOD should lead the charge for small reactors to meet their own needs as well as to make sure that the US leads that industry’s development**. When first written the paper mentioned that most of the technology was stymied somewhere between the drawing board and production. **But there is good news in the President’s 2011 Budget for nukes.** The New York Times reported that **the budget contains $500 million over five years for DOE to complete two designs and secure** National Regulatory Commission (NRC**) approval**. The reactors will be built entirely in a factory and trucked to the site, like “modular homes”. **Sounds just like what** Dr. **Andres ordered. Only problem is that $500 million is only about half of the cost to get to NRC approval. Actual production is in the $2 billion neighborhood, and that is a pricey neighborhood**. Enter Amory Lovins. Amory has often derided the cost for nuclear power as an unnecessary expenditure. His argument is that micropower is the way of the future, not big honking gigawatt nuclear power plants. **Although there has been a resurgence in the interest in nuclear power, it is still difficult to find private investments willing to underwrite the expense**. Maybe the development of small nukes for national security reasons will lead to cost effective small nukes for distributed micropower nationwide. Small reactors for FOBs are more problematic. Even Bagram only needs about 25 MW with other FOBS being smaller. Security will be the first concern. If someone tries a smash and grab at Fort Hood they have to go through a couple of armored divisions and have a long way to got to get away. Kabul to Peshawar is only 128 miles. Cost shouldn’t be an overriding factor in considering secure power, but even at a 75% cost reduction in production, half a billion for 25MW is a bit much. Of course if you could produce a 300MW system, Bagram could air condition Kabul! The real soft power. My buddy, T.C. the fighter pilot, would tell you that DOD's mission is to fight and win the Nation's wars, not spark business recovery. DOD needs to focus on conserving energy. “Reducing the consumption at Miramar by 50% might save a lot of fuel and money, but I'd rather reduce consumption by 50% at PB Jugroom even though the savings in gallons and dollars are tiny.” Reducing demand reduces risk. All that being said**, it may well be worth DOE and DOD efforts to explore the potential. It is something that may be beyond the means of commercial entities, but not government** (See China). **If there is going to be a market here, let us not be left behind as we have been with other alternative energy production means**.

**No reason why SMRs trade-off with the entire Russian nuclear exports market- the link evidence is terrible**

#### Rapid US SMR commercialization stops Russian market dominance- they’ll sell floating reactors globally

Ferguson 2010 (Dr. Charles D. Ferguson, President of the Federation of American Scientists, Adjunct Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University and Adjunct Lecturer in the National Security Studies Program at the Johns Hopkins University, May 19, 2010, Statement before the House Committee on Science and Technology for the hearing on Charting the Course for American Nuclear Technology: Evaluating the Department of Energy’s Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap, http://www.fas.org/press/\_docs/05192010\_Testimony\_HouseScienceCommHearing%20.pdf)

The United States and several other countries have considerable experience in building and operating small and medium power reactors. The U.S. Navy, for example, has used small power reactors since the 1950s to provide propulsion and electrical power for submarines, aircraft carriers, and some other surface warships. China, France, Russia, and the United Kingdom have also developed nuclear powered naval vessels that use small reactors. Notably, Russia has deployed its KLT-40S and similarly designed small power reactors on icebreakers and has in recent years proposed building and selling barges that would carry these types of reactors for use in sea-side communities throughout the world. China has already exported small and medium power reactors. In 1991, China began building a reactor in Pakistan and started constructing a second reactor there in 2005. In the wake of the U.S.-India nuclear deal, Beijing has recently reached agreement with Islamabad to build two additional reactors rated at 650 MWe.2¶ One of the unintended consequences of more than 30 years of sanctions on India’s nuclear program is that India had concentrated its domestic nuclear industry on building small and medium power reactors based on Canadian pressurized heavy water technology, or Candu-type reactors. Pressurized heavy water reactors (PHWRs) pose proliferation concerns because they can be readily operated in a mode optimal for producing weapons-grade plutonium and can be refueled during power operations. Online refueling makes it exceedingly difficult to determine when refueling is occurring based solely on outside observations, for example, through satellite monitoring of the plant’s operations. Thus, the chances for potential diversion of fissile material increase. This scenario for misuse underscores the need for more frequent inspections of these facilities. But the limited resources of the International Atomic Energy Agency have resulted in a rate of inspections that are too infrequent to detect a diversion of a weapon’s worth of material.3 The opening of the international nuclear market to India may lead to further spread of PHWR technologies to more states. For example, last year, the Nuclear Power Corporation of India, Ltd. (NPCIL) expressed interest in selling PHWRs to Malaysia.4 NPCIL is the only global manufacturer of 220 MWe PHWRs. New Delhi favors South-to-South cooperation; consequently developing states in Southeast Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and South America could become recipients of these technologies in the coming years to next few decades. Many of these countries would opt for small and medium power reactors because their electrical grids do not presently have the capacity to support large power reactors and they would likely not have the financial ability to purchase large reactors.¶ What are the implications for the United States of Chinese and Indian efforts to sell small and medium power reactors? Because China and India already have the manufacturing and marketing capability for these reactors, the United States faces an economically competitive disadvantage. Because the United States has yet to license such reactors for domestic use, it has placed itself at an additional market disadvantage. By the time the United States has licensed such reactors, China and India as well as other competitors may have established a strong hold on this emerging market.¶ The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission cautioned on December 15, 2008 that the “licensing of new, small modular reactors is not just around the corner. The NRC’s attention and resources now are focused on the large-scale reactors being proposed to serve millions of Americans, rather than smaller devices with both limited power production and possible industrial process applications.” The NRC’s statement further underscored that “examining proposals for radically different technology will likely require an exhaustive review” ... before “such time as there is a formal proposal, the NRC will, as directed by Congress, continue to devote the majority of its resources to addressing the current technology base.”6 Earlier this year, the NRC devoted consideration to presentations on small modular reactors from the Nuclear Energy Institute, the Department of Energy, and the Rural Electric Cooperative Association among other stakeholders.7 At least seven vendors have proposed that their designs receive attention from the NRC.8¶ Given the differences in design philosophy among these vendors and the fact that none of these designs have penetrated the commercial market, it is too soon to tell which, if any, will emerge as market champions. Nonetheless, because of the early stage in development, the United States has an opportunity to state clearly the criteria for successful use of SMRs. But because of the head start of China and India, the United States should not procrastinate and should take a leadership role in setting the standards for safe, secure, and proliferation-resistant SMRs that can compete in the market. Several years ago, the United States sponsored assessments to determine these criteria.9 While the Platonic ideal for small modular reactors will likely not be realized, it is worth specifying what such an SMR would be. N. W. Brown and J. A. Hasberger of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory assessed that reactors in developing countries must:¶ • “achieve reliably safe operation with a minimum of maintenance and supporting infrastructure;¶ • offer economic competitiveness with alternative energy sources available to the candidate sites;¶ • demonstrate significant improvements in proliferation resistance relative to existing reactor systems.”10¶ Pointing to the available technologies at that time from Argentina, China, and Russia, they determined that “these countries tend to focus on the development of the reactor without integrated considerations of the overall fuel cycle, proliferation, or waste issues.” They emphasized that what is required for successful development of an SMR is “a comprehensive systems approach that considers all aspects of manufacturing, transportation, operation, and ultimate disposal.”

#### Al Qaeda will attack floating SMRS- collapses more than half of global trade

Nitkin and Andreyev 2011 (Alexander Nikitin, former Russian submarine officer and nuclear safety inspector, and Leonid Andreyev, Bellona researcher and Doctor of Economics, 2011, “Floating nuclear power plants,” Bellona, http://www.bellona.org/filearchive/fil\_fnpp-en.pdf)

Physical security of nuclear sites plays an important role in advancing the goals of nuclear non- proliferation and in countering the threat of terrorism. This is why physical protection of floating nuclear power plants will be one of the critical issues in ensuring the safety of these facilities in the context of export deliveries. If this Russian technology is exported and put to use on an international scale, it must be guaranteed, first and foremost, that this activity would comply with the Treaty on the Non- Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT),xxiv as well as be in accordance with two IAEA documents – the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM)xxv and Nuclear Security Recommendations on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities.xxvi¶ Several reports have studied the possibilities of using floating nuclear power plants in Asia [16]. These reports point out that Southeast Asia is one of the world’s most troubling hot spots in terms of international terrorism – a given, to a large extent, of the particular geography of the region. This is where strategic international trade routes lie, along which between 200 and 600 commercial vessels pass daily, carrying crude oil and other hydrocarbon fues, as well as chemicals, exported and imported by Japan, China, South Korea, and other Asia-Pacific countries. This is also where important sea and air routes cross toward South Asia and the Middle East. In the UN’s estimates, up to 80 percent of the six billion tonnes of cargoes traded annually in the world is shipped by sea – and of that percentage, almost 75 percent is moved through one of the five shipping “pinch points” – the narrow waterways of the Panama and Suez Canals, the Strait of Gibraltar and the Strait of Hormuz, as well as the Strait of Malacca in Southeast Asia. The news agency World Net Daily has reported that the international militant Islamist network al-Qaeda has already managed to procure two dozen vessels for the group’s terrorist activities. Al-Qaeda, the World Net Daily said, may use its ships to take a cargo of deadly chemicals, or a so-called “dirty bomb” – a radiological weapon capable of dispersing radioactive material across a wide area by means of conventional explosives – or even nuclear weapons to a civilian port in order to carry out a terrorist attack there. These ships are, in essence, the suicide bombers of the terrorist future. Even without taking into account the ever-present piracy risks that the international shipping trade is facing daily, there is the real threat that the most important shipping routes and fairways may prove vulnerable to an attack by al-Qaeda or a like-minded group with close ties with it [12]. Indonesia and Malaysia, as countries that have, among other potential customers, already expressed an interest in Russia’s FNPP project, are of most concern in that regard, since a combination of their geography, the booming shipping trade along their coastlines, and other factors forms just such conditions that create a considerable risk of terrorist attacks at sea. This risk is compounded, furthermore, by the alarming statistics of pirate attacks in the region. For a floating nuclear power plant lying at anchor at its place of operation, the threat of falling prey to a pirate or terrorist attack and its crew being captured for ransom, or to use as hostages in a negotiation, is very real – and so is the risk that the nuclear materials or radioactive waste on board may also be hijacked in the process for use in further criminal activities. Analyses have shown that operating a floating nuclear power plant in the waters off the shores of the island states of Indonesia and Malaysia may not just be unsafe for those countries and their closest neighbours, but may also pose a global risk. Should a terrorist attack scenario be carried out successfully and the nuclear vessel captured, with the nuclear materials and/or radioactive waste on board falling into the wrong hands, these materials may then be used to perpetrate criminal acts elsewhere in the world. Additionally, the reports that examine the prospects of operating floating nuclear power plants in the Asia-Pacific region also mention the dangers and risks that arise in case of an outbreak of armed hostilities on the territory of the customer country.

#### They have the capability

Lawlor 2011 (Major General Bruce Lawlor, served on the White House’s Homeland Security Council and was the first chief of staff for the Department of Homeland Security and currently director with Virginia Tech's Simulation and Decision Informatics Laboratory, December 15, 2011, “The Black Sea: Center of the nuclear black market,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, http://thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-black-sea-center-of-the-nuclear-black-market)

Harvard's Project on Managing the Atom has published a comprehensive report on this threat, combining several well-known facts to create an unsettling picture. First, several terrorist groups, particularly Al Qaeda, have been trying to get their hands on a nuclear weapon for years. Osama bin Laden referred to it as a "religious duty" and embraced the idea of an American Hiroshima. Al Qaeda operatives have consulted with nuclear experts, tested conventional explosives for use in nuclear bombs, and attempted to purchase working nuclear devices. There is nothing to suggest that bin Laden's death has ended this quest. Second, the Harvard study notes that if a sophisticated terrorist group acquired sufficient weapon-grade material, it would be able to build at least a crude, gun-type atomic bomb (WMD Commission, 2005). A nuclear device of this type wouldn't be transported to the target by a sophisticated delivery system; its more likely delivery mode would be a rental truck. Third, although terrorist groups may not be able to manufacture the plutonium or weapon-grade uranium to make a crude bomb, it is not beyond their ability to buy or steal it. And fourth, nuclear smuggling is very difficult to combat. Globalization, huge profit margins, and organized crime have created a multibillion-dollar illicit-trafficking market that is producing ever more sophisticated methods of keeping contraband from being discovered. Nuclear contraband has become a part of that illicit market.

#### Causes sustained shut-down of trade, spurs protectionism and collapses the global economy

Richardson 2004 (Michael Richardson, former Asia Editor of the International Herald Tribune and a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2004, “A Time Bomb for Global Trade,” google books)

A nuclear 9/11 would make the World Trade Center attacks look like a warning shot. It would be impossible to calculate the economic costs, because there is no way to calculate how long it would take for citizens to recover the confidence they need to spend and invest. The public would assume that if the terrorists had one nuclear weapon, they could get another. If they would use it in one city, they would use it in another. If even one goes off, it’s hard to see how we would recover. We have to prevent it from happening- ever. Former US Senator and arms control expert, Sam Nunn, who co-chairs the Nuclear Threat Initiatve. The use of either a nuclear or powerful radiological bomb in a major port-city would cut the arteries of maritime commerce if it was believed to have come by sea. It would halt many of the world’s trade and severely damage the global economy, as governments scrambled to put in place extra security measures to proect their people, cities and economies. Such measures would be drastic and include: lengthy cargo inspections in the ports of the affected country, as well as in ports of nations that did extensive sea trade with it, or even the complete closure of ports for an indefinite period, while extra checks and safeguards were put in place to allay public anxiety.

#### Retaliation causes extinction

Ayson 2010 (Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, July 2010, “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response.

#### SMR’s solve warming

**Rosner et al. 11**

(Robert Rosner, Robert Rosner is an astrophysicist and founding director of the Energy Policy Institute at Chicago. He was the director of Argonne National Laboratory from 2005 to 2009, and Stephen Goldberg, Energy Policy Institute at Chicago, The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, Joseph S. Hezir, Principal, EOP Foundation, Inc., Many people have made generous and valuable contributions to this study. Professor Geoff Rothwell, Stanford University, provided the study team with the core and supplemental analyses and very timely and pragmatic advice. Dr. J’Tia Taylor, Argonne National Laboratory, supported Dr. Rothwell in these analyses. Deserving special mention is Allen Sanderson of the Economics Department at the University of Chicago, who provided insightful comments and suggested improvements to the study. Constructive suggestions have been received from Dr. Pete Lyons, DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; Dr. Pete Miller, former DOE Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy; John Kelly, DOE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Reactor Technologies; Matt Crozat, DOE Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Vic Reis, DOE Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary for Science; and Craig Welling, DOE Deputy Office Director, Advanced Reactor Concepts Office, as well as Tim Beville and the staff of DOE’s Advanced Reactor Concepts Office. The study team also would like to acknowledge the comments and useful suggestions the study team received during the peer review process from the nuclear industry, the utility sector, and the financial sector. Reviewers included the following: Rich Singer, VP Fuels, Emissions, and Transportation, MidAmerican Energy Co.; Jeff Kaman, Energy Manager, John Deere; Dorothy R. Davidson, VP Strategic Programs, AREVA; T. J. Kim, Director—Regulatory Affairs & Licensing, Generation mPower, Babcock & Wilcox; Amir Shahkarami, Senior Vice President, Generation, Exelon Corp.; Michael G. Anness, Small Modular Reactor Product Manager, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Matthew H. Kelley and Clark Mykoff, Decision Analysis, Research & Technology, Westinghouse Electric Co.; George A. Davis, Manager, New Plant Government Programs, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Christofer Mowry, President, Babcock & Wilcox Nuclear Energy, Inc.; Ellen Lapson, Managing Director, Fitch Ratings; Stephen A. Byrne, Executive Vice President, Generation & Transmission Chief Operating Officer, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; Paul Longsworth, Vice President, New Ventures, Fluor; Ted Feigenbaum, Project Director, Bechtel Corp.; Kennette Benedict, Executive Director, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist; Bruce Landrey, CMO, NuScale; Dick Sandvik, NuScale; and Andrea Sterdis, Senior Manager of Strategic Nuclear Expansion, Tennessee Valley Authority. The authors especially would like to acknowledge the discerning comments from Marilyn Kray, Vice-President at Exelon, throughout the course of the study, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power”, <http://epic.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/SMRWhite_Paper_Dec.14.2011copy.pdf>, November 2011, LEQ)

As stated earlier, SMRs have the potential to achieve **significant greenhouse gas emission reductions**. They could provide alternative baseload power generation to facilitate the retirement of older, smaller, and less efficient coal generation plants that would, otherwise, not be good candidates for retrofitting carbon capture and storage technology. They could be deployed in regions of the U.S. and the world that have less potential for other forms of carbon-free electricity, such as solar or wind energy. There may be technical or market constraints, such as projected electricity demand growth and transmission capacity, which would support SMR deployment but not GW-scale LWRs. From the on-shore manufacturing perspective, a key point is that the manufacturing base needed for SMRs can be developed domestically. Thus, while the large commercial LWR industry is seeking to transplant portions of its supply chain from current foreign sources to the U.S., the SMR industry offers the potential to establish a large domestic manufacturing base building upon already existing U.S. manufacturing infrastructure and capability, including the Naval shipbuilding and underutilized domestic nuclear component and equipment plants. The study team learned that a number of sustainable domestic jobs could be created – that is, the full panoply of design, manufacturing, supplier, and construction activities – if the U.S. can establish itself as a credible and substantial designer and manufacturer of SMRs. While many SMR technologies are being studied around the world, a strong U.S. commercialization program can enable U.S. industry to be first to market SMRs, thereby serving as a fulcrum for export growth as well as a lever in influencing international decisions on deploying both nuclear reactor and nuclear fuel cycle technology. A viable U.S.-centric SMR industry would enable the U.S. to recapture technological leadership in commercial nuclear technology, which has been lost to suppliers in France, Japan, Korea, Russia, and, now rapidly emerging, China.

#### US-Russian relations are cyclical- prevents full relations collapse

Xing ‘12

[Li Xing, director for Russian studies at the School of Political Science and International Studies at Beijing Normal University. Interviewed by Ling Yi at the Global Times.

<http://www.globaltimes.cn/DesktopModules/DnnForge%20-%20NewsArticles/Print.aspx?tabid=99&tabmoduleid=94&articleId=709170&moduleId=405&PortalID=0> ETB]

Russia-US relations are constantly cyclical. As the US presidential election is coming this fall, the Obama campaign wants to show a tough attitude on Russia, which explains the finger-pointing about Russia's election earlier this year. But this will improve after the US election. Such high-level ties are always based on mutual interests. Russia has to expand economic cooperation with the US and the White House needs the Kremlin's support on international security issues such as Iran and Syria.

#### Russian leadership prevents relations boost and cooperation

Kramer 10

[David J. Kramer took the oath of office as Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor on March 21, 2008. From July 2005 to March of 2008, Mr. Kramer was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, responsible for Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, and Belarus affairs, as well as regional nonproliferation issues. Previously, he served in the Department of State Office of Policy Planning as a Professional Staff Member, and before that, was Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs. He also was Executive Director of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy in Washington. “Resetting US-Russian Relations: It Takes Two” The Washington Quarterly]

Backing down on missile defense and focusing on relations with Russia instead of its neighbors are two key points at the heart of recommendations from the so-called realist camp.26 In exchange for this approach of providing Russia with incentives, the realists argue, the United States can secure Russian cooperation on issues that truly matter such as Afghanistan, Iran, and North Korea. Central to this argument is that Russia and the United States have common national interests and can reach common understandings of how to address these challenges. The reality is that the current Russian leadership does not, for the most part, share U.S. interests or threat perceptions, to say nothing of U.S. values. As long as that is the case, extensive cooperation and significantly improved relations will be difficult to achieve.

#### Long timeframe for relations good impacts

Hart and Simes 09

Gary Hart is the Wirth Chair at the University of Colorado at Denver and is also a former Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado. Dmitri K. Simes is the publisher of The National Interest “The Road to Moscow.” National Interest, 08849382, May/Jun2009, Issue 101

Even the best American strategy is unlikely to produce breakthroughs .or the sudden transformation of our current near rivalry into a beautiful friendship. But pretending to cooperate with Russia, as we have done for almost two decades, is not a responsible course in the current troubled world. Especially if the help we need from Moscow on America's national-security priorities is not make-believe, but real.

#### Alt causes -- Can’t overwhelm the litany of issues.

- Color revolutions -NATO Expansion -Contest for Eurasia -Georgia -Caucuses

Bhadrakumar, ‘9

(Was a career diplomat in the Indian Foreign Service7/11/ p. http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central\_Asia/KG11Ag01.html

Three, does the reset itself, therefore, signify a change of policy or is it a mere change of rhetoric? Russian-American relations have plunged to their lowest point in a quarter of a century. The good part is that there are signs of the Obama administration doing some rethinking about the US's role in the contemporary world. But the difficult part is that US-Russia relations cannot **conceivably** begin from a clean slate. Simply put, far too much happened - US-sponsored "color revolutions" in Tbilisi and Kiev, continued expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) into the territories of the former Soviet republics, unrelenting contest for influence in Eurasia, US plans to deploy a missile defense system in Central Europe, conflict in the Caucasus, and so on.

### Cap K

**Framework: the affirmative must defend a topical plan, the negative must defend the status quo or a competing policy option.**

**a) Best for real world education – our fw most closely resembles how policymakers decide on advocacy.**

**b) Fairness – our interp provides a clear way to compare two advocacies by weighing impacts which is essential to fairness. Their fw makes opportunity cost impossible and invites judge intervention.**

**c) Predictability – our fw ensures predictable aff ground because we predict args based upon our aff literature.**

#### d) Infinitely regressive – there are an infinite number of philosophical perspectives

#### Perm- do plan and the alt

#### Perm- do the alt

#### Case outweighs- plan prevents extinction in the short term, their impacts are about structural collapse decades away. Prefer solvency for specific scenarios over miniscule risk that voting neg breaks down capitalism. War makes the alt impossible- cant rethink the global economy while countries are fighting over resources in south china sea

#### Existence comes first

Kacou 8

Amien. WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: there is pleasure in all consciousness of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, it is simply the very experience of liking things, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, there are many things the experience of which we like. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that life has some objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

#### The alt causes transition wars

Anderson 1984. professor of sociology – UCLA, ’84 (Perry, In the tracks of historical materialism, p. 102-103)

That background also indicates, however, what is essentially missing from his work. How are we to get from where we are today to where he point us to tomorrow? There is no answer to this question in Nove. His halting discussion of “transition” tails away into apprehensive admonitions to moderation to the British Labor Party, and pleas for proper compensation to capitalist owners of major industries, if these are to be nationalized. Nowhere is there any sense of what a titanic political change would have to occur, with what fierceness of social struggle, for the economic model of socialism he advocates ever to materialize. Between the radicalism of the future end-state he envisages, and the conservatism of the present measures he is prepared to countenance, there is an unbridgeable abyss. How could private ownership of the means of production ever be abolished by policies less disrespectful of capital than those of Allende or a Benn, which he reproves? What has disappeared from the pages of The Economics of Feasible Socialism is virtually all attention to the historical dynamics of any serious conflict over the control of the means of production, as the record of the 20th century demonstrates them. If capital could visit such destruction on even so poor and small an outlying province of its empire in Vietnam, to prevent its loss, is it likely that it would suffer its extinction meekly in its own homeland? The lessons of the past sixty-five years or so are in this respect without ambiguity or exception, there is no case, from Russia to China, from Vietnam to Cuba, from Chile to Nicaragua, where the existence of capitalism has been challenged, and the furies of intervention, blockade and civil strife have not descended in response. Any viable transition to socialism in the West must seek to curtail that pattern: but to shrink from or to ignore it is to depart from the world of the possible altogether. In the same way, to construct an economic model of socialism in one advanced country is a legitimate exercise: but to extract it from any computable relationship with a surrounding, and necessarily opposing, capitalist environment—as this work does—is to locate it in thin air.

#### That causes extinction

Kothari 1982

Kothari, profrssor of political science – University of Delhi, ‘82

(Rajni, Towards a Just Social Order, Alternatives, p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification ofthe old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for eventual global holocaust.

#### Transition fails—causes war—consumption would reemerge even worse—try or die assessments are wrong

Monbiot 9

George Monbiot. 2009. The Guardian, Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?, www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change

I detect in your writings, and in the conversations we have had, an attraction towards – almost a yearning for – this apocalypse, a sense that you see it as a cleansing fire that will rid the world of a diseased society. If this is your view, I do not share it. I'm sure we can agree that the immediate consequences of collapse would be hideous: the breakdown of the systems that keep most of us alive; mass starvation; war. These alone surely give us sufficient reason to fight on, however faint our chances appear. But even if we were somehow able to put this out of our minds, I believe that what is likely to come out on the other side will be worse than our current settlement.¶ Here are three observations: 1 Our species (unlike most of its members) is tough and resilient; 2 When civilisations collapse, psychopaths take over; 3 We seldom learn from others' mistakes.¶ From the first observation, this follows: even if you are hardened to the fate of humans, you can surely see that our species will not become extinct without causing the extinction of almost all others. However hard we fall, we will recover sufficiently to land another hammer blow on the biosphere. We will continue to do so until there is so little left that even Homo sapiens can no longer survive. This is the ecological destiny of a species possessed of outstanding intelligence, opposable thumbs and an ability to interpret and exploit almost every possible resource – in the absence of political restraint.¶ From the second and third observations, this follows: instead of gathering as free collectives of happy householders, survivors of this collapse will be subject to the will of people seeking to monopolise remaining resources. This will is likely to be imposed through violence. Political accountability will be a distant memory. The chances of conserving any resource in these circumstances are approximately zero. The human and ecological consequences of the first global collapse are likely to persist for many generations, perhaps for our species' remaining time on earth. To imagine that good could come of the involuntary failure of industrial civilisation is also to succumb to denial. The answer to your question – what will we learn from this collapse? – is nothing.

#### Capitalism is the most ethical system

C. Bradley Thompson. 1993. BB&T Research Professor at Clemson University and the Executive Director of the Clemson Institute for the Study of Capitalism “Socialism vs. Capitalism: which is the moral system”On Principle, v1n3 October 1993

The intellectuals’ mantra runs something like this: In theory socialism is the morally superior social system despite its dismal record of failure in the real world. Capitalism, by contrast, is a morally bankrupt system despite the extraordinary prosperity it has created. In other words, capitalism at best, can only be defended on pragmatic grounds. We tolerate it because it works. Under socialism a ruling class of intellectuals, bureaucrats and social planners decide what people want or what is good for society and then use the coercive power of the State to regulate, tax, and redistribute the wealth of those who work for a living. In other words, socialism is a form of legalized theft. The morality of socialism can be summed-up in two words: envy and self-sacrifice. Envy is the desire to not only possess another’s wealth but also the desire to see another’s wealth lowered to the level of one’s own. Socialism’s teaching on self-sacrifice was nicely summarized by two of its greatest defenders, Hermann Goering and Bennito Mussolini. The highest principle of Nazism (National Socialism), said Goering, is: "Common good comes before private good." Fascism, said Mussolini, is " a life in which the individual, through the sacrifice of his own private interests…realizes that completely spiritual existence in which his value as a man lies." Socialism is the social system which institutionalizes envy and self-sacrifice: It is the social system which uses compulsion and the organized violence of the State to expropriate wealth from the producer class for its redistribution to the parasitical class. Despite the intellectuals’ psychotic hatred of capitalism, it is the only moral and just social system. Capitalism is the only moral system because it requires human beings to deal with one another as traders--that is, as free moral agents trading and selling goods and services on the basis of mutual consent. Capitalism is the only just system because the sole criterion that determines the value of thing exchanged is the free, voluntary, universal judgement of the consumer. Coercion and fraud are anathema to the free-market system. It is both moral and just because the degree to which man rises or falls in society is determined by the degree to which he uses his mind. Capitalism is the only social system that rewards merit, ability and achievement, regardless of one’s birth or station in life. Yes, there are winners and losers in capitalism. The winners are those who are honest, industrious, thoughtful, prudent, frugal, responsible, disciplined, and efficient. The losers are those who are shiftless, lazy, imprudent, extravagant, negligent, impractical, and inefficient. Capitalism is the only social system that rewards virtue and punishes vice. This applies to both the business executive and the carpenter, the lawyer and the factory worker. But how does the entrepreneurial mind work? Have you ever wondered about the mental processes of the men and women who invented penicillin, the internal combustion engine, the airplane, the radio, the electric light, canned food, air conditioning, washing machines, dishwashers, computers, etc.? What are the characteristics of the entrepreneur? The entrepreneur is that man or woman with unlimited drive, initiative, insight, energy, daring creativity, optimism and ingenuity. The entrepreneur is the man who sees in every field a potential garden, in every seed an apple. Wealth starts with ideas in people’s heads. The entrepreneur is therefore above all else a man of the mind. The entrepreneur is the man who is constantly thinking of new ways to improve the material or spiritual lives of the greatest number of people. And what are the social and political conditions which encourage or inhibit the entrepreneurial mind? The free-enterprise system is not possible without the sanctity of private property, the freedom of contract, free trade and the rule of law. But the one thing that the entrepreneur values over all others is freedom--the freedom to experiment, invent and produce. The one thing that the entrepreneur dreads is government intervention. Government taxation and regulation are the means by which social planners punish and restrict the man or woman of ideas. Welfare, regulations, taxes, tariffs, minimum-wage laws are all immoral because they use the coercive power of the state to organize human choice and action; they’re immoral because they inhibit or deny the freedom to choose how we live our lives; they’re immoral because they deny our right to live as autonomous moral agents; and they’re immoral because they deny our essential humanity. If you think this is hyperbole, stop paying your taxes for a year or two and see what happens. The requirements for success in a free society demand that ordinary citizens order their lives in accordance with certain virtues--namely, rationality, independence, industriousness, prudence, frugality, etc. In a free capitalist society individuals must choose for themselves how they will order their lives and the values they will pursue. Under socialism, most of life’s decisions are made for you. Both socialism and capitalism have incentive programs. Under socialism there are built-in incentives to shirk responsibility. There is no reason to work harder than anyone else because the rewards are shared and therefore minimal to the hard-working individual; indeed, the incentive is to work less than others because the immediate loss is shared and therefore minimal to the slacker. Under capitalism, the incentive is to work harder because each producer will receive the total value of his production--the rewards are not shared. Simply put: socialism rewards sloth and penalizes hard work while capitalism rewards hard work and penalizes sloth..