# 2AC

## Case

#### Disease can wipe out species – newest study proves

Viegas ‘12

(Jennifer Viegas of Discovery News. “Christmas Island Rats Wiped Out by Disease” Nov. 5, 2008 accessed online August 26, 2012 at http://dsc.discovery.com/news/2008/11/05/rat-extinct-disease-print.html)

Disease can wipe out an entire species, reveals a new study on rats native to Australia's Christmas Island, which fell prey to "hyperdisease conditions" caused by a pathogen that led to the rodents' extinction.¶ The study, published in the latest issue of the journal PLoS One, presents the first evidence for extinction of an animal entirely because of disease.¶ The researchers say it's possible for any animal species, including humans, to die a out in a similar fashion, although a complete eradication of Homo sapiens would be unlikely.¶ "I can certainly imagine local population or even citywide 'extinction,' or population crashes due to introduced pathogens under a condition where you have a pathogen that can spread like the flu and has the pathogenicity of the 1918 flu or Ebola viruses," co-author Alex Greenwood, assistant professor of biological sciences at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Va., told Discovery ¶

## AT States

#### Perm do both

#### Links as much to politics as the plan

#### Don’t solve

#### States can’t force DoD policy

#### States don’t have legal authority over military bases- they are enclaves

Tymkovich 12

(Seymour, Circuit Judge, “ALLISON v. BOEING LASER TECHNICAL SERVICES” <http://www.leagle.com/xmlResult.aspx?xmldoc=In%20FCO%2020120810042.xml&docbase=CSLWAR3-2007-CURR>, SEH)

Under a body of constitutional law applicable to federal enclaves, U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 17, state law that is adopted after the creation of the enclave generally does not apply on the enclave. A federal enclave is created when a state cedes jurisdiction over land within its borders to the federal government and Congress accepts that cession. These enclaves include numerous military bases, federal facilities, and even some national forests and parks. Federal enclave doctrine operates as a choice of law doctrine that dictates which law applies to causes of action arising on these lands.¶ It is well-established that after a state has transferred authority over a tract of land creating a federal enclave, the state may no longer impose new state laws on these lands. But state laws enacted before the cession continue to apply unless Congress specifically overrides them. The question here is whether state common law causes of action recognized after the state ceded the enclave to the federal government are available on federal enclaves. This question is governed by a long string of Supreme Court precedent that makes it clear that the law on a federal enclave is the state law that governed the land at the time the federal government established the enclave, not state law enacted thereafter—unless that law was expressly adopted by the enclave's new sovereign, the federal government.

#### 50 state fiat is bullshit- steals the aff moots literature

## EPA

### Should” Not Competition

#### Should means “ought”

American Heritage Dictionary 10

[“should,” date last modified, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should]

Should 1. simple past tense of shall.¶ 2. (used to express condition): Were he to arrive, I should be pleased.¶ 3. must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency): You should not do that.¶ 4. would (used to make a statement less direct or blunt): I should think you would apologize.

#### That means we just need to make a recommendation

American Heritage Dictionary 10

[“should,” date last modified, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should]

Used to express probability or expectation: They should arrive at noon.

#### Resolved is before the colon and not in the plan text

Webster’s 2k

(Guide to Grammar and Writing, http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm)

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter

#### resolved means to decide

Princeton Wordnet 10

[“resolved,” date last modified, http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=resolved]

S: (v) purpose, resolve (reach a decision) "he resolved never to drink again"

#### Substantially

Dictioanry.com

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/substantial>

1. of ample or considerable amount, quantity, size, etc.: a substantial sum of money.

#### EPA fails at their job don’t follow their own regulations – lawsuits prove

Fimrite ‘11

(Peter Fimrite, Chronicle Staff Writer, “Suit says EPA fails to shield species from poisons” 4:00 a.m., Friday, January 21, 2011 <http://www.sfgate.com/green/article/Suit-says-EPA-fails-to-shield-species-from-poisons-2478117.php>, TSW)

Two environmental groups filed a lawsuit Thursday accusing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency of failing to prevent the pesticide poisonings of more than 200 endangered and threatened species, including the California condor.¶ The suit, filed in U.S. District Court in San Francisco by the Center for Biological Diversity and Pesticide Action Network North America, is the largest action brought against the EPA alleging pesticide poisoning of imperiled species.¶ The plaintiffs say EPA officials consistently ignored their obligation under the Endangered Species Act to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine whether pesticides being considered for registration were harming listed species or their habitat.¶ The failure to hold the formal consultations prevented anything from being done about widespread pesticide contamination of groundwater, drinking water and wildlife habitats throughout the country, according to Jeff Miller, conservation advocate for the Center for Biological Diversity.¶ "For decades, the EPA has turned a blind eye to the disastrous effects pesticides can have on some of America's rarest species," Miller said. "This lawsuit is intended to force the EPA to follow the law and ensure that harmful chemicals are not sprayed in endangered species habitats."¶ Dale Kemery, the spokesman for the EPA, said the agency cannot comment on pending litigation.

#### The environment is indestructible

Easterbrook 95

Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation

**(**Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25)

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### Won’t cause extinction

Easterbrook ‘3

(Gregg, senior fellow at The New Republic, July, Wired Magazine, “We’re All Gonna Die!” <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we’re talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don’t measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn’t be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

#### 2AC AT Meltdowns- SMR’s are safe

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>, SEH)

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.

## Elections

### Nuclear reactors off coasts

### 2AC Uniqueness Slayer

#### Obama already pushed for SMR’s

New York Times 11

(Matthew L. Wald, “Administration to Push for Small ‘Modular’ Reactors” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/13/science/earth/13nuke.html?_r=3>, SEH)

The Obama administration’s 2012 budget proposal will include a request for money to help develop small “modular” reactors that would be owned by a utility and would supply electricity to a government lab, people involved in the effort say. The department is hoping for $500 million over five years, half of the estimated cost to complete two designs and secure the Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s approval. The reactors would be built almost entirely in a factory and trucked to a site like modular homes.¶ In promoting the reactor, the administration’s immediate goal is to help the Energy Department meet a federal target for reducing its carbon dioxide emissions by relying more on clean energy and less on gas and coal. Like other federal agencies, the department is required by an executive order to reduce its carbon footprint by 28 percent by 2020.

### 2AC Romney Supports

#### Romney can’t turn this into a win—he’s already come out in support of nuclear

Wood 9/13/12

Elisa, energy columnist for AOL, “What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy,” <http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/>, AM

Fossil fuels and renewable energy have become touchy topics in this election, with challenger Mitt Romney painting President Barack Obama as too hard on the first and too fanciful about the second – and Obama saying Romney is out of touch with energy's future. But two other significant resources, nuclear power and energy efficiency, are evoking scant debate. What gives? Nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of US electricity, and just 18 months ago dominated the news because of Japan's Fukushima Daiichi disaster – yet neither candidate has said much about it so far on the campaign trail. Romney mentioned nuclear power only seven times in his recently released white paper, while he brought up oil 150 times. Even wind power did better with 10 mentions. He pushes for less regulatory obstruction of new nuclear plants, but says the same about other forms of energy. Obama's campaign website highlights the grants made by his administration to 70 universities for research into nuclear reactor design and safety. But while it is easy to find his ideas on wind, solar, coal, natural gas and oil, it takes a few more clicks to get to nuclear energy. The Nuclear Energy Institute declined to discuss the candidates' positions pre-election. However, NEI's summer newsletter said that both "Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

### 2AC Link Turn

#### New Military Base Spending is popular

**Bloomberg 9/4**

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

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

### 2AC No I/L

#### Energy not key

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

### Agencies Don’t Link

#### Agencies avoid politics – empirically proven

Shane 95

Dean and Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh (Peter, “Political Accountability in a System of Checks and Balances: The Case of Presidential Review of Rulemaking”, 48 Ark. L. Rev. 161, 1995)

Such was the regulatory oversight system dedicated most faithfully to a categorical separation of powers philosophy that, in turn, was touted as advancing the cause of accountability. But even without careful parsing, the record suggests obvious accountability issues. First, it was the conclusion of the most extensive journalistic study of the Council that it intervened in "dozens of unpublicized controversies over important federal regulations, leaving what vice presidential aides call "no fingerprints' on the results of its interventions." 58 The White House's efforts to avoid public disclosure of its oversight activity took multiple forms: resisting FOIA disclosure of documents belonging to President Reagan's Task Force on Regulatory Relief on the ground that the Task Force (and, by implication, the Council) was not a covered "agency"; 59 resisting Congressional access to information about the Council beyond published fact sheets and the testimony of individuals who did not participate in Council deliberations; 60 keeping decisions at staff level to shield them from the greater publicity that would likely follow cabinet level involvement. 61 Intriguingly, only one Council decision - pressuring EPA on pollution permit modifications - ever escalated to actual presidential involvement; 62 the usual, albeit tacit, rule was to avoid appeals to the President wherever possible. 63 It would not seem unrealistic that behind this approach lay a desire to buffer the President from criticism for Council policies, especially given a campaign promise to be the "environmental president." 64 That would, of course, be the opposite of accountability

### This is dumb

#### 1. It's a non-falsifiable claim written for no reason other than web traffic

#### 2. It is NOT in Obama's character and HIGHLY unlikely

HEILBRUNN '12

http://nationalinterest.org/blog/jacob-heilbrunn/obamas-october-surprise-bombing-iran-7285

But as Romney calls for "any and all measures" to stop Iran, Obama surely could deflate his sails by launching a strike in October. If it worked, he would be hailed as a hero. The consequences of a strike wouldn't be felt for at least a few weeks—the nightmare scenario is that an oil shock would result in a quadrupling of oil price, splunging the world into a new Great Depression. Enough time for Obama to sail back into office as a tough foreign-policy president. Given Obama's congenital caution and sobriety, he seems unlikely to follow such a course. But it should not be ruled out. The neocons may be closer to helping bring about an assault on Iran than even they realize. They've already captured Romney. But they may also be on the verge of capturing Obama. Their sustained campaign of pressure, in other words, may be more effective than anyone has acknowledged. For the fact is that Obama already has amply demonstrated his ruthlessness when it comes to confronting America's adversaries. If he were able to carry out regime change in Tehran, he might even start referring to himself as the new Decider.

#### Iranian military threat is overblown- any conflict would be limited

Luttwak 07

An American military strategist and historian who has published works on military strategy, history, and international relations. The Middle of Nowhere”. Edward Nicolae Luttwak. 5/26/07. Prospect Issue 134.)

Arab-Israeli catastrophism is wrong twice over, first because the conflict is contained within rather narrow boundaries, and second because the Levant is just not that important any more. The second repeated mistake is the Mussolini syndrome. Contemporary documents prove beyond any doubt what is now hard to credit: serious people, including British and French military chiefs, accepted Mussolini’s claims to great power status because they believed that he had serious armed forces at his command. His army divisions, battleships and air squadrons were dutifully counted to assess Italian military power, making some allowance for their lack of the most modern weapons but not for their more fundamental refusal to fight in earnest. Having conceded Ethiopia to win over Mussolini, only to lose him to Hitler as soon as the fighting started, the British discovered that the Italian forces quickly crumbled in combat. It could not be otherwise, because most Italian soldiers were unwilling conscripts from the one-mule peasantry of the south or the almost equally miserable sharecropping villages of the north. Exactly the same mistake keeps being made by the fraternity of middle east experts. They persistently attribute real military strength to backward societies whose populations can sustain excellent insurgencies but not modern military forces. In the 1960s, it was Nasser’s Egypt that was mistaken for a real military power just because it had received many aircraft, tanks and guns from the Soviet Union, and had many army divisions and air squadrons. In May 1967, on the eve of war, many agreed with the prediction of Field Marshal Montgomery, then revisiting the El Alamein battlefield, that the Egyptians would defeat the Israelis forthwith; even the more cautious never anticipated that the former would be utterly defeated by the latter in just a few days. In 1973, with much more drama, it still took only three weeks to reach the same outcome. In 1990 it was the turn of Iraq to be hugely overestimated as a military power. Saddam Hussein had more equipment than Nasser ever accumulated, and could boast of having defeated much more populous Iran after eight years of war. In the months before the Gulf war, there was much anxious speculation about the size of the Iraqi army—again, the divisions and regiments were dutifully counted as if they were German divisions on the eve of D-day, with a separate count of the “elite” Republican Guards, not to mention the “super-elite” Special Republican Guards—and it was feared that Iraq’s bombproof aircraft shelters and deep bunkers would survive any air attack. Now the Mussolini syndrome is at work over Iran. All the symptoms are present, including tabulated lists of Iran’s warships, despite the fact that most are over 30 years old; of combat aircraft, many of which (F-4s, Mirages, F-5s, F-14s) have not flown in years for lack of spare parts; and of divisions and brigades that are so only in name. There are awed descriptions of the Pasdaran revolutionary guards, inevitably described as “elite,” who do indeed strut around as if they have won many a war, but who have actually fought only one—against Iraq, which they lost. As for Iran’s claim to have defeated Israel by Hizbullah proxy in last year’s affray, the publicity was excellent but the substance went the other way, with roughly 25 per cent of the best-trained men dead, which explains the tomb-like silence and immobility of the once rumbustious Hizbullah ever since the ceasefire. It is true enough that if Iran’s nuclear installations are bombed in some overnight raid, there is likely to be some retaliation, but we live in fortunate times in which we have only the irritant of terrorism instead of world wars to worry about—and Iran’s added contribution is not likely to leave much of an impression. There may be good reasons for not attacking Iran’s nuclear sites—including the very slow and uncertain progress of its uranium enrichment effort—but its ability to strike back is not one of them. Even the seemingly fragile tanker traffic down the Gulf and through the straits of Hormuz is not as vulnerable as it seems—Iran and Iraq have both tried to attack it many times without much success, and this time the US navy stands ready to destroy any airstrip or jetty from which attacks are launched.

## AT IAEA DA

### IAEA Overwhelmed

#### Overwhelmed now – Japan does not even listen to the IAEA

Dagger 12

[Christine (Correspondent for Yahoo News) “Nuclear Disaster Planning: Japan, Tepco and the IAEA All Failed to Plan for a Possible Meltdown” Yahoo News, <http://voices.yahoo.com/nuclear-disaster-planning-japan-tepco-iaea-8089984.html>

It's easy of course for the layman - like me and a billion others - to criticise the IAEA, the Japanese government and Tepco with hindsight. Most of us will never have given a thought to Japan's nuclear power industry before March 11th 2011. On the other hand, it wasn't our job to do so. It's clear that the most pressing priority right now - 19th March - is to contain the nuclear disaster at Fukushima and to get emergency aid to hundreds of thousands of bereaved and homeless Japanese survivors of the earthquake and tsunami. But inevitably a spotlight is falling on the crucial lack of nuclear emergency disaster planning internationally, in Japanese government or in the Japanese nuclear power industry. That is, while international nuclear authorities and Japan introduced laws about building power plants in earthquake zones, and while they were subject to international regulations and inspections, no-one in authority seems to have addressed the critical question: What would we do if safety systems failed and we suddenly faced potential meltdown in reactors with cracked containers? When the pumps failed and the reactors, rods and spent fuel pools raised the question in emergency conditions, it was far too late to start planning. Hosing the reactors down with water and dumping seawater by helicopter were desperate on-the-hoof measures to try and avert catastrophe. By March 18th, the next desperate idea was to bury the reactors. But this was all improvisation in a nuclear emergency. No-one in a position of leadership, authority or responsibility knew what to do. Not the IAEA, not the Japanese government and not Tepco. The workers at Fukushima, battling with true heroism to cool the rods and reactors, bore the immediate brunt of that failure and it's not clear at time of writing what the eventual impact of the emergency will be on Japan or the wider world.

### SMRs Not Hurt IAEA

#### IAEA would work in early design stages – checks the impact

Campagna 10

[Mark, July, American Nuclear Society, “PHYSICAL SECURITY FOR SMALL MODULAR REACTORS” <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=6&ved=0CEYQFjAF&url=https%3A%2F%2Fsmr.inl.gov%2FDocument.ashx%3Fpath%3DDOCS%252FReading%2BRoom%252FPolicy%2Band%2Bregulation%252FANS%2BSMR%2BPHYSICAL%2BSECURITY%2B910.pdf&ei=pz5ZUJ8xg_jzBMmFgMgP&usg=AFQjCNFYkczfb8249GQAzntiS5tO_AAVPA&cad=rja> ]

Since SMRs are generally in the early stages of development, a significant opportunity exists to affect designs in a way that (1) minimizes the future need for either substantial security forces, excess engineered devices, and/or complex procedural methodologies and (2) allows for the design optimization needed for more effective deployment of new applications. Early-stage design input can compensate in part for later possible design vulnerabilities against intentional acts of sabotage or theft.Therefore, IAEA safeguards and physical security of the SMR must be included in the early design phase in order for the SMR to be an economically feasible solution when built. It is imperative that any SMR design demonstrate proof of requisite high levels of safe survivability from all credible threats, including malevolent terrorism, theft, or aircraft impact. An approach such as the proliferation resistance and physical protection evaluation methodology developed for Generation IV (GEN-IV) nuclear energy systems (Ref. 3) offers an attractive framework for application to SMRs. Stakeholders must understand the risks (i.e., financial and functional); the actual level of threat and required protection must be carefully assessed and understood by the appropriate qualified engineers/designers during very early stages of design/engineering.

### IAEA Not Solve

#### IAEA is terrible – Iran proves

Blitz et al 12

[James & Najmeh Bozorgmehr 2/22 “West dismayed at failure of IAEA talks in Iran”, Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/dc8d8114-5d79-11e1-8bb6-00144feabdc0.html#axzz25QpY83Bq ]

The failure of talks this week between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency over the Iranian nuclear programme has triggered dismay in western capitals, heightening concerns that any forthcoming negotiations between Tehran and world powers are destined to make little progress. As an IAEA team returned to the agency’s headquarters on Wednesday from a fruitless two-day meeting with officials in Tehran, western diplomats said Iran’s stance during the encounter suggested it was unlikely to negotiate seriously over its programme any time soon. Their return came as Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, reiterated the regime’s long-held view that the country was not pursuing nuclear weapons and vowed that “pressure, sanctions, terrors and threats” could not force the country to abandon its programme. In a meeting with nuclear scientists, Ayatollah Khamenei, who has the last say in all state affairs, said Iran considered having nuclear weapons ideologically and religiously as a “great sin” with “high risks”. He added that the country’s authority was not dependent on such arms. The meeting was seen as an effort to boost Iranian nuclear scientists’ morale in view of the assassinations of five scientists in recent years. Iran has blamed Israel for the deaths. The diplomatic pressure on Iran has been growing since the IAEA published a lengthy report last November into possible military dimensions of its nuclear programme, detailing a long list of questions it has compiled relating to allegations that the regime has sought to build a bomb in defiance of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The IAEA has paid two visits to Iran in recent weeks which have widely been seen as an opportunity for the regime to come clean over the allegations. Early on Wednesday, the IAEA issued a terse statement saying both meetings had been “disappointing”, with no agreement reached on any of the issues under discussion. The IAEA said that in the two rounds of discussions it has requested access to a military site at Parchin, where the watchdog suspects that testing of parts for a nuclear warhead has been undertaken. “Iran did not grant permission for this visit to take place,” the IAEA said. The agency added that it had engaged with Iran in a constructive spirit, “but no agreement was reached”. According to a senior diplomat based at IAEA headquarters in Vienna, the agency’s brief statement at the end of the meeting was unprecedented for the organisation. “It’s very unusual for the IAEA secretariat to deliver such a blunt statement in this way,” the diplomat said. “Usually, they come back from a visit like this and digest and consider things before commenting. The IAEA inspectors clearly feel a deep sense of frustration about how product-free their visits have been.” Another senior diplomat at the Vienna headquarters said: “Iran did not throw a bone to the IAEA delegation at any time. You now have to wonder whether the Iranians are in a mood to negotiate over any aspect of the programme.” The IAEA is likely to censure Iran in the latest report into its nuclear programme that may be published on Friday. The report, which comes ahead of a regular meeting of the IAEA board of governors, will also be watched closely for any fresh detail it contains on Iran’s progress in developing a second uranium enrichment site near Qom.

# 1AR

### Asia War Impact

**Most probable**

**Campbell et al 8** (Kurt M, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Dr. Campbell served in several capacities in government, including as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asia and the Pacific, Director on theNational Security Council Staff, previously the Chief Executive Officer and co-founder of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), served as Director of the Aspen Strategy Group and the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Washington Quarterly, and was the founder and Principal of StratAsia, a strategic advisory company focused on Asia, rior to co-founding CNAS, he served as Senior Vice President, Director of the International Security Program, and the Henry A. Kissinger Chair in National Security Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, doctorate in International Relation Theory from Oxford, former associate professor of public policy and international relations at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Assistant Director of the Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, member of Council on Foreign Relations and  International Institute for Strategic Studies, “The Power of Balance: America in iAsia” June 2008, <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CampbellPatelSingh_iAsia_June08.pdf>)

Asian *investment* is also at record levels. Asian countries lead the world with unprecedented infra­structure projects. With over $3 trillion in foreign currency reserves, Asian nations and businesses are starting to shape global economic activity. Indian firms are purchasing industrial giants such as Arcelor Steel, as well as iconic brands of its once-colonial ruler, such as Jaguar and Range Rover. China’s Lenovo bought IBM’s personal computer

We call the transformations across the Asia-Pacific the emergence of “iAsia” to reflect the adoption by countries across Asia of fundamentally new stra­tegic approaches to their neighbors and the world. Asian nations are pursuing their interests with real power in a period of both tremendous potential and great uncertainty. iAsia is: *Integrating:* iAsia includes increasing economic interdependence and a flowering of multinational forums to deal with trade, cultural exchange, and, to some degree, security. *Innovating:* iAsia boasts the world’s most successful manufacturing and technology sectors and could start taking the lead in everything from finance to nanotech to green tech. *Investing:* Asian nations are developing infrastruc­ture and human capital at unprecedented rates. But the continent remains plagued by: Insecurity: Great-power rivalry is alive in Asia. Massive military investments along with historic suspicions and contemporary territorial and other conflicts make war in Asia plausible. Instability: From environmental degradation to violent extremism to trafficking in drugs, people, and weapons, Asian nations have much to worry about. *Inequality:* Within nations and between them, inequality in Asia is more stark than anywhere else in the world. Impoverished minorities in countries like India and China, and the gap in governance and capacity within countries, whether as back­ward as Burma or as advanced as Singapore, present unique challenges. A traditional approach to Asia will not suffice if the United States is to both protect American interests and help iAsia realize its potential and avoid pitfalls. business and the Chinese government, along with other Asian financial players, injected billions in capital to help steady U.S. investment banks such as Merrill Lynch as the American subprime mortgage collapse unfolded. Chinese investment funds regional industrialization, which in turn creates new markets for global products. Asia now accounts for over 40 percent of global consumption of steel 4 and China is consuming almost half of world’s available concrete. 5 Natural resources from soy to copper to oil are being used by China and India at astonishing rates, driving up commodity prices and setting off alarm bells in Washington and other Western capitals. Yet Asia is not a theater at peace. On average, between 15 and 50 people die every day from causes tied to conflict, and suspicions rooted in rivalry and nationalism run deep. The continent harbors every traditional and non-traditional challenge of our age: it is a cauldron of religious and ethnic tension; a source of terror and extrem­ism; an accelerating driver of the insatiable global appetite for energy; the place where the most people will suffer the adverse effects of global climate change; the primary source of nuclear proliferation; and the most likely theater on Earth for a major conventional confrontation and even a nuclear conflict. Coexisting with the optimism of iAsia are the ingredients for internal strife, non-traditional threats like terrorism, and traditional interstate conflict, which are all magnified by the risk of miscalculation or poor decision-making.