### DA 1

#### Obama will win on debt ceiling

Klein 1-2

Ezra is a Washington Post Columnist, “The Lessons of the Fiscal Cliff,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/02/the-lessons-of-the-fiscal-cliff/>

The question of who “won” the fiscal cliff won’t be answered till we know what happens when Congress reaches the debt ceiling. The White House says that there’ll be no negotiations over the debt ceiling, and that if Republicans want further spending cuts, their only chance is to hand over more tax revenue. If they’re right and they do manage to enforce a 1:1 ratio of tax hikes to spending cuts in the next deal, they’re going to look like geniuses.¶ Republicans swear they are crazy enough to push the country into default, and they promise that the White House isn’t strong enough to stand by and let it happen. If they’re right, and the White House agrees to big spending cuts absent significant tax increases in order to avert default, then Republicans will have held taxes far lower than anyone thought possible.¶ But both Republicans and Democrats can’t be right. If we take the lessons of this negotiation, here’s what will happen: The White House will negotiate over the debt ceiling. They’ll say they’re not negotiating over the debt ceiling, and in the end, they may well refuse to be held hostage over the debt ceiling, but the debt ceiling will be part of the pressure Republicans use to force the next deal. The White House fears default, and in the end, they always negotiate.¶ That said, the Republicans aren’t quite as crazy as they’d like the Democrats to believe. They were scared to take the country over the fiscal cliff. They’re going to be terrified to force the country into default, as the economic consequences would be calamitous. They know they need to offer the White House a deal that the White House can actually take — or at least a deal that, if the White House doesn’t take it, doesn’t lead to Republicans shouldering the blame for crashing the global economy. That deal will have to include taxes, though the tax increases could come through reform rather than higher rates.¶ The Republicans also have a problem the White House doesn’t: The public broadly believes they’re less reasonable and willing to negotiate than the Democrats are. The White House has a reputation for, if anything, being too quick to fold. They have more room to avoid blame for a default than the Republicans do. In the end, if the White House holds its ground, Republicans will likely compromise — though only after the White House has done quite a bit of compromising, too. ¶ The final moments of the fiscal cliff offered evidence that both sides see how this is going to go. In his remarks tonight, President Obama signaled he would hold firm on the debt ceiling. “While I will negotiate over many things, I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills they’ve already racked up through the laws they have passed,” he said. And Boehner signaled that he knows tax reform will have to be part of the next deal. The post-deal press release his office sent out had the headline, “2013 Must Be About Cutting Spending and Reforming the Tax Code.” That said, the final days of the fiscal cliff, in which the deal almost broke apart a half-dozen times for a hal-dozen reasons, is a reminder that these tense, deadline negotiations can easily go awry. And so there’s a third possibility, too: That the White House is wrong about the Republicans will compromise, that the Republicans are wrong that the White House will fold, and so we really will breach the debt ceiling, unleashing economic havoc.

#### Obama’s capital key to final cliff deal

U.S. News 12-20

“Setting Clear Priorities Will be Clear for Obama,” <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/12/20/setting-clear-priorities-will-be-key-for-obama>

President Obama's administration is brimming with new initiatives, creating a fresh sense of possibility at the White House but also alarming Washington veterans who wonder if he is asking too much of himself, his staff, and especially Congress. The challenge for Obama will be to set clear priorities rather than allow his wish list to get bogged down in a capital that has trouble dealing with more than one or two major issues at a time.¶ First and foremost, Obama is immersed in budget negotiations with House Speaker John Boehner, the top Republican leader in Congress.¶ If they fail to make a deal, tax increases and deep spending cuts will automatically start taking effect on January 1, which could create another recession. And even if Obama reaches an agreement with Boehner, it won't mean that restless conservatives or equally concerned liberals will accept what their leaders produce. Getting a final pact will take up large amounts of energy and political capital.

#### Plan drains capital and causes an immediate fight

Szondy, ‘12

[David, freelance writer -- Gizmag, 2-16, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/]

The problem is that nuclear energy is the proverbial political hot potato - even in early days when the new energy source exploded onto the world scene. The tremendous amount of energy locked in the atom held the promise of a future like something out of a technological Arabian Nights. It would be a world where electricity was too cheap to meter, deserts would bloom, ships would circle the Earth on a lump of fuel the size of a baseball, planes would fly for months without landing, the sick would be healed and even cars would be atom powered. But though nuclear power did bring about incredible changes in our world, in its primary role, generating electricity for homes and industry, it ended up as less of a miracle and more of a very complicated way of boiling water.¶ Not only complicated, but expensive and potentially dangerous. Though hundreds of reactors were built all over the world and some countries, such as France, generate most of their electricity from it, nuclear power has faced continuing questions over cost, safety, waste disposal and proliferation. One hundred and four nuclear plants provide the United States with 20 percent of the nation's power, but a building permit hadn't been issued since 1978 with no new reactors coming on line since 1996 and after the uproar from the environmental movement after nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, it seemed unlikely that any more would ever be approved - until now. This fierce domestic opposition to nuclear power has caused many governments to take an almost schizophrenic stance regarding the atom.

#### Going over the debt ceiling collapses the economy

Millhiser 12/30

(Ian Millhiser - Senior Constitutional Policy Analyst at the Center for American Progress Action Fund and the Editor of ThinkProgress Justice, “Lindsay Graham: I Will Destroy America’s Solvency Unless The Social Security Retirement Age Is Raised,” Dec 30, 2012, <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/12/30/1379681/lindsay-graham-i-will-destroy-americas-solvency-unless-the-social-security-retirement-age-is-raised/?mobile=nc> KB)

Although official Washington is currently fixated on the so-called “Fiscal Cliff,” the biggest threat to American prosperity is the debt ceiling, which must be raised in February to prevent economic catastrophe. If Republicans refuse to reach a deal on the so-called cliff, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that they will spark a new recession in 2013. But if Republicans block action on the debt ceiling, they will make that potential recession look quaint. Without raising the debt ceiling, the United States will be forced to embrace austerity so severe it will lead to “a bigger GDP drop than that experienced during the Great Recession of 2008.”

#### Decline causes war

Kemp 10

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

### DA 2

#### Transition from nuclear to renewables now – plan reverses this

Wasserman 12

Harvey Wasserman 12,Author, 'SOLARTOPIA! Our Green-Powered Earth' http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harvey-wasserman/post\_3127\_b\_1353253.html

In the wake of Fukushima, grassroots citizen action is shutting the worldwide nuclear power industry. A Solartopian tipping point is upon us in the U.S., Europe and Japan which will re-define how the human race gets its energy. States rights and local democracy are at the core of the battle. The definitive breaking point looms in Vermont. By mid-March a state board is likely to deny the Yankee reactor licenses to operate or to create radioactive waste. If that happens, a Vermont shutdown could mark a critical moment in establishing state power over an atomic reactor. A critical domino would fall -- as it has in Japan and Europe -- and we will begin taking down old reactors all across the U.S. Four new reactors barely under construction will go down with them, making inevitable the end America's age of atomic power. In Vermont, the New Orleans-based Entergy bought the Yankee reactor in 2002. Entergy agreed to shut it if the state's Public Service Board denied it a Certificate of Public Good to continue to operate and generate radioactive waste. That decision is due by March 21, the forty-year anniversary of the reactor's 1972 opening. Entergy has horrified many of its staunchest Green Mountain supporters. One of its cooling towers has simply collapsed from ancient rot and basic negligence. It has leaked tritium and other radioactive isotopes from pipes the company has said -- under oath -- do not exist. Entergy sued Vermont after the legislature voted (26 to 4) to shut the reactor. When its lawyers won in federal court, Entergy demanded the public pay it $4 million in legal fees. But the company miscalculated. It welcomed Federal Judge Garvan Murtha's ruling that the legislature could not shut Yankee (the state is appealing). But Murtha also upheld the right of the Public Service Board to deny Entergy those operating and waste production permits. So after lauding the decision, Entergy's lawyers now want Murtha to change it. Entergy has also asked the Public Service Board for a stay in its expected denial of the permits. The case is clearly headed to the corporate-owned U.S. Supreme Court. But for Entergy to win, the Roberts majority would have to rule that the company was temporarily insane when signed its agreements with the state, and that a state agency can be forced (against its will) to issue reactor operating and waste creating permits. The history of U.S. courts denying states the right to shut reactors dates back to the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. But deferral to the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission's bent for keeping rush-bucket reactors on line is rapidly eroding. The Commission granted Vermont Yankee a license extension one day before the Fukushima disaster. A state-mandated shut down could seriously impact the political calculus for an industry whose grassroots opposition has become a full-on tsunami. New York's Indian Point reactors are under assault from Governor Andrew Cuomo, whose father cut the 1988 deal that forced Long Island's Shoreham reactor to shut without ever achieving commercial operation. Cuomo is being pushed by a fierce grassroots anti-nuke groundswell. Entergy does need state permits that would let two remaining reactors at Indian Point (Unit One went down long ago) continue heating and irradiating the Hudson River. New York could demand Entergy build extremely expensive cooling towers,which may force it to shut down for economic reasons. Similar forces are at work in New Jersey and other states. In Florida, botched multi-billion dollar repairs to the Crystal River reactor near Tampa have forced a brutal grassroots battle over soaring electric rates which must be approved by increasingly beleaguered state regulators. It is highly likely that reactor will never operate again. At Pilgrim, Mass., is strongly intervening against a license extension. Both remaining reactors are currently shut at California's San Onofre (Unit One there also went down long ago), where grassroots activists -- including local surfers -- are in pitched battle against re-opening. Ohio's Davis-Besse is having its containment dome sliced for the fourth time. Two reactors in Nebraska are still recovering from major flooding. All across the country, dozens of rust-bucket nukes stagger on their last legs even as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission hands them extended licenses in the face of escalating state and local opposition. Once the firewall against recourse from the states is breached, a flood of shutdowns could well follow. In Japan, utilities must have permits from a host prefecture to re-open after refueling or repairs. Of 54 licensed reactors nationwide, only two now operate. Both could be shut soon, rendering Japan nuke-free for the first time in four decades. Germany has shut eight reactors and will take down 11 more by 2012. Except for Great Britain and a number of eastern holdouts, the "nuclear renaissance" has been all but abandoned in Europe, with an escalating cascade of elderly nukes going cold and proposed new projects being abandoned. The accelerating revolution in renewables has allowed solar, wind and other green sources to outstrip atomic reactors in cost, time to build, ecological impact and safety. As billions pour into Solartopian sources, private investment in atomic energy has all but disappeared -- except where there are massive taxpayer subsidies. Even that's not enough. In 2011, President Obama handed $8.33 billion in federal loan guarantees to the builders of two reactors at Georgia's Vogtle. But Peach State ratepayers are already being soaked for billions more in pre-payments, and the cost of the project is soaring. A parallel financial disaster looms at the Robinson site in neighboring South Carolina. Though the industry assumes these four reactors will eventually be finished, economic realities may say otherwise. Cost estimates for new nukes have been soaring even before construction begins. Even with federal money, the builders still demand that state ratepayers foot the bill as the process proceeds, meaning consumers are on the hook for multiple billions even if the reactors never open. Pitched battles over this Construction Work in Progress scam have already been won by consumers in Missouri and are being fought in Iowa and elsewhere. As the years of building drag on, costs will escalate while renewables continue to become cheaper. Sooner or later, construction is likely to stop, as it did at numerous projects in the 1970s and 1980s which were never finished. Today the Department of Energy still sits on some $10 billion in available guarantees without a recipient ready to build a new nuke. For the first time since early in the George W. Bush years, there has been no executive request for additional reactor construction loan guarantees. In Finland and Flamanville, France, new reactor projects are years behind schedule and billions over budget. With new construction virtually abandoned, and the continued operation of old reactors under intense attack in Japan, Europe and the U.S., only China and India remain as likely sites for large numbers of new nukes. Russia is doing its best to peddle them throughout the Third World. South Korea wants to sell reactors to the United Arab Emirates. But grassroots resistance in India has been fierce. China is still mulling a post-Fukushima decision on whether to proceed with reactors already under construction. Signs of a popular uprising against rampant pollution -- including nuclear reactors -- indicate growing public opposition. But here in the U.S., we are at the fall-off-the-cliff moment for atomic energy, new and old. Entergy, says Deb Katz of the Citizens Awareness Network, has been "blinded by its arrogance and contempt for the state of Vermont." The company, she says, "is attempting to establish that corporations are more powerful than the states they operate in." If the citizens of Vermont can shut Yankee, a dam will be breached and the post-Fukushima power of a rising grassroots tsunami will be made tangible. Solartopia will be that much closer. And the grassroots No Nukes campaign will begin to take its place as one of history's most successful popular movements. Let's just make sure these shut-downs happen before the next Fukushima irradiates us all.

#### Renewables solve water shortages – consume less water than any other energy source.

Rajgore 12

Gail Rajgor 9/19/12, Renewable Energy Focus Writer, http://www.renewableenergyfocus.com/blog/2012/9/19/water-use-in-electricity-generation-the-sobering-facts-that-make-a-case-for-wind-and-solar-power/651.aspx

Water use in electricity generation: the sobering facts that make a case for wind and solar power Did you know **it takes 100,000 gallons of water to produce a single megawatt hour of electricity**? Well according to a new report out today, it does **– unless you’re using wind or solar power** that is. So maybe, with much of the world battling more regular bouts of drought and water shortages it’s something policy makers need to start taking more notice of? The proponents of the report from Synapse Energy Economics - prepared for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI) and the Environmental Working Group – certainly think they should. These groups warn that **the huge demands on increasingly scarce water are “a major hidden cost” of** a business-as-usual approach to American **electricity generation**. The report, The Hidden Costs of Electricity: Comparing the Hidden Costs of Power Generation Fuels, analyses six fuels used to generate electricity --- biomass, coal, nuclear, natural gas, solar (photovoltaic and concentrating solar power), and wind (both onshore and offshore). Water impacts, climate change impacts, air pollution impacts, planning and cost risk, subsidies and tax incentives, land impacts, and other impacts are all considered. With many – but not all - of the key energy technologies used today relying heavily on water, the headline findings make for fascinating reading: **Nuclear power** has critical cooling requirements that **require huge amounts of water**. Roughly 62% of US nuclear plants have closed-loop cooling systems. Reactors with closed-loop systems withdraw between 700-1100 gallons of water per MWh and lose most of that water to evaporation, the report says. “Water withdrawals are even higher at open-loop cooled nuclear plants, which need between 25,000-60,000 gallons per MWh.” Most of the water is returned, but at a higher temperature and lower quality, it adds. In addition to fouling streams and drinking water through mining and coal-ash dump sites, **coal**-fired **power** also **relies heavily on** closed-loop **cooling** systems, withdrawing 500-600 gallons of water per MWh. Again most of this is then lost via evaporation. Withdrawals for open-looped cooled coal-fired power plants are between 20,000-50,000 gallons per MWh. And again, while most of the water is returned, it’s at a higher temperature and lower quality, the analysis finds. It may be a renewable energy source, but biomass too has its issues and water usage is highlighted as one by this report. With proposals for a Clean Energy Standard, biomass would become a much larger source of US electricity generation and the authors of the report urge caution on this. The report notes that a typical 50MW biomass plant “could withdraw roughly 242 million gallons of water per year and lose most of this”. Adding 10 of these plants in a region would mean the use 2.42 billion gallons of water per year. Meantime for dedicated energy crops, water use for irrigation can also be considerable – the report highlights one study which estimates water use for most crops is between 40,000 and 100,000 gallons per MWh, with some crops exceeding this range. Unsurprisingly, the Synapse report also points out that in 2010, the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) estimated that **fracking** shale wells **can use anywhere from two to 10 million gallons of water per well**. The water is often extracted from on-site surface or groundwater supplies. “Such huge water withdrawals raise serious concerns about the impacts on ecosystems and drinking water supplies, especially in areas under drought conditions, areas with low seasonal flow, locations with already stressed water supplies, or locations with waters that have sensitive aquatic communities”, says the report. The water saving options “By contrast, **wind and solar** photovoltaic power **require little water in the electricity generation process”**, it continues. **Concentrating solar power requires water** for cooling purposes**, but new tech**nologies **are placing greater emphasis on dry cooling**. “Solar power plants with dry cooling use only around 80 gallons per MWh – about a tenth of the low-end estimate for nuclear power and one-sixth of the low end estimate for coal-fired power generation.” Estimates of the lifecycle water withdrawals from wind projects, including both onshore and offshore projects, range from just 55 to 85 gallons per MWh.

**Goes nuclear**

**Weiner ‘90**

(Jonathan, Visiting Professor of Molecular Biology at Princeton University. The Next One Hundred Years: Shaping the Fate of Our Living Earth, p. 214)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And **in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other**. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, **tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in the single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled** since Trinity.

### CP

#### The 50 States and all relevant Territories should enter into a compact on:

#### Providing substantial loan guarantees for the expansion of nuclear power in the United States. The Compact should collect revenue via a Clean Energy Community Finance Initiative.

#### Compacts solve faster than the federal government

Mountjoy ‘01

John is a policy analyst with the council of State Governments, “Interstate Compacts Make a Comeback,” Spring <http://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/ncic/Comeback.pdf>

Some may question the need for interstate compacts to address multi-state policy issues. Why ¶ not leave such regulation to the feds? ¶ “Interstate compacts help us maintain state control,” said Gary McConnell, director of the ¶ Georgia Emergency Management Agency. ¶ During his 10 years as GEMA director, McConnell has played an instrumental role in developing ¶ and promoting a successful interstate compact —the Emergency Management Assistance ¶ Compact, or EMAC. EMAC allows state emergency management agencies to cooperate and ¶ share resources in the event of natural and man-made disasters. ¶ “We can go to the federal government for all kinds of help when natural disasters strike, but the ¶ states [cooperating under an interstate compact] can provide specific resources quicker, which ¶ are likely to be problem specific,” McConnell said. “It’s less bureaucratic, and it’s far cheaper. ¶ It’s easier for us under EMAC to obtain resources from surrounding states than it is to use ¶ federal assistance, which we’d end up having to pay more for anyway. I suspect this is the case ¶ with many other interstate compacts as well.” ¶ “States are rediscovering that they have the power to address their own problems better than the ¶ federal government,” said Rick Masters, The Council of State Governments’ legal counsel and ¶ special counsel for interstate compacts. ¶ CSG, which has tracked interstate compacts for more than 40 years, maintains a clearinghouse of ¶ compact information. More recently, CSG helps administer EMAC and is facilitating the update ¶ of the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and the Interstate Compact on ¶ Juveniles. Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution laid the legal foundation for interstate ¶ compacts: “No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep ¶ Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another ¶ State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent ¶ Danger as will not admit of delay.” Compacts actually preceded the Constitution, having been ¶ used in colonial times to resolve boundary disputes between colonies. ¶ Prior to the 1920s, interstate compacts were typically bi-state agreements, addressing boundary ¶ disputes and territorial claims. In fact, only 36 interstate compacts were formed between 1783 ¶ and 1920. It is only in this century that states have turned to interstate compacts to facilitate ¶ cooperative solutions to multi-state problems. ¶ After a lull in the late 1970s and early 1980s, interstate compacts are beginning to enjoy a ¶ resurgence. Since the early 1990s, states have initiated or updated several high-profile compacts. ¶ Examples include EMAC, the Interstate Compact on Industrialized/Modular Buildings and the ¶ Interstate Insurance Receivership Compact. Interstate compacts can set the framework for cooperative solutions to today’s cross-state ¶ challenges, from policing drugs to supplying energy or controlling sprawl. ¶ “Issues within the states are becoming more complex and aren’t confined by state boundaries. As ¶ a result, solutions are becoming multi-state as well. Compacts are the only tool that is truly ¶ adequate for addressing these multi-state issues,” said Bill Voit, senior project director at The ¶ Council of State Governments. ¶ An example is an interstate compact being considered to facilitate taxation of e-commerce. ¶ Opponents of Internet taxation claim that it would be virtually impossible for online vendors to ¶ comply with the complex, often confusing system of state and local sales and use taxes. Since ¶ Internet sales are expected to reach $184 billion annually by 2004, states have a vested interest in ¶ breaking down this and other barriers to taxing online transactions. ¶ Congress currently is considering the Internet Tax Moratorium Equity Act (S. 512) to help states ¶ simplify their sales and use taxes, in part by authorizing states to enter into an Interstate Sales ¶ and Use Tax Compact. The compact would create a “uniform, streamlined sales and use tax ¶ system,” convenient to remote sales. ¶ At least 18 states are considering the model streamlined sales tax legislation in 2001. Kentucky, ¶ South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming already have signed bills into law. ¶ Existing interstate compacts, many drafted in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, are ripe for ¶ amendment and revision. Technology and the Internet now make the sharing of information ¶ seamless and immediate, yet several interstate compacts are plagued by inadequate ¶ administration. ¶ “Not only do we see the development of new compacts, but we are seeing the re-examination of ¶ existing compacts…revising them to keep pace with our changing world,” Masters said. ¶ Developed in 1937, the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers is ¶ one example of a compact in need of update. Adopted by all 50 states, the compact regulates the ¶ movement of parolees and probationers across state lines. The burgeoning offender population ¶ and the ease with which offenders now can travel have created several problems for the compact, ¶ including: frequent violations of compact rules, inability to enforce compliance, difficulty in ¶ creating new rules and slow, unreliable exchange of case information. ¶ The antiquated compact needed a replacement that would provide states the authority, ¶ enforcement tools and resources to adequately track and ensure supervision of parolees and ¶ probationers. ¶ The new interstate compact, the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision, provides ¶ these solutions. The new compact includes mechanisms for enforcement, accountability, resource provision, information sharing and state-to-state cooperation. Currently, the compact ¶ has been introduced in 39 states and enacted in 18. ¶ Just as technology can smooth the operation of interstate compacts, alternative dispute resolution ¶ techniques can increase their self-sufficiency. Enforcement tools within interstate compacts need ¶ to utilize more of the mediation and arbitration services that have proven successful throughout ¶ state government. By developing additional self-contained enforcement mechanisms, compact ¶ members would not need to rely solely on the crowded docket of the U.S. Supreme Court. ¶ States should further utilize interstate compacts to address new problems and create new ¶ methods of interstate cooperation. If not, federal preemption in certain policy areas is a distinct ¶ possibility.

**Clean energy revenue systems solve**

**Saha et al ’12**

Devasharee is a senior policy analyst at Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Center and writing with 3 other analysts on state and environmental policy for a Brookings study, “Leveraging State Clean Energy Funds for Economic Development,” <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/11%20states%20energy%20funds/0111_states_energy_funds>

To act on this promise, **states without clean energy funds should consider establishing dedicated clean energy revenue streams to engage in project finance** and smart industry support. ¶ These states typically do not have dedicated support for either clean energy projects or clean energyrelated economic development activities.¶ 16¶ **A range of sources for these funds exists and includes** ¶ general **revenue bonds, tax or lottery revenues, pollution charges, and renewable portfolio standard ¶ (RPS**) compliance fees. However, **experience has shown that electricity surcharges set on electricity ¶ consumption or “wires charges” tend to be the most stable and reliable revenue source,** as well as the ¶ most fair as they internalize the environmental consequences of electricity purchases.¶ 17¶ States should ¶ examine these sources as potential bases for the establishment of new clean energy funds.

### K

**The affirmative’s proliferation logic is racist**

**Gusterson 1999** (Hugh, Professor of Anthropology, George Mason University , “Nuclear Weapons and the Other in Western Imagination,” Cultural Anthropology, pg. 114)

http://people.reed.edu/~ahm/Courses/Stan-PS-314-2009-Q1\_PNP/Syllabus/EReadings/Gusterson1999Nuclear.pdf

Thus in Western discourse nuclear weapons are represented so that "theirs" are a problem whereas "ours" are not. During the Cold War the **Western discourse on the dangers of "nuclear proliferation" defined the term in such a way as to sever** the two senses of the word proliferation. This usage split off **the "vertical" proliferation of the superpower arsenals** (the development of new and improved weapons designs and the numerical expansion of the stockpiles) **from the "horizontal" proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries, presenting only the latter as the "proliferation problem.**" Following the end of the Cold War, the American and Russian arsenals are being cut to a few thousand weapons on each side.5 However, the United States and Russia have turned back appeals from various nonaligned nations, especially India, for the nuclear powers to open discussions on a global convention abolishing nuclear weapons. Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty notwithstanding, the Clinton administration has declared that nuclear weapons will play a role in the defense of the United States for the indefinite future. Meanwhile, in a controversial move**, the Clinton administration has broken with the policy of previous administrations in basically formalizing a policy of using nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states to deter chemical and biological weapons** (Panofsky 1998; Sloyan 1998).  **discourse that stabilizes this system of nuclear apartheid in Western ideology is a specialized variant within a broader system of colonial and postcolonial discourse that takes as its essentialist premise a profound Otherness separating Third World from Western countries. This inscription of Third World (especially Asian and Middle Eastern) nations as ineradicably different from our own has, in a different context, been labeled "Orientalism" by Edward Said** (1978). Said argues that **orientalist discourse constructs the world in terms of a series of binary oppositions that produce the Orient as the mirror image of the West: where "we" are rational and disciplined, "they" are impulsive and emotional; where "we" are modern and flexible, "they" are slaves to ancient passions and routines; where "we" are honest and compassionate, "they" are treacherous and uncultivated. While the blatantly racist orientalism of the high colonial period has softened, more subtle orientalist ideologies endure in contemporary politics.** They can be found, as Akhil Gupta (1998) has argued, in discourses of economic development that represent Third World nations as child nations lagging behind Western nations in a uniform cycle of development or, as Lutz and Collins (1993) suggest, in the imagery of popular magazines, such as National Geographic. I want to suggest here that another variant of contemporary orientalist ideology is also to be found in U.S. national security discourse.

**That justifies endless imperialism**

**Gourgouris 2006** Stathis Gourgouris Social Text 87, Vol. 24, No. 2, Summer 2006. © 2006 by Duke University Press

It is important to understand that **both these registers are**, in the first instance, **constitutively intertwined**. Namely, **the broader epistemological and allegorical register is as real and historical as the one that pertains to actual social times and spaces.** Conversely, **a profound** allegorical and **epistemological force animates and surely exceeds the explicit boundaries of the social dimensions that are easily recognizable in the specific histories and geographies of orientalist practices. One need only consider how complex and ubiquitous — indeed, practically limitless — is the racist prejudice that configures the Arab as terrorist, which permeates the social and political imagination in America, with very real and brutal consequences**. In the second instance, both these registers, intertwined as they are, are fundamentally political in nature. By this I mean: **they are both determined by, but also determining of, a whole complex of relations of power and violent contention, a social dynamics of domination, antagonism, and resistance, which has been linked from the outset (that is, from when orientalism emerged as a bona fide discipline in the nineteenth century) to a vast network of colonialist and, later, imperialist practices.** The tremendous anxiety and animosity that Said’s book continues to provoke in certain quarters are certainly due to the immanent political stakes of its object of inquiry, despite the fact that most critiques from such quarters compulsively displace their source of animosity to the author himself.

**The Alternative: Vote Negative to Affirm the 1AC without the justification of halting proliferation**

**Mendieta, 2002**

Eduardo Mendieta, 2002, “To Make Live and to Let Die – Foucault and Racism

This is where **racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but** **from within, constitutively**. For **the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism**. For **racism grants,** and here I am quoting: “**the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism** “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –**the power of the state** after the 18 th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population**, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary.** So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). **Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state**. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And **with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war** that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: **the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war.** **Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture.** As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

### Natural Gas Advantage

#### Natural Gas stable long term

**Zeits 9/7**/2012

(Richard, Zeits Energy Analytics, Seeking Alpha Investment Analysis, "US gas production to stay high for the next 12-18 months" seekingalpha.com/article/852901-southwestern-energy-u-s-gas-production-to-stay-high-for-the-next-12-18-months)

Mr. **Mueller's forecast**, while not bullish at the first glance, in fact **has positive implications for the sector**. I would argue, **with natural gas prices in the $4-$5 range, the industry stands to make ample returns, and additional demand would amplify profitable volumes**. It is difficult to disagree with Mr. Mueller's assessment that a $5/MMBtu price would not be sustainable for long, considering the industry's much evolved cost structure. **Over the past several years, shale gas operators have made great progress in perfecting extraction techniques**, reducing drilling and completion times, and optimizing production regimes. On average, natural gas wells are more productive and less expensive to drill and complete than just two or three years ago. **Processing and delivery infrastructure has largely been put in place to accommodate massive shale gas volumes**.

#### Can’t solve emissions- lack of plants globally and not fast enough

**Netzer ‘11**

[Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber. The authors work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Develop­ment, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The end of nuclear energy? International perspectives after Fukushima.” July 2011 ETB]

In weighing out different aims and scenarios, it is considering that **neither fossil fuels nor nuclear energy have ever been a low-emission** or ecologically sustainable **choice**. While it is indeed true that a nuclear power plant does not produce any CO2 in operation, **if one takes into account the entire cycle of construction and operation** all the way to decommissioning **and** in particular **include**s **the mining of uranium and manufacture of fuel rods** **in the equation**, **greenhouse gases** certainly **are produced**, **as** **fossil** energy **fuels** **are** **used** **for** many of **these processes**. On top of this, the **potential** **for reduc­tion of** CO2 **emissions** in this sector **is not** particularly **high because of the low percentage of nuclear energy in global** primary **energy production**. **It will** moreover **scarcely be possible to build enough reactors** in the near future in order **to reduce the global emissions balance**. **To reach the target** accepted by the international com­munity of states at the World Climate Summit in Cancun of keeping global warming to below 2°, global green­house **emissions would have to decline by** at least **50 per cent by 2050.** **Because the** average **time required to put a reactor into operation** from the planning to commis­sioning **is** approximately **10 years, nuclear energy can­not provide any speedier contribution to a reduction of emissions.**

**U.S. manufacturing is in a renaissance – multiple factors**

- Production costs, oil exports, China costs

**Hill 12/26**/2012

(The Washington Times¶ December 26, 2012 Wednesday¶ Trade deficit on course for surplus; ¶ Cheaper fuel helps cut costs for goods made in America¶ BYLINE: By Patrice Hill THE WASHINGTON TIMES¶ SECTION: A, PAGE ONE; Pg. 1 - Kurr)

**Rising U.S. competitiveness has stoked a major export revival** since 2009, helping pull the economy out of recession. Many analysts have been surprised by how well exports have held up this year despite the slide back into recession of the largest U.S. export market - the 17-nation eurozone - and a major slowdown in the nation's fastest growing market - China.¶ **The export revival owes to a constellation of U.S. trends that have been building for years, including a pronounced weakening of the dollar against other major currencies, high productivity growth and subdued wage increases, and rising fuel and transport costs that make it more expensive for manufacturers overseas to deliver goods to customers** in the U.S. American farmers also are helping the balance of trade by becoming beneficiaries for rising living standards in China and other emerging countries, driving farm prices to near-record levels.¶ On the import side, **there has been a trend toward saving more and spending less among U.S. consumers** and a dramatic reversal of U.S. energy consumption and production trends since 2005 **that has put a lid on American oil imports and promises to turn the U.S. into a net energy exporter** in coming decades. America's gigantic oil deficit has been second only to the gargantuan trade deficit with China as a major driver of chronic U.S. trade gaps that surged to more than $800 billion at their peak in 2006.¶ "The secular trend of the U.S. trade deficit is a great, positive story," said David A. Levy, chairman of the New York-based Jerome Levy Forecasting Center. "The trade gap has been an enormous [drag on the economy] for over three decades. America may be only a decade from running consistent merchandise trade surpluses."¶ Oil deficit on the wane¶ Trade deficits act like a dead weight on the economy by draining the wealth of the country and bleeding domestic industries. U.S. leaders have been worried about bloating deficits since the 1970s with a surge in oil imports from the Middle East.¶ **The sea change in oil exports this year has been breathtakingly fast - narrowing the trade deficit in September to the lowest in two years** as U.S. production of oil from shale formations in Texas and North Dakota led to a surge in petroleum exports.¶ "The revival in domestic oil production is narrowing the U.S. deficit" even amid a lull in manufactured exports brought on by the European recession, said Nigel Gault, an economist with IHS Global Insight. The current account deficit, the broadest measure of merchandise and service flows, fell 9 percent to a 3½-year low of $107.5 billion in the third quarter, the Commerce Department has reported, and IHS expects it to stay in that low range or even make further progress next year despite the global slowdown.¶ Coming home¶ While the federal government could play more of a role in boosting exports through tax reform and training assistance, business groups say, some **industries are already staging a comeback** without help from Washington, **thanks to improving trends in the marketplace**.¶ Petrochemical companies such as The Dow Chemical Co., Royal Dutch Shell PLC, Chevron Corp. and Exxon Mobil Corp., which moved plants overseas a decade ago, are relocating to the U.S. and considering building plants here to take advantage of the lowest natural gas prices on the planet. **Because chemicals and plastics are core ingredients for many other manufactured goods, this trend promises to coax even more manufacturers to locate in the U.S**.¶ **"The boom in gas and unconventional oil extraction may generate a significant number of new jobs," said Dieter Ernst, an economist with the East-West Center. "It reduces one of the main cost factors for petrochemical products such as plastic, which could accelerate investment in a broad range of domestic industries."¶** A report from the National Intelligence Council this month said that the lower gas and oil prices in the U.S. brought on by the shale boom would have "significant positive ripple effects" for the U.S. economy, possibly increasing jobs in extraction and manufacturing industries by as much as 3 million by 2030, while helping to "significantly reduce" the trade deficit.¶ "The most important domestic energy development in the last 50 years is poised to reshape American manufacturing," said Kevin Swift, chief economist of the American Chemistry Council, who noted that increasing production in the U.S. this year turned a chronic trade deficit in chemicals into a modest surplus.¶ Has China peaked?¶ Analysts see progress as well on the other major cause of the trade deficit: China. **After decades of jobs and industries lost to China, some analysts say, the pendulum is starting to swing back toward the United States.¶** "**There is growing evidence that China's challenge to U.S. manufacturing has peaked, and its competitive advantage is in decline**," said Jerry Jasinowski, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers. "The resurgence may be even stronger and more broader-based than most people realize."¶ A study last year by the Boston Consulting Group found that the **cost of producing goods in China is rising rapidly. China has the fastest growing wages of any country and has had to pay steeply higher bills for the oil, coal, copper and other raw materials it imports in massive quantities from abroad to feed its manufacturing base. The costs of industrial real estate, energy and transportation have been escalating in China as well**, and citizens are demanding more safety and environmental controls, making it more expensive for manufacturers to locate there.¶ **China's sharply rising costs for basic materials and housing drove up inflation 7 percent there last year, forcing the government to douse the inflation fires** with tighter lending policies that produced a sharp slowdown in China this year. Within five years, the Boston Consulting Group predicts, the cost of producing goods in China's coastal cities will be only 10 percent to 15 percent less than in some regions of the U.S. - not enough of an advantage to overcome the high legal, transportation and inventory costs of manufacturing there.¶ For this reason, the group cites a growing list of companies moving production back to the U.S. from China, including NCR Corp., the Coleman Co., Ford Motor Co. and the Outdoor GreatRoom Co.¶ "The tide is turning in our favor," said Mr. Jasinowski, citing the "strongest productivity growth in the industrial world" and **subdued wage growth that has made the U.S. more attractive to global companies such as General Electric** Co. and Apple Inc., both of which have announced plans to locate facilities at home after years of moving abroad.

#### Military power does not translate into security.

**Hachigan and Sutphen 08**

(Nina, Senior Fellow at American Progress, senior political scientist at RAND Corporation and served as the director of the RAND Center for Asia Pacific Policy for four years, From 1998 to 1999, Hachigian was on the staff of the National Security Council in the White House, Monica Sutphen, Stanford Center for International Security, 2008, The Next American Century, p. 168-9

***IN PRACTICE*, the strategy of primacy failed to deliver**. While the fact of being the world’s only superpower has substantial benefits, a national security **strategy based on** pursuing and **maintaining primacy has not made America more secure**. America’s **military might has not been the answer to terrorism, disease, climate change, or proliferation**. **Iraq, Iran, and North Korea have become more dangerous in the last seven years, not less**. Worse than being ineffective with transnational threats and smaller powers**, a strategy of maintaining primacy is counterproductive when it comes to pivotal powers.** If America makes primacy the main goal of its national security strategy, then why shouldn’t the pivotal powers do the same? **A goal of primacy signals that sheer strength is most critical to security. American cannot trumpet its desire to dominate the world military and then question why China is modernizing its military**.

**Warming won’t cause extinction**

**Barrett 7**

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7¶ (Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, **climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species**.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though **biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons**). **It will alter critical ecosystems** (though **this is also happening now**, and **for reasons unrelated to climate change**). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “**Catastrophic” climate change is** possible, but **not certain.** Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, **large changes** (**such as sea level rise** of, say, ten meters) **will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust.** “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, **abrupt climate change** (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, **is unlikely to be ruinous.** Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. **Even in a worse case scenario**, however, global **climate change is not the equivalent of the** Earth being hit by **mega-asteroid.** Indeed, **if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful**, then **our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming.** The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

### Prolif Advantage

#### Technical barriers prevent nuclear terrorism—the risk is less than 1 in a million

**Mueller ‘8**

(John, poli sci prof at Ohio State Univ, “The Atomic Terrorist: Assessing the Likelihood,” 1-1, Prepared for presentation at the Program on International Security Policy, Univ of Chicago, 1-15-2008, http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/APSACHGO.PDF)

Appraising the barriers. As noted earlier, **most discussions of atomic terrorism deal rather piecemeal with the subject--focusing separately on individual tasks** such as procuring HEU or assembling a device or transporting it. But, as the Gilmore Commission, a special advisory panel to the President and Congress, stresses, **building a nuclear device capable of producing mass destruction presents "Herculean challenges" and requires that a whole series of steps be accomplished. The process requires obtaining enough fissile material, designing a weapon "that will bring that mass together in a tiny fraction of a second, before the heat from early fission blows the material apart," and figuring out some way to deliver the thing.** And it emphasizes that **these merely constitute "the minimum requirements." If each is not fully met, the result is** not simply **a** less powerful **weapon**, but one **that can't produce any significant nuclear yield at all or can't be delivered** (Gilmore 1999, 31, emphasis in the original). Following this perspective, an approach that seems appropriate is to catalogue the barriers that must be overcome by a terrorist group in order to carry out the task of producing, transporting, and then successfully detonating Allison's "large, cumbersome, unsafe, unreliable, unpredictable, and inefficient" improvised nuclear device. Table 1 attempts to do this, and it arrays some 20 of these--all of which must be surmounted by the atomic aspirant. Actually, it would be quite possible to come up with a longer list: in the interests of keeping the catalogue of hurdles down to a reasonable number, some of the entries are actually collections of tasks and could be divided into two or three or more. For example, number 5 on the list requires that heisted highly-enriched uranium be neither a scam nor part of a sting nor of inadequate quality due to insider incompetence; but this hurdle could as readily be rendered as three separate ones. In assembling the list, I sought to make the various barriers independent, or effectively independent, from each other, although they are, of course, related in the sense that they are sequential. However, while the terrorists must locate an inadequately-secured supply of HEU to even begin the project, this discovery will have little bearing on whether they will be successful at securing an adequate quantity of the material, even though, obviously, they can't do the second task before accomplishing the first. Similarly, assembling and supplying an adequately equipped machine shop is effectively an independent task from the job of recruiting a team of scientists and technicians to work within it. Moreover, members of this group must display two qualities that, although combined in hurdle 9, are essentially independent of each other: they must be both technically skilled and absolutely loyal to the project. Assessing the probabilities. In seeking to carry out their task, would-be atomic terrorists effectively must go though an exercise that looks much like this. If and when they do so, they are likely to find their prospects daunting and accordingly uninspiring or even dispiriting. To bias the case in their favor, one might begin by assuming that they have a fighting chance of 50 percent of overcoming each of these obstacles even though for many barriers, probably almost all, the odds against them are much worse than that. Even with that generous bias, the chances they could successfully pull off the mission come out to be worse than one **in a million, specifically they are one in 1,048,567**. Indeed, **the odds of surmounting even seven of the twenty hurdles at that unrealistically**, even absurdly, **high presumptive success rate is considerably less than one in a hundred.** If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds they will be able to pull off the deed drop to one in well over three billion--specifically 3,486,784,401. What they would be at the (entirely realistic) level one in ten boggles the mind. Comparisons with the 9/11 conspiracy. The difficulties confronting the 9/11 hijackers were considerable, but they were nothing like those confronting the atomic terrorist. The 9/11 conspirators did maintain extensive secrecy and group loyalty on their daring and risky endeavor, and their planning does seem to have been meticulous. But the size of the conspiracy was very small, they never had to trust strangers or criminals, technical requirements were minimal, obtaining flight training only took the money to pay for it, the weapons they used could legally be brought on planes, and, most importantly, they were exploiting an environment in which the policy was to cooperate with hijackers rather than fight and risk the entire plane--indeed, only a few months earlier three Muslim terrorists, in this case Chechens, had commandeered a Russian airliner and had it flown to Saudi Arabia where they were then overcome by local security forces with almost no loss of life (Kramer 2004/05, 58). Even at that, the 9/11 hijackers failed to accomplish their mission with the last of the four planes. A comparison of the personnel requirements for each case may make this clear. **The 9/11 plot necessitated the recruitment and the training** (minimal, except for the pilots) **of a single group of men who were absolutely loyal to the cause.** However, aside from a general physical ability and a capacity to carry out orders, they needed little in the way of additional qualities. **In the case of the terrorist bomb, the conspiracy**--or, actually, the sequential sets of conspiracies--**mandate the enlistment of a much larger number of people, and most of these must not only be absolutely loyal, but also extremely skilled at an elaborate series of technical, organizational, and conspiratorial tasks.**  The bottom line. Keller suggests that "the best reason for thinking it won't happen is that it hasn't happened yet," and that, he worries, "is terrible logic" (2002). "Logic" aside, **there is a**nother quite **good reason for thinking it won't happen: the task is bloody difficult.** The science fiction literature, after all, has been spewing out for decades--centuries, even--a wealth of imaginative suggestions about things that might come about that somehow haven't managed to do so. We continue to wait, after all, for those menacing and now-legendary invaders from Mars.

#### Proliferation does not cause war

**Tepperman ‘9** (Jonathan Tepperman a journalist based in New York City. “Why Obama should learn to love the bomb” Newsweek Nov 9, 2009 <http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome_files/nukes_Final.pdf>)

**A growing** and compelling **body of research suggests** that **nuclear weapons** may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous, as Obama and most people assume. The bomb may actually **make us safer**. In this era of rogue states and trans-national terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that’s a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Obama’s idealistic campaign, so out of character for a pragmatic administration, may be unlikely to get far (past presidents have tried and failed). But it’s not even clear he should make the effort. There are more important measures the U.S. government can and should take to make the real world safer, and these mustn’t be ignored in the name of a dreamy ideal (a nuke free planet) that’s both unrealistic and possibly undesirable. The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, **there’s never been a** nuclear, or even a nonnuclear, **war between two states that possess them**. Just stop for a second and think about that: it’s hard to overstate how remarkable it is, especially given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading “nuclear optimist” and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, “We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It’s striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states.” To understand why—and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way—you need to start by recognizing that **all states are rational** on some basic level. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they’re pretty sure they can get away with them. Take war: **a country will start a fight only when it’s almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price**. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn’t think they could win. The problem **historically** has been that **leaders often make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side**—and millions of innocents pay the price. **Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war** obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a button— and everybody knows it—the basic math shifts. Even the craziest tin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and thus not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, “Why fight if you can’t win and might lose everything?” Why indeed? **The iron logic of deterrence** and mutually assured destruction **is so compelling**, it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world’s major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight **proxy wars**, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these **never matched the** furious **destruction of** full-on, great**-power war** (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there’s very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring—because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, “It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time.” The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. **The best recent example is India and Pakistan**, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. **Getting their hands on weapons** of mass destruction didn’t do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did **dramatically mellow their behavior**. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war.

**Every plant increases the risk of terrorism and prolif**

**Shrader-Frechette ‘8**

[Kristin Shrader-Frechette teaches biological sciences and philosophy at the University of Notre Dame. <http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=10884> ETB]

Pursuing nuclear power also perpetuates the myth that increasing atomic energy, and thus increasing uranium enrichment and spent-fuel reprocessing, will increase neither terrorism nor proliferation of nuclear weapons. This myth has been rejected by both the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.S. Office of Technology Assessment. **More** nuclear **plants means more weapons materials, which means more targets, which means a higher risk of terrorism and prolif**eration. The government admits that **Al Qaeda** already **has targeted U.S. reactors, none of which can withstand attack by a large** air**plane.** **Such an attack**, warns the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, **could cause** fatalities as far away as 500 miles and **destruction 10 times worse than** that caused by the nuclear accident at **Chernobyl** in 1986. **Nuclear energy** actually **increases the risks of** weapons **prolif**eration **because** **the** same **tech**nology used for civilian atomic power **can be used for weapons**, as the cases of India, Iran, Iraq, North Korea and Pakistan illustrate. As the Swedish Nobel Prize winner Hannes Alven put it, “The military atom and the civilian atom are Siamese twins.” **Yet if the world stopped building nuclear-power plants, bomb ingredients would be harder to acquire, more conspicuous and more costly politically, if nations were caught trying to obtain them. Their motives for seeking nuclear materials would be unmasked as military, not civilian.**

#### US is still the nuclear tech leader

Pete Domenici 12, senator and Warren Miller, co-chair of Nuclear Initiative, former DOE Assist. Sec., July 2012, “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” Bipartisan Policy Center

Nuclear power already plays an important role in the U.S. energy supply mix: The nation’s existing fleet of 104 reactors currently accounts for close to 20 percent of overall electricity production. In many parts of the country, nuclear plants help to assure grid stability and have been a major source of cost-effective, low-carbon base-load power for decades. The NRC, the industry’s chief regulatory overseer, is expected to approve extension of the operating licenses for most of these plants to 60 years while striving for improved safety and increasingly efficient operations. At present, the domestic nuclear industry is looking at limited opportunities for expansion in terms of increasing the number of U.S. plants. Currently, four new Generation III+ nuclear reactors have been licensed by the NRC and are under construction in the Southeast. In addition, the Tennessee Valley Authority has restarted construction activities at Watts Bar II. Given this near-term expansion, the United States will continue to be a world leader in the development of advanced reactor technologies, including Generation III+ advanced passive reactors and SMRs. International interest in developing new nuclear-generating capacity, on the other hand, presents potentially substantial business opportunities for the domestic nuclear industry. Commercial nuclear exports generate obvious economic benefits for U.S. firms and for the nation’s overall balance of trade. Importantly, they also help the United States retain a major role in the evolution and maintenance of international nuclear safety and nonproliferation regimes. Other nations not only look to the U.S. industry for operational expertise, they see the NRC as setting the international gold standard for safety and physical security regulation. DOE’s National Nuclear Security Administration, meanwhile, has a great deal of influence over the nonproliferation aspects of international fuel-cycle issues.

#### Nuclear power backfires in prolif negotiations

**Farmer ’10**

[J. Doyne Farmer of the Santa Fe Institute and Arjun Makhijani of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research. “As US Nuclear Future? Not wanted, not needed.” Nature 467, 391–393 (23 September 2010) ETB]

There are also undesirable side effects of using nuclear power**. To make a** large **dent in CO2 emissions, 2,000–**3,000 **reactors would be needed worldwide by 2050** to replace an equivalent coal capacity and to increase the share of nuclear electricity to about 30%. **This poses a huge proliferation hazard.** **Two** medium-sized uranium–**enrichment plants would need to be built every year** to fuel so many nuclear reactors, **increasing the risk that** some **fuel would be diverted and enriched to weapons-grade material.** **A major US push for nuclear power will make developing countries more likely to demand the capacity to enrich their own fuel, vastly hampering efforts to clamp down on nuclear proliferation.**

**Export restrictions means still lose to China**

**Blomberg 10/1**

(Brian Wingfield, “Nuclear Firms Seek Eased Export Rules as U.S. Demand Wanes” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-01/nuclear-companies-seek-relaxed-export-rules-as-u-s-demand-wanes.html>, SEH)

“For U.S. exporters and their customers, navigating the bureaucratic maze for a U.S. export license presents a challenge in itself that has no parallel in the other countries surveyed in this study,” its said.¶ The Energy Department, which has jurisdiction over nuclear- related assistance for foreign countries, has proposed rule revisions that “would significantly expand the scope of technologies covered by the regulation,” according to today’s report, prepared by for the NEI by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP.¶ Compared with the regulatory systems Russia, France, Japan and Korea, “the U.S. regime imposes few deadlines for decision- making on export license applications,” according to the report. Processing export licenses in the U.S. can take a year or more, it said.¶ Exelon of Chicago wants to export its operations methods, which would involve sending top managers abroad to provide guidance on reactor technology and safety, according to Bradley Fewell, vice president and deputy general counsel for Exelon Generation Co. LLC.¶ “These regulations are hampering our ability to expand the sale of and the implementation of” the product, he said at a press conference today in Washington. Exelon is the largest U.S. owner and operator of commercial nuclear reactors.

**U.S. won’t use prolif influence**

**Cleary ’12**

Richard is a former research assistant with the American Enterprise Institute and worked for the United States Committee on Foreign Relations, “Richard Cleary: Persuading Countries to forgo nuclear fuel making,” <http://npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1192&tid=30>, August

The cases above offer a common lesson: The U.S., though constrained or empowered by circumstance, can exert considerable sway in nonproliferation matters, but often elects not to apply the most powerful tools at its disposal for fear of jeopardizing other objectives. The persistent dilemma of how much to emphasize nonproliferation goals, and at what cost, has contributed to cases of nonproliferation failure. The inconsistent or incomplete application of U.S. power in nonproliferation cases is most harmful when it gives the impression to a nation that either sharing sensitive technology or developing it is, or will become, acceptable to Washington. U.S. reticence historically, with some exceptions, to prioritize nonproliferation—and in so doing reduce the chance of success in these cases—does not leave room for great optimism about future U.S. efforts at persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making.¶ The most successful case above, South Korea, saw the U.S. put in question the basis of its relationship with Seoul, its security assurance, for nonproliferation aims. The potential near-term consequences of a South Korean nuclear weapon made this bold diplomatic maneuver worth the risk. But in other cases competing U.S. aims, often worthy, have impinged on nonproliferation goals, diluting efforts and sending mixed signals. In the case of Pakistan, for example, even well before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the United States failed to use sufficiently forceful sticks or attractive carrots. U.S. efforts were bound by increasing distrust between Islamabad and Washington, a delicate geopolitical situation in the subcontinent given India’s close relationship with the Soviet Union, and facing a great challenge in a Pakistani leadership that was humiliated in 1971 and keen to reestablish some power equity with India. In negotiations with Iran regarding the nuclear cooperation agreement, U.S. policy makers–hoping to reinforce the NPT after the Indian test, avoid offending the Shah, and secure civilian nuclear contracts–were initially willing to make concessions on the issue of national reprocessing. In the case of the West Germany-Brazil contract, Kissinger went so far as to tell his counterpart in Bonn that, with expanded safeguards, the deal would be acceptable to Washington despite the clear proliferation risk from Brasilia.¶ The examples above show the limitations of both demand and supply side efforts. Supply side diplomatic interventions, made before the transfer of technology, have been at times effective, particularly in precluding nuclear fuel-making in the short term and buying time for more lasting solutions. However, as the Pakistan and Brazil cases illustrated, supply side interventions are no substitute for demand side solutions: Countries face political choices regarding nuclear fuel-making. A nation set upon an independent fuel-making capacity, such as Pakistan or Brazil, is unlikely to give up efforts because of supply side controls. Multilateral fuel-making arrangements, as proposed repeatedly by the United States, have not materialized and therefore seem to have had little tangible influence.¶ In recent years, a new nonproliferation instrument has appeared: a restructured 123 nuclear cooperation agreement, developed in the course of negotiations with the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and signed in 2009. This agreement, unlike previous bilateral nuclear cooperation agreements, offers a model for demand side nonproliferation, with the UAE vowing to forgo all enrichment and reprocessing technology on its own soil. It goes far beyond, for example, the “veto” on reprocessing of U.S.-origin spent fuel broached in the negotiations with the Shah. This “Gold Standard” agreement, much hailed at first, particularly in contrast to Iran’s enrichment activities, has begun to lose its luster as, once again, competing priorities marginalize nonproliferation. In January 2012, the Obama Administration announced that a “case by case” approach would be taken to the application of the Gold Standard. Countries such as Vietnam, where the U.S. holds out hope for a grander partnership aimed at countering China, may not be held to the UAE’s standard.100 Today, as in the 1970s with the Symington and Glenn Amendments, Congress seems most concerned about the prospect of proliferation of ENR technology.¶ The UAE case is a striking reminder of the lasting challenge facing American nonproliferation efforts. As a global power with ranging interests, governed by a political system where dissenting factions in Congress, the White House, and bureaucratic organs can influence policy in a number of ways, and operating in an international system with its own constraints on U.S. power, the United States has struggled to marshal its strength toward persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making. While there is no guarantee that the decisive and steadfast application of sticks and carrots in the cases above would have changed the outcomes—it may have brought unintended consequences of its own—a commitment to doing so would have improved the chance of persuading countries to eschew fuel-making.

### Solvency

#### No Solvency- NRC licensing suspension

**Reuters 8/7**/12

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/08/nuclear-power-plant-license\_n\_1753931.html ETB]

**U.S. regulators** on Tuesday **suspended** **issuing final decisions on new licenses and** on license **renewals for nuclear** power **plants** until the agency decides how to deal with the thorny issue of spent nuclear fuel. The order from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission - headed by Allison Macfarlane, a nuclear waste expert - will not stop hearings or other work on licensing activity and **no license decisions are imminent,** an NRC spokesman said.

**Nuclear is failing because its uneconomic- loan guarantees aren’t enough to solve and risk creating a speculation bubble**

**Cooper ‘11**

[Mark Cooper Senior Research Fellow for Economic Analysis Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School. AN ANALYSIS OF MARKET FORCES THAT MAKE NUCLEAR REACTORS RISKY INVESTMENTS. ETB]

**The following** charts vividly **illustrate** **the folly of the federal government taking further steps to make nuclear even more of a "ward of the state."**

Factor 1: **Nuclear reactors cost much more than the industry projected when it made the case for them**. You never hear about a new coal or natural gas-fired power plant costing 100 percent or 200 percent more to build than was initially projected. But **low-balled front-end cost projections and rising back-end construction costs are the norm in the nuclear power industry.** Not only does **the sky-high projected cost of nuclear power make them impossible to finance on Wall Street – and unable to produce price competitive power** – but the ever-rising construction costs make them even bigger white elephants. U.S. taxpayers and ratepayers have much to fear if elected officials rush in with direct and indirect subsidies where Wall Street fears to tread. **The industry understated its initial cost projections in order to get a seat at the energy policy table**, counting on being able to stick taxpayers and ratepayers with the inevitably much higher price tag at a later date. Factor 2: **Nuclear power** simply **cannot compete with** low-cost **natural gas.** In a competitive marketplace, natural gas beats nuclear hands down from a price standpoint. This was a major factor in the collapse of the Calvert Cliffs-3 project in Maryland. Studies have shown that if built the South Texas Project – the next candidate in line for **a federal loan guarantee – could not** **deliver** electricity cheaply **enough to survive**. **It** is the key factor that **has led many** of the leading nuclear utilities in the U.S. **to abandon plans for** construction of **new reactors**. Factor 3: Natural gas is not the only alternative with which nuclear cannot compete. **There are numerous lower cost alternatives available** to meet the need for electricity whether or not the U.S. adopts policies to reduce carbon emissions in the electricity sector. If technologies are allowed to compete on a level playing field to meet the need for electricity, **nuclear reactors would be unable to win in the marketplace for the foreseeable future.** Policies that address climate change help most of the alternatives as much as nuclear if not more so. **This is** a key reason **why** **capital markets will not fund these projects** and the industry is so desperate for subsidies. Factor 4: Rapidly **falling consumer demand** **for electricity has destroyed the case for** many **proposed** nuclear **reactors**. While the recession has depressed demand for electricity in the near term, it is becoming clear that a **major shift in consumption patterns is taking place**, **driven** in part **by** the success story of **increased** energy **efficiency**. Energy efficiency is the cheapest, cleanest and fastest energy source available today – it is significantly less expensive than nuclear and involves no safety issues, waste disposal problems and lengthy construction delays. **What we have seen in the U.S.** nuclear reactor space in the past decade **is a** classic **speculative "bubble**." It unfolded in the classic stages: a promotional frenzy (2001-2005 per the streamlining of the licensing process and establishment of the loan guarantee program); a surge in speculative interest (2006-2008, as measured by applications for licenses and loan guarantees) that the industry could not deliver on (as demonstrated by skyrocketing cost estimates); and, finally, the inevitable bursting of the bubble under the weight of economic reality (2009-2010, per plummeting natural gas prices and declining demand growth, resulting in reactor cancelations and postponements). **This is a bubble that will one day find itself in the textbooks as an example of market mania on a grand scale.**

#### Takes 2 decades

**Robertson ‘11**

[Joseph Robertson is a visiting instructor in Spanish language and humanities at Villanova University, where he is also the creator and coordinator of the GreenNOVAtion online community for environmentally sustainable projects, organizer of the ClimateTalks.info roundtable discussion series, and chair of the Technology Committee of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures. Through the Hot Spring Network, a social-networking innovation project aimed at brainstorming paradigm-shift solutions, he created and operates ProjectQuipu.net, a user-made global economic forum that seeks to find new ways to assess the real economic value of intangibles, and to propose generative policy solutions that empower individuals and communities, and foster a more democratic, more open economy. He also runs another Hot Spring project, Futurismo Verde, a Spanish-language publication focused on ecological economics, sustainability and innovation. <http://www.casavaria.com/hotspring/2011/10/20/1474/nuclear-power-offshore-drilling-may-keep-oil-prices-artificially-high/> ETB]

Now, **given** the intense **security concerns** related to nuclear power, **rapid construction is** literally **impossible**. **Federal** public health and environmental **laws also require fastidious attention to detail,** **which has intensified** since the last plant was constructed 3 decades ago. Failure to meet with absolute precision all the security requirements can result in catastrophic accidents and/or major cost-overruns in relation to federal regulatory fines and/or takeovers. This means that entirely **new systems for construction need to be** designed and **tested before** even the first **construction** of any new plant **can begin**. **There is**, simply put, **no way that new nuclear plants can affect** current **gas prices. The timeline** here **has** also **been pushed back as far as 2030 for any significant shift on percentage of** national **energy production derived from nuclear power, if** the **massive new construction** project **were** **undertaken**.