## Case

### A2: Fukushima Killed the industry

#### Japan policy shift increased development of SMRs in other countries

Commodities Now 9/15

(Since 1997 Commodities Now has been developing expertise and market connections to provide commodity market professionals and the wider investment community with dedicated research and intelligence on the commodity complex. “Japan's decision to abandon nukes” 15 September 2012 <http://www.commodities-now.com/reports/power-and-energy/12484-japans-decision-to-abandon-nukes.html>, TSW)

Japan’s decision to end nuclear power is a pragmatic and political one that in effect has pushed nuclear closures out 25 years. "By announcing this policy, Japanese utilities are now better poised politically to restart reactors closed following Fukushima, and to subsequently reduce the adverse environmental and financial burdens that have resulted from the country’s increase in fossil fuels,” according to Chris Gadomski, Lead Analyst, Nuclear, Bloomberg New Energy Finance.¶ “The future of the nuclear power industry does not lie within the Japanese market. Much more important markets are China, India, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East. Announcements to turn-away from nuclear in these markets would be much more detrimental to the industry.”¶ “Given the seismic history of Japan, as well as its population density of 336 people per square kilometer, expanding a nuclear infrastructure there makes less sense than doing so in geologically stable areas with low population densities. Northern Alberta, for example, has 1.2 people per kilometer, plenty of inexpensive natural gas, and is geologically much more stable. Exporting its natural gas to Japan to displace its nuclear capacity makes more sense.”¶ “Decisions by both Japan and Germany to wind down their respective nuclear infrastructure pose a challenge to the renewable industry. How well these technologies can respond without higher electricity prices and without increasing GHG emissions from stand-by and back-up fossil technologies will be closely scrutinized by politicians and industry alike.”¶ “The nuclear industry paradigm is changing for developed economies. Instead of large nuclear reactors, utilities will be more interested in small modular reactors § Marked 15:42 § that incorporate passive safety features, can better withstand seismic events, and more easily integrate into a utility’s load with increasing shares of renewable technologies. The Japanese policy shift may in fact speed commercial development of innovative small nuclear reactors,” says Gadomski.¶ According to Greenpeace Energy Campaigner Richard George, “Japan’s decision to pull the plug on nuclear power is a major vote of no confidence from another of the world’s leading economies, following Germany’s phase-out decision last year. This is an historic blow to an industry already in decline and makes a British nuclear renaissance even less likely.¶ "With costs spiralling and investor confidence at an all-time low, the Government’s plans to put new nuclear power at the centre of UK energy policy make no sense and should be abandoned. Hard-pressed households and businesses can’t afford to subsidise the nuclear industry’s failures. The Coalition should instead be investing in clean renewable energy to drive sustainable growth and jobs in the UK,” he added.

#### SMRs deployable soon

U.S. Department of Commerce International Trade Administration 11

(“The Commercial Outlook for¶ U.S. Small Modular Nuclear¶ Reactors” <http://www.trade.gov/publications/pdfs/the-commercial-outlook-for-us-small-modular-nuclear-reactors.pdf>, SEH)

Although SMRs have significant potential and ¶ the market for their deployment is growing, their ¶ designs must still go through the technical and ¶ regulatory processes necessary to ensure that ¶ they can be safely and securely deployed. Lightwater technology–based SMRs may not be ready ¶ for deployment in the United States for at least ¶ a decade, and advanced designs might be even ¶ further off**.** **Light-water SMRs and SMRs that have** ¶ **undergone significant testing are the most likely** ¶ **candidates for near-term deployment, because** ¶ **they are most similar to existing reactors that** ¶ **have certified designs and significant operating** ¶ **histories**. NuScale is on track to submit its reactor ¶ design to the NRC by 2012, as is Babcock & Wilcox ¶ for its mPower design. In addition, GE-Hitachi, ¶ which already completed an NRC preapplication ¶ review for its PRISM reactor in 1994, plans to submit its PRISM design for certification in 2012. ¶ With fierce competition for commercial deployment of U.S. SMRs anticipated, the U.S. government is accelerating its efforts to support the ¶ licensing of new reactor designs. The fiscal year ¶ 2011 budget request for the Department of Energy ¶ includes $39 million for a program to support ¶ design certification of SMRs for commercial deployment, as well as a research and development ¶ portfolio that will address the technology development needs of both near- and longer-term SMRs. ¶ **The Department of Energy is also in discussions** ¶ **with several U.S. companies to facilitate the lightwater SMR design certification by the NRC within** ¶ **a reasonable timeframe.** The department also ¶ continues to support research and development ¶ efforts toward advanced reactor designs through ¶ the Advanced Reactor Concepts program, which ¶ focuses on metal-cooled reactor technologies.

### A2: Timeframe Can’t get reactors

#### Current SMR technology is well established- Navy ships

Freed 10

(Josh, Director of the Third Way Clean Energy Program, Elizabeth Horwitz is a Policy Advisor at Third Way’s Clean Energy ¶ Program, Jeremy Ershow was formerly a Policy ¶ Advisor at Third Way, “Thinking Small On Nuclear Power” http://content.thirdway.org/publications/340/Third\_Way\_Idea\_Brief\_-\_Thinking\_Small\_On\_Nuclear\_Power.pdf, SEH)

The light water technology that current SMRs use is well-established; ¶ American manufacturers have designed and built small, light water reactors for ¶ 60 years to fuel the Navy’s carriers and submarines.¶ 29¶ While advanced reactor ¶ technology is further off, innovation is necessary to complete the transition to ¶ clean energy. Advanced reactor technologies are promising technologies that ¶ we need to invest in today

### A2: Terror up (Personnel)

#### Don’t have to have personnel – passive safety feature, and simplicity

IAEA, ‘5

(International Atomic Energy Agency, “Innovative small and medium sized reactors: Design features, safety approaches and R&D trends, May 2005,¶ <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1451_web.pdf>, accessed 8-1-12,)

In order to beat the economy of scale SMRs have to incorporate specific design features that result into simplification of the overall plant design, modularization and mass production. Several approaches are being under development and consideration, including the increased use of passive features for reactivity control and reactor shut down, decay heat removal and core cooling, and reliance on the increased margin to fuel failure achieved through the use of advanced high-temperature fuel forms and structural materials. Some SMRs also offer the possibility of very long core lifetimes with burnable absorbers or high conversion ratio in the core. These reactors incorporate increased proliferation resistance and may offer a very attractive solution for the implementation of adequate safeguards in a scenario of global deployment of nuclear power.

### A2: Terror up (Fuel)

#### Terrorists can’t steal fuel – can’t get to it

Taso, ‘11

(Firas Eugen Taso, “21st Century Civilian Nuclear Power and the Role of Small Modular Reactors”, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Tufts University, May 2011 http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/docview/877618836)

There are those who claim that SMRs will inherently be safer to operate and would reduce the risk of terrorism, proliferation and waste management. Since some will be buried underground, they would be less accessible to terrorists wishing to sabotage them or steal fuel, according to Roger Howsley. Since they are small, the redundant systems that are built into large plants can be simplified or reduced due to size and simplicity of design, and the operation and supervision made easier. As they are built in factories, they can be standardized and a new workforce can be trained to deal with safety of operation and emergencies, rather than sitespecific training as is done today. Finally, proliferation concerns are reduced since some of these reactors do not need to be refueled for their useful life, and others have longer and easier refueling cycles than existing plants. The waste issue remains, as SMRs would add to the total stock of waste worldwide, but since they are smaller and some may use reprocessed fuel, waste management for them will likely not altering the status quo on the waste issue.

## T

#### We meet – We buy over 130 SMRs more than doubling the current number of US reactors

#### SMRs solve waste – uses it

Szondy ‘12

(David Szondy is a freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington. An award-winning playwright, he has contributed to Charged and iQ magazine and is the author of the website Tales of Future Past. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” February 16, 2012 accessed online August 22, 2012 at http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

#### Counter Interp Financial incentives is one of the following which includes procurement

Webb 93

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

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

#### They don’t lose Spending and politics links they’re based on type of energy not financial incentives

#### Our interp is better for education

#### They over limit we lose core ground can’t do nuclear without procurement

#### Over limiting skews the topic Military affs and nuclear are the only way to leverage against the states CP

#### Isn’t limitless allows topical military affs

#### We have a clear predictable bright line

#### Prefer reasonability only so many financial incentives for nuclear power

#### T isn’t a voter

## CP

## Elections

#### Case outweighs

#### -Bioterror disease spread outweighs all your impacts that’s lilliefors ‘12

#### -Prolif outweighs destabilizes hot spots that’s Cimbala ‘08

#### -Heg solves all your impacts that’s Kagan ‘12

**Romney will win- factors**

Morris 9-14

Dick is a former advisor to Bill Clinton and Trent Lott, “Why Romney Will Win,” http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/09/14/why\_romney\_will\_win\_115452.html

Now that both conventions are over, the dimensions of the likely Romney triumph are becoming clear. Both through an analysis of the polling and an examination of the rhetoric, the parameters of the victory are emerging.¶ Start with the polling. It appears that **the bulk of the Obama post-convention bounce has been in blue states where his left-oriented convention stirred up the enthusiasm of an already committed group of voters. Among likely voters** identified **in The Washington Post poll** -- taken after the conventions -- **Obama holds a slim one-point edge**. And an analysis of Rasmussen's state-by-state likely voter data indicates a tie in the the battleground states. ¶ But it's not really a tie at all. **All pollsters are using 2008 models of voter turnout**. Some are combining '04 and '08 but skewing their samples to '08 numbers. African Americans cast 11 percent of the national vote in '04, but their participation swelled to 13 percent in '08. These 2 million new black voters backed Obama overwhelmingly. Will they come out in such numbers again? Will college and under 30 voters do so as well? Will Latino turnout be at historic highs? All these questions have to be answered "yes" for the polling samples so widely published to be accurate.¶ For example, **when a poll shows an Obama lead among likely voters of, say 47-45, it is based on an assumption that blacks will cast 13 percent of the vote**. But the lack of enthusiasm among **Obama's base for his candidacy and their doubts about the economy make an 11 percent black turnout more likely. In this event, Romney would actually win in this sample by 46-45**.¶ And then there is the enthusiasm gap. All recent polling suggests that Republican- and GOP-leaning Independents are 13 points more enthusiastic and following the race more closely than their Democratic counterparts. If the grassroots do their job, this will yield a stronger Romney vote.¶ Finally, when **every poll among every sample has Obama below 50 percent of the vote, it is most likely that the undecided have, in fact, decided not to back his re-election**.¶ But § Marked 15:48 § to crawl out of the statistical weeds, let's examine the state of the partisan dialogue. Former President Bill **Clinton made a huge blunder when he accepted the Republican challenge and flatly** -- and loudly -- **asserted that we are, in fact, better off than we were four years ago. Polls show that only about 33 percent of voters agree**, while close to half do not see the world that way.¶ Finally, both parties seemed happily to embrace the same formulation of the difference between them. Both agreed that the Republican Party is based on a philosophy of individual responsibility. Obama articulated it as, "You're on your own." Republicans put it differently: "We'll get government off your back." Democrats said theirs was a party that would lend you a hand.¶ Gallup measured these two options, and voters chose "leave me alone" over "lend me a hand" by 54-35.¶ Over the long haul, these are the questions that will dominate voting intentions. The function of the conventions is to formulate and articulate each party's view of the world. The fact that they were so similar and that each was willing to trust its fate to the question of, "Are you better off?" means that the Romney message will have a very strong advantage. The decision of the Democrats to embrace this choice and not to move to the center will make it impossible for them either to re-elect their president or to command a majority in the new Senate.

#### And Obama has already made a budget stance means any voters that would have switch already did.

#### SMRs publically popular – easier to explain safety features.

NEA ‘08

(Nuclear Energy Agency, “Why SMRs are being developed”, Brief 7,)

SMRs seem to respond well to these requirements, because they allow for design simplification and for introduction of new features, such as passive components and processes that avoid the need for early action by the operator in an abnormal situation. The design of some SMRs also makes it possible to set clearer and more precise safety criteria that may be easier for the public to understand, for example the exclusion of any possibility of a radioactive release to the environment. Some experts contend that the engineering principles are more readily explainable to the non-specialist, which should improve public acceptance.

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

Kramer ‘12

(David J. Kramer was educated at Tufts University, receiving his B.A. in Soviet Studies and Political Science, and then at Harvard University, receiving his M.A. in Soviet Studies. “Romney, Obama surrogates spell out candidates’ energy policies” September 2012 Accessed online at <http://www.physicstoday.org/resource/1/phtoad/v65/i9/p20_s10>)

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

#### DOD doesn’t Link – Agencies don’t affect agenda

Schoenbrod 94,

Prof., Law, New York Univ [David, Power Without Responsibility: How Congress Abuses the People through Delegation, p. 108)

Delegation allows for the president to avoid personal involvement in lawmaking; an appointee adopts the law, and, as discussed earlier, presidents frequently distance themselves from the controversial decisions of their appointees.

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

Bartles 9-21

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

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

**A2: Romney Kills**

**Relations inevitable under Romney – no policy change and co-op outweighs**

**CQ Weekly 9-10**

“U.S.-Russia Reset: From Diplomacy to Reset,”

President Obamaentered office pledging to “reset” America’s troubled relations with Russia. But despite some tangible successes, including a new nuclear arms reduction treaty and increased sanctions on Iran, Democrats on the campaign trail are hardly touting their breakthroughs with Moscow. Indeed, Republicans and their presidential nominee, Mitt Romney, have used relations with Russia as one of their few consistent foreign policy attack lines against the White House.¶ The campaign rhetoric reinforces what has been a reality for months: **The once-celebrated reset is over**, with Vladimir V. Putin’s recoronation as Russia’s president in May the most visible symbol. New **divisions over the Syrian uprising, Russia’s human rights record and missile defense** — combined with shifting political circumstances in both the United States and Russia **— have soured diplomacy between the two nations.**¶ **But overheated rhetoric** out of Moscow and Washington aside, the **two nations still have an incentive to cooperate on critical security and economic issues, including** the **Afghanistan** War **and trade**. Beyond the battle for the White House, how Congress balances collaboration on these issues with complaints about Putin’s heavy-handed policies will help determine just how frigid the relationship becomes. Republicans have promised to take a harder line with Russia if they win control of the Senate and the White House, but **as** GOP Sen. John **McCain** of Arizona **observes, it’s in nobody’s interest to “reignite the Cold War**.”¶ Now that Russia has joined the World Trade Organization, the renewed tension is playing out in the trade arena. Without legislation to normalize trade relations, U.S. companies are unable to take advantage of eased access to Russian markets. Republicans have urged the White House to lean on Democrats to support the necessary changes. House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp of Michigan, in announcing a June hearing on Russia’s accession to the WTO, said he wanted to see the “administration’s active engagement on all of the issues” related to U.S. trade with Russia.¶ The White House, however, wants to avoid an awkward public debate. “The House leadership was obviously goading Obama to come out and make more statements in support of the legislation,” says Carroll Colley, a Russia analyst at the Eurasia Group, a political-risk consulting company. However, with Putin at Russia’s helm, no politician “wants to step out and advocate anything vis-à-vis Russia” right now, he says.¶ Andrew Kuchins, director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies’ Russia program, agrees. “Russia’s just kind of a stinker right now,” Kuchins says, pointing to its widely criticized crackdown on the anti-Putin female punk band Pussy Riot and its continued support of strongman Bashar al-Assad’s bloody war against dissidents in Syria.¶ Russia’s recent actions have complicated the push in Congress to normalize trade relations, a high priority for both the U.S. business community and the Obama administration. To do so, Congress must remove Russia from a list of countries facing U.S. trade restrictions under the Jackson-Vanik amendment to a 1974 trade law. The amendment was intended to punish the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries for restricting Jewish emigration, an issue long since resolved.¶ On both the right and the left, critics of Russia’s human rights record have insisted that any legislation normalizing trade must include a component to penalize those who have violated human rights in Russia. The enormous anti-Putin political protests last fall and the ensuing government crackdown have only strengthened their hand.¶ To win the support of such critics, pro-trade House and Senate leaders have agreed to add language from a separate bill, named for the Russian lawyer and anti-corruption activist Sergei Magnitsky, who died in police custody in 2009. The bill would establish a freeze on the travel and assets of human rights violators from Russia or, in some versions, anywhere in the world. House leaders told the business community it would hold a vote on the trade normalization bill this week, but it’s not clear whether they have enough votes to win passage. The political sensitivity around anything that looks to be supporting Russia and Putin in the heat of campaign season may force a delay until after the election.¶ ‘Where They Park Their Cash’¶ Russians are eager to gain preferential trade status with the United States, but they’re irate about the language in the Magnitsky bill. The main concern in Moscow, according to Colley, is that Europe might adopt a similar law. “That’s where Russians vacation, and that’s where they park their cash,” he says. “This is a priority for them.”¶ Colley predicts considerable blowback from Moscow if the Magnitsky language becomes law. “It’s unclear how that will manifest itself,” he says, but he could imagine Russia making life difficult for American citizens who seek visas or for U.S. businesses that operate there.¶ The conflict in Syria is also a “big, big variable” in U.S. relations with Russia, Kuchins says. Members of Congress have, through various bills, blasted Russia’s continued support of Assad. For example, both chambers included language in their fiscal 2013 defense authorization bills that would bar funding for additional U.S. military purchases of Russian-made Rosoboronexport helicopters, which are used in Afghanistan, because that arms manufacturer also sells attack helicopters to the Assad regime.¶ One House-passed amendment to the fiscal 2013 Defense appropriations bill would go so far as to prohibit funds for nuclear nonproliferation activities with Russia unless Moscow demonstrates that it has worked to reduce weapons proliferation.¶ And after a short lull, missile defense is raising hackles in both capitals. The Obama administration tamped down a long-running dispute with Moscow on the subject when it announced, in 2009, alterations to U.S. plans for an anti-ballistic missile shield in Eastern Europe. In 2010, NATO kicked off talks with Russia on potential areas of cooperation on missile defense. Those talks, however, have stalled, and Russian saber rattling has increased; in recent months, Kremlin officials have publicly threatened to junk the New START pact and take military action if they don’t get their way.¶ In the United States, Republicans have made clear that missile defense is one of their priorities. The House in July passed an amendment to the defense policy bill that would prohibit funds from being used to share with Russia classified information about missile defense systems. Even if Obama is elected to another term, he may not have much flexibility in dealing with missile defense, given how closely GOP lawmakers are watching the issue. And if Republicans take over the White House, heightened confrontation with Russia on missile defense is a near-certainty.¶ Several Accomplishments¶ Despite the rising tensions, Obama’s approach to Russia “resulted in a number of agreements that served U.S. foreign and national security policy” over the past three years, Kuchins says. These include New START, a pact creating NATO transit corridors to Afghanistan through Russia and Moscow’s acquiescence to a strict new set of United Nations sanctions against Iran.¶ Those sanctions have yet to deter Iran from continuing its nuclear enrichment program. But as part of the “P5 plus one” — the group comprising the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany — Russia remains an active player in efforts to resolve the standoff diplomatically.¶ Also, Russia has a major incentive to help stabilize Afghanistan — which is more or less in its backyard — as NATO troops withdraw over the next two years.¶ And even though Republican congressional opposition makes new arms control agreements in the next few years unlikely, **GOP lawmakers have signaled that, should they take control of Congress and the White House, they aren’t particularly interested in curbing existing treaties**. **Under those pacts, Russia and the United States continue to work together to destroy and safeguard nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.**¶ Richard G. Lugar, the Senate’s retiring arms control sage, recently visited Russia, Georgia and Ukraine to observe some of those efforts. He is pushing for the United States and Russia to extend what is known as the “umbrella agreement,” an executive initiative that underpins the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, in which the United States and the former Soviet Republics work together to dismantle excess weapons of mass destruction. (The program is also known as Nunn-Lugar, after the Indiana Republican and his former colleague Sen. Sam Nunn, a Georgia Democrat.)¶ The agreement, which has been extended before, expires in 2013. Lugar says that “a good number of other deadly weapons of mass destruction” — which the United States is ready to help Russia destroy — remains.¶ He worries that the increasingly heated rhetoric between Washington and Moscow could hamper such cooperation. Quoting retired diplomat Thomas R. Pickering, Lugar notes that the two countries have “been sort of kicking each other in the shins” in recent months. “The problem is, if there is too much kicking in the shins and so forth, people become unhappy with each other,” he says.¶ “Taking the perspective of the safety of the American people or the safety of the world, we better move past that,” Lugar adds. “The missiles we saw being cut up are not theoretical.”

### A2: Changes Policy

**Romney won’t change Russian policy**

NYT 7/28

(New York Times, Peter Baker, “Romney and Obama Strain to Show Gap on Foreign Policy”, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/29/us/politics/obama-and-romney-strain-to-assert-foreign-policy-differences.html?pagewanted=all)

Mr. **Romney has called Russia “our No. 1 geopolitical foe” and declared** Mr. **Obama’s effort to improve relations a failure.** Mr. Romney promises to challenge Mr. Putin’s authoritarianism. **But he has not suggested cutting off cooperation between the countries’ space programs or counterterrorism agencies, nor shutting down the Afghanistan supply route** through Russia negotiated by Mr. Obama. **He supports Mr. Obama’s drive to normalize trade relations, though with a human rights amendment** the president initially resisted.¶ Mr. **Romney’s visit to Poland is intended to highlight what he called** Mr. **Obama’s “sudden abandonment o**f friends in Poland” under Russian pressure by canceling Mr. Bush’s missile defense program partly based there. **But** Mr. **Obama did not abandon missile defense altogether;** he substituted a reconfigured system devised by Mr. Bush’s last defense secretary.

### Russia Relations Defense

**Give Russia war zero probability – politics, military superiority, economic concerns, and nuclear security**

**Graham ‘07**

(Thomas, Russia in Global Affairs, "The dialectics of strength and weakness", <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/20/1129.html>, WEA)

An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when **Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability.** Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia.

## CAP K

#### Case outweighs and is a disad to the K –

**a) Cyber attacks are the number one threat to US security – extend ABC News ‘11 – only the plan will sponsor the provision of small nuclear reactors to prevent cyber attacks. Two impacts:**

**1) Cyber attacks will eventually draw the US into conflicts. That’s Gelinas ’10.**

**2) Stopping blackouts is necessary to prevent the grid from being vulnerable to terrorist attacks that will escalate to extinction due to bioweapons and retaliation. Extend Defense Science Board ‘8, Blair ‘12, Lilliefors ‘12, and National Strategy for Biosurveillance ‘12.**

**b) Without SMRs, the US loses its status as the leader in nuclear technology. Extend Loudermilk. US leadership is key to prevent nuclear proliferation. The impact is extinction as a result of great power wars and the escalation of regional conflicts.. Extend Cimbala ‘8, Kroenig ’12, and Kroenig ‘9.**

#### Conditional PICs abusive:

#### 1. They steal the 1ac- forces the entire debate to be about the net-benefit which we can’t link-turn because its our own aff and when we impact turn they can kick out of it- skewing 2ac strategy

#### 2. Reciprocity- the affirmative has one resolutional advocacy there’s no reason they should be able to defend part of the plan conditionally

#### 3. Unpredictable-shifts the focus of the debate from the topic-literature to whatever obscure part of the plan they PIC out of

#### 4. Contradictions are abusive- forces us to argue against ourselves in non-reciprocal ways while the get out of all external offense

#### 5. Voter for fairness

#### Perm: do both.

#### Perm: do the affirmative and the alternative in all other instances.

#### Capitalism is solving war

Peter T. Leeson, social change graduate research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason and a fellow at the James M. Buchanan Center for Political Economy, 8-22-2002, Chicago Sun-Times, “In America, capitalism is the great uniter,” p. 27, l/n

The world is a big place and home to innumerable customs, religions, tastes and personalities. Does our globe's unending diversity mean unending conflict between differing peoples? If one looks at America, it's obvious the answer is no. The United States may be the most ethnically, religiously and socially diverse nation in the world. Outside the Civil War, why hasn't our "melting pot" led us to wage war on each other? Because, unlike Afghanistan, America is the home of capitalism. And, as Nobel prize-winning economist Milton Friedman is fond of pointing out, capitalism creates peace. Contrary to the sentiments expressed by globalization protesters, capitalism is founded on the principle of peaceful exchange. In order to get what you want in a capitalist society, you must serve the interests of those you don't know. Similarly, those who desire what you have must serve you in return. Enabled by the market, people of different shapes and sizes realize the mutual gains made available through trade. Capitalism brings the Jew, the Gentile and the Muslim together through a common purpose--profits. The process of peaceful exchange that lies at the heart of the free market aligns the interests of otherwise unconnected people in their pursuit of the almighty dollar. Differences over religion, culture or tastes pose no obstacle. In order to generate personal wealth, differing people must peacefully interact with one another. Fighting, on the other hand, is costly and hurts the bottom line. Realizing this, capitalist countries just don't fight. New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman's "Golden Arches Theory of Peace" demonstrates this truth. No two countries with McDonald's restaurants have ever been at war with one another. In Afghanistan, however, things are different. There, government intervention prevents markets from doing what they do best--fostering peace and prosperity. When servicing others is no longer an option for getting what you want, pummeling others becomes the rule. To paraphrase the great 19th century political economist Frederic Bastiat, when goods don't cross boundaries (be they national, religious, or otherwise), guns do. Thus, while the Hamburgler remains a fictitious figure of fast food in the United States, he is a model of interaction for much of the Middle East. Jihad is more than a holy war--it is a war on the greatest source of prosperity the world has ever seen. Nations such as Afghanistan breed intolerance of diversity because they lack the uniting principle of private property and the profit motive. This intolerance not only destroys these nations internally; if left untreated, it spreads its ugly violence outside its borders, too.

#### The alt causes backlash and 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 § Marked 15:50 § 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.

#### Capitalism key to space

Blundell, director general of the Institute for Economic Affairs, 2004 (John, “Mission to Mars must go private to succeed,” February 2, http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=news&ID=166)

What we need is capitalists in space. Capitalism needs property rights, enforcement of contracts and the rule of law. The ideological tussle does not cease once we are beyond the ionosphere. With the exception of Arthur C Clarke, none of us imagined the entertainment potential from satellites. Geostationary lumps of electronic gadgetry beam us our BSkyB television pictures. I remain in awe that Rupert Murdoch can place a device in the skies above Brazil that sends a signal to every home in each hemisphere. Who could have foreseen that mobile phones could keep us chattering without any wiring, or that global position techniques could plot where we all are to within a metre? These are business applications. Business is already in space. Markets detect and apply opportunities that are not envisaged by even the most accomplished technicians. I’m not saying Murdoch has special competences. I imagine he is as baffled by digital miracles as I am. The point is that companies define and refine what public bodies cannot achieve. Lift the veil of course and all those satellite firms are an intricate web of experts supplying ideas and services. We have an infant space market. What use will the Moon be? Is there value on Mars other than the TV rights? The answer is nobody can know. We can only make some guesses. The Spanish ships that set off for the US thought they would get to India. The Portuguese knew they’d reach China. The English followed them westwards seeking gold. In fact, they got tobacco. Events always confound expectations. The arguments for putting men on Mars are expressly vague from President Bush. Perhaps he was really bidding for votes. From my reading the best results may be medical. Zero, or low, gravity techniques may allow therapies of which we are ignorant. It seems facetious to suggest tourism may be a big part of space opportunity but as both the North and South poles are over-populated and there is a queue at the top of Mount Everest, a trip to the Sea of Tranquility may prove a magnet for the wealthy. Instead of NASA’s grotesque bureaucracy it may be Thomas Cook will be a greater force for exploration. NASA could be a procurement body. It need not design and run all space ventures. It could sub-contract far more extensively. Without specialised engineering expertise it is not easy to criticise projects such as the shuttle. It seems to be excessively costly and far too fragile. There are private space entrepreneurs already. They are tiddlers up against the mighty NASA. Yet Dan Goldin, the NASA leader, says he favours the privatisation of space: "We can’t afford to do solar system exploration until we turn these activities over to the cutting edge private sector..."Some may say that commercialising portions of NASA’s functions is heresy. Others may think we are taking a path that will ruin the wonders of space. I believe that when NASA can creatively partner, all of humankind will reap the benefits of access to open space". Is it possible the Moon has a more noble future than merely a branch office of NASA? Is it tolerable that Mars could be a subsidiary of the USA? Could it be nominally a further state of the union? These are not silly questions. In time space will be defined by lawyers and accountants as property rights will need to be deliberated. One possibility may be that both environments are so hostile that Mars and the Moon will never be more than token pockets for humanity. On the evidence so far it is the orbiting satellites that have made us see the Earth through new eyes. We can survey and explore the planet better from 200 miles up than stomping on the surface. The emerging commercial body of space law is derived from telecommunications law. It is perplexing and contrary to our immediate senses. How can you own or exchange something as intangible as digital messages bouncing off satellites? Yet we all pay our mobile phone bills. Many of the business results of space exploration are unintended consequences of NASA’s early adventures. Computer development would probably have been slower but for the need for instrumentation for Apollo. Are there prospects for Scottish firms in space? The prizes will not go to only the mega corporations. Perhaps Dobbies, the Edinburgh garden centre group, can create new roses by placing pots beyond gravity. Edinburgh University laboratories, or rather their commercial spin offs, could patent new medicines. Is it possible the genetic magicians at the Bush could hitch a ride into space and extend their discoveries? NASA is a monopolist. All monopolies are bad for business. They only stunt opportunities. They blunt alternatives. By opening space to entrepreneurship we will be starting on what FA Hayek memorably describes as "a discovery procedure". Science is an open system. So is capitalism.

#### Space exploration key to solve multiple existential threats.

Pelton in ’03

 (Joseph, Director of the Space and Advanced Communications Research institute at George Washington University and Executive Director of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation, “COMMENTARY: Why Space? The Top 10 Reasons”, September 23, http://www.space.com/news/commentary\_top10\_030912.html)

Actually the lack of a space program could get us all killed. I dont mean you or me or my wife or children. I mean that Homo sapiens as a species are actually endangered. Surprising to some, a well conceived space program may well be our only hope for long-term survival. The right or wrong decisions about space research and exploration may be key to the futures of our grandchildren or great-grandchildren or those that follow. Arthur C. Clarke, the author and screenplay writer for 2001: A Space Odyssey, put the issue rather starkly some years back when he said: The dinosaurs are not around today because they did not have a space program. He was, of course, referring to the fact that we now know a quite largish meteor crashed into the earth, released poisonous Iridium chemicals into our atmosphere and created a killer cloud above the Earth that blocked out the sun for a prolonged period of time. This could have been foreseen and averted with a sufficiently advanced space program. But this is only one example of how space programs, such as NASAs Spaceguard program, help protect our fragile planet. Without a space program we would not know about the large ozone hole in our atmosphere, the hazards of solar radiation, the path of killer hurricanes or many other environmental dangers. But this is only a fraction of the ways that space programs are crucial to our future. He Continues… Protection against catastrophic planetary accidents: It is easy to assume that an erratic meteor or comet will not bring destruction to the Earth because the probabilities are low. The truth is we are bombarded from space daily. The dangers are greatest not from a cataclysmic collision, but from not knowing enough about solar storms, cosmic radiation and the ozone layer. An enhanced Spaceguard Program is actually a prudent course that could save our species in time.