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#### Obama has a small lead in Ohio --- it will determine the election and the economy is key

Spinelli, 8/23 (John, 8/23/2012, “Latest Ohio Poll shows tight races between Obama and Romney, Brown and Mandel (Video),” http://www.examiner.com/article/latest-ohio-poll-shows-tight-races-between-obama-and-romney-brown-and-mandel)

In all-important Ohio, the tipping-point state that will make which ever candidate who wins it the next president, President Barack Obama holds a slim 3-point lead over former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, according to the latest Ohio Poll released Thursday morning. In the poll conducted this year with Ohio likely voters from August 16 to August 21, the contest—49% to 46%—between the incumbent president and his soon-to-be challenger makes it a toss-up race. Overseen by Eric W. Rademacher, PhD and Kimberly Downing, PhD at the Institute for Policy Research at the University of Cincinnati, the poll of 847 likely voters from throughout the state shows just how close the race is in the Buckeye State and why er both campaigns will return over the next 74 days until Election Day on November 6. President Obama visited the state on Tuesday for the 11th time this year. Mitt Romney and running mate Wisconsin Rep. Paul Ryan have been in Ohio separately before, but this Saturday morning in Powell, a small, affluent rural community north of the state capital, Columbus, they will campaign together. The Ohio Poll also offered a measuring stick in the U.S. Senate race between incumbent Senator Sherrod Brown (48%) and Ohio Treasurer Josh Mandel (47%). Both races are within the survey's margin of error. The pollsters said "the eyes of the world will once again look to Ohio as a bellwether of the American electorate. As the candidates hit Ohio’s campaign trails in earnest, they will find many voters still weighing their options." Nearly one in five (17%) Ohio voters say they may change their current presidential choice before Election Day or are undecided as to how they will vote. Similarly, 21 percent are still weighing their options in the race for U.S. Senate. The upcoming national conventions will no doubt offer more opportunities for the dynamics of these races to change. What's the top issue? The economy, of course. A majority of voters (51%) cite economic considerations when asked to identify the most important issue in their presidential choice, the poll reported.

#### Spending alienates swing state independents --- Obama is leading with them now

Galston, 12 (5/10/2012, William A., “Six Months To Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins,“ <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/Where%20the%20Presidential%20Contest%20Stands.pdf>)

According to the 2008 exit polls, Obama carried Independents by eight points—52 to 44 percent. Today, his standing with this important group is significantly weaker. The most recent Quinnipiac poll gave Romney a 46 to 39 percent edge over the president; Pew found Romney enjoying a similar 48 to 42 percent advantage.48 It is hard to see how Obama can win a majority of the popular vote unless he rebuilds his standing among Independents. But it is not clear his current strategy is the one best calculated to bring about this result. Independents care more about economic growth and equal opportunity than they do about reducing gaps in wealth and income. While half of them believe that the U.S. economic system is unfair, 57 percent think that they themselves have been treated fairly. Perhaps that is why only 47 percent think that income and wealth gaps need to be fixed through public policy.49 A recent report50 found Obama statistically tied with Romney among Independents in swing states, with 36 percent of these Independents up for grabs. Among these “Swing Independents,” Obama now enjoys a lead of 44 to 38 percent. But there are some warning signs. These voters are split on Obama’s economic management, and they strongly prefer Republicans both on the budget deficit and government spending, issues of great concern to them. And according to the report, they are not much moved by the fairness argument. By 57 to 38 percent, they said it was more important to fix the budget deficit than to reduce the income gap. A plurality—42 percent—thought that reducing the budget deficit was the single most effective way of strengthening the economy. For this key group, the themes of growth and opportunity trump both the conservative focus on economic freedom and the liberal emphasis on economic inequality. They are most worried about the national debt (64 percent), congressional gridlock (55 percent), and the ability of the next generation to achieve the American dream (40 percent). And they are much angrier about the failure of Congress to address our problems than they are about Wall Street bailouts or the suggestion that the wealthy don’t pay their fair share of taxes.

#### Obama victory key to prevent economic collapse, war and warming --- impact is extinction

Mogulescu, 12 --- Entertainment attorney, writer, and political activist (7/13/2012, Miles, “Progressive Critics of President Obama Must Go All Out to Defeat Romney,” [www.huffingtonpost.com/miles-mogulescu/progressive-critics-of-pr\_b\_1671367.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/miles-mogulescu/progressive-critics-of-pr_b_1671367.html) )

That said, I consider the possible election of Mitt Romney (and the likely election of reactionary Republican majorities in the Senate and the House if he prevails) to be the greatest threat to the nation since the Great Depression and perhaps since the Civil War.Such a victory for a Republicans -- the most virulently reactionary American political party in historical memory -- would likely result in British/European-style austerity that would plunge a country already experiencing an unnecessarily slow recovery from the deepest recession since the 1930's into a full-blown depression. It would likely lead to tax cuts for the wealthy that would only increase the economic inequality between the top 1% (and top 0.01%) and the 99% that has been widening since the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980. It would likely lead to the unraveling of the economic reforms of the Progressive era, the New Deal, and the Great Society including Medicare and Social Security, which have done so much to turn America into the first largely middle class society in history. It would unravel even the relatively mild regulation of Too Big To Fail Banks of the Obama administration and make another financial crisis more likely. It would restore the neocons to leadership of American foreign policy which could lead to further unnecessary wars. It would lead to the appointment of up to three new Supreme Court Justices in the mold of Scalia/Alito/Thomas who would block progressive reforms for a generation to come. And it would unravel environmental regulation and guarantee that nothing is done to mitigate Global Climate Change which threatens the very fabric of human civilization. Therefore, this progressive critic of President Obama intends to do as much, or more, to aid his reelection -- and the election of a Democratic Congress -- in 2012 as I did to aid their election in 2008. With all my heart, I urge other progressives to do likewise.

### 1NC

#### Text: Nuclear Regulatory Commission should remove current licensing regulations for Small Modular nuclear Reactors and establish guidelines staffing levels, security requirements, and construction criteria.

#### Reform of NRC regulations for Small Modular Reactors key to spur the industry – must reject subsidies

Spencer & Loris, Nuclear Research Fellow @ Thomas Roe Institute, ’11

[Jack Spencer, Research Fellow in Nuclear Energy in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, Nicolas D. Loris is a Research Associate in the Roe Institute at The Heritage Foundation, “A Big Future for Small Nuclear Reactors?,” February 2nd 2011, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/a-big-future-for-small-nuclear-reactors]

If SMRs Are So Great, Where Is the Construction? While some designs are closer to market introduction than others, the fact is that America’s regulatory and policy environment is not sufficient to support a robust expansion of existing nuclear technologies, much less new ones. New reactor designs are difficult to license efficiently, and the lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management policy causes significant risk to private investment. Many politicians are attempting to mitigate these market challenges by offering subsidies, such as loan guarantees. While this approach still enjoys broad support in Congress and industry, the reality is that it has not worked. Despite a lavish suite of subsidies offered in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including loan guarantees, insurance against government delays, and production tax credits, no new reactors have been permitted, much less constructed. These subsidies are in addition to existing technology development cost-sharing programs that have been in place for years and defer significant research and development costs from industry to the taxpayer. The problem with this approach is that it ignores the larger systemic problems that create the unstable marketplace to begin with. These systemic problems generally fall into three categories: Licensing. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is ill prepared to build the regulatory framework for new reactor technologies, and no reactor can be offered commercially without an NRC license. In a September 2009 interview, former NRC chairman Dale E. Klein said that small nuclear reactors pose a dilemma for the NRC because the commission is uneasy with new and unproven technologies and feels more comfortable with large light water reactors, which have been in operation for years and has a long safety record.[11] The result is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a timeframe that would promote near-term investment. So, regardless of which attributes an SMR might bring to the market, the regulatory risk is such that real progress on commercialization is difficult to attain. This then leaves large light water reactors, and to a lesser extent, small ones, as the least risky option, which pushes potential customers toward that technology, which then undermines long-term progress, competition, and innovation. Nuclear Waste Management. The lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management solution is perhaps the greatest obstacle to a broad expansion of U.S. nuclear power. The federal government has failed to meet its obligations under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, to begin collecting nuclear waste for disposal in Yucca Mountain. The Obama Administration’s attempts to shutter the existing program to put waste in Yucca Mountain without having a backup plan has worsened the situation. This outcome was predictable because the current program is based on the flawed premise that the federal government is the appropriate entity to manage nuclear waste. Under the current system, waste producers are able to largely ignore waste management because the federal government is responsible. The key to a sustainable waste management policy is to directly connect financial responsibility for waste management to waste production. This will increase demand for more waste-efficient reactor technologies and drive innovation on waste-management technologies, such as reprocessing. Because SMRs consume fuel and produce waste differently than LWRs, they could contribute greatly to an economically efficient and sustainable nuclear waste management strategy. Government Intervention. Too many policymakers believe that Washington is equipped to guide the nuclear industry to success. So, instead of creating a stable regulatory environment where the market value of different nuclear technologies can determine their success and evolution, they choose to create programs to help industry succeed. Two recent Senate bills from the 111th Congress, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act (S. 2052) and the Nuclear Power 2021 Act (S. 2812), are cases in point. Government intervention distorts the normal market processes that, if allowed to work, would yield the most efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate nuclear technologies. Instead, the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted, and provides capital subsidies that allow investors to ignore the systemic problems that drive risk and costs artificially high. This approach is especially detrimental to SMRs because subsidies to LWRs distort the relative benefit of other reactor designs by artificially lowering the cost and risk of a more mature technology that already dominates the marketplace. How to Fix a Broken System At the Global Nuclear Renaissance Summit on July 24, 2008, then-NRC chairman Dale Klein said that a nuclear renaissance with regard to small reactors will take “decades to unfold.”[12] If Members of Congress and government agencies do not reform their current approach to nuclear energy, this will most certainly be the case. However, a new, market-based approach could lead to a different outcome. Instead of relying on the policies of the past, Congress, the Department of Energy, and the NRC should pursue a new, 21st-century model for small and alternative reactor technologies by doing the following: Reject additional loan guarantees. Loan guarantee proponents argue that high up-front costs of new large reactors make them unaffordable without loan guarantees. Presumably, then, a smaller, less expensive modular option would be very attractive to private investors even without government intervention. But loan guarantees undermine this advantage by subsidizing the capital costs and risk associated with large reactors. A small reactor industry without loan guarantees would also provide competition and downward price pressure on large light water reactors. At a minimum, Congress should limit guarantees to no more than two plants of any reactor design and limit to two-thirds the amount of any expanded loan guarantee program that can support a single technology. Such eligibility limits will prevent support from going only to a single basic technology, such as large light water reactors.[13] Avoid subsidies. Subsidies do not work if the objective is a diverse and economically sustainable nuclear industry. Despite continued attempts to subsidize the nuclear industry into success, the evidence demonstrates that such efforts invariably fail. The nuclear industry’s success stories are rooted in the free market. Two examples include the efficiency and low costs of today’s existing plants, and the emergence of a private uranium enrichment industry. Government intervention is the problem, as illustrated by the government’s inability to meet its nuclear waste disposal obligations. Build expertise at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC is built to regulate large light water reactors. It simply does not have the regulatory capability and resources to efficiently regulate other technologies, and building that expertise takes time. Helping the NRC to develop that expertise now would help bring new technologies into the marketplace more smoothly. Congress should direct and resource the NRC to develop additional broad expertise for liquid metal-cooled, fast reactors and high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors. With its existing expertise in light water technology, this additional expertise would position the NRC to effectively regulate an emerging SMR industry. Establish a new licensing pathway. The current licensing pathway relies on reactor customers to drive the regulatory process. But absent an efficient and predictable regulatory pathway, few customers will pursue these reactor technologies. The problem is that the legal, regulatory, and policy apparatus is built to support large light water reactors, effectively discriminating against other technologies. Establishing an alternative licensing pathway that takes the unique attributes of small reactors into consideration could help build the necessary regulatory support on which commercialization ultimately depends.[14] Resolve staffing, security, construction criteria, and fee-structure issues by December 31, 2011. The similarity of U.S. reactors has meant that the NRC could establish a common fee structure and many general regulatory guidelines for areas, such as staffing levels, security requirements, and construction criteria. But these regulations are inappropriate for many SMR designs that often have smaller staff requirements, unique control room specifications, diverse security requirements, and that employ off-site construction techniques. Subjecting SMRs to regulations built for large light water reactors would add cost and result in less effective regulation. The NRC has acknowledged the need for this to be resolved and has committed to doing so, including developing the budget requirements to achieve it. It has not committed to a specific timeline.[15] Congress should demand that these issues be resolved by the end of 2011. Reform waste management. The federal government’s inability to fulfill its legal obligations under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act has often been cited as a significant obstacle to building additional nuclear power plants. Given nuclear power’s potential to help solve many of the nation’s energy problems, now is the time to break the impasse over managing the nation’s used nuclear fuel. The current system is driven by government programs and politics. There is little connection between used-fuel management programs, economics, and the needs of the nuclear industry. Any successful plan must grow out of the private sector, be driven by sound economics, and provide access to the funds that have been set aside for nuclear waste management.[16] Such an approach would propel the development of SMRs by placing market value on their potential waste management attributes. Transitioning to a New Era of Nuclear Power It is an exciting time for the nuclear industry in the United States and around the world, but that excitement could quickly dwindle if Congress and the White House do not usher in a new path forward for nuclear energy. New technologies have the potential to revolutionize how people produce and consume energy, but if the same bureaucratic approach is taken, it will create the same problems of dependency and stagnation that led to the demise of the commercial nuclear industry decades ago. Congress and the Administration have the opportunity to create a robust, competitive market for nuclear power and should implement the necessary reforms to make this happen.

### 1NC

#### The aff reproduces neoliberal subjectivity, translating military risk calculations into an opportunity for market expansion – this logic screens out the structural violence caused by nuclear power and creates an invisible war against minorities and the environment

Jacobs 11

(Ron, activist journalist with a pretty legit epistemology, “No More Nukes!”, March 15th, 2011, http://dissidentvoice.org/2011/03/no-more-nukes/)

Nuclear power is the perfect metaphor for the current phase of monopoly capitalism — neoliberalism. It involves a concentration of power (literal and corporate) to effect its goal and depends on the government to provide military security to protect that power from getting into the “wrong hands.” Furthermore, thanks to laws pushed through by the energy industry, if a disaster should happen because of some kind of nuclear accident, the government limits the corporation’s liability for any damage and loss of life that might occur. As the “Declaration of Nuclear Resistance” of the New England anti-nuke group, the Clamshell Alliance, wrote in 1977: Nuclear power is dangerous to all living creatures and to their natural environment. The nuclear industry is designed to concentrate profits and the control of energy resources in the hands of a powerful few, undermining basic principles of human liberty. A nuclear power plant at Seabrook, New Hampshire, could lock our region into a suicidal path.1 This statement, in all its direct simplicity, remains true today. Despite the claims by such former anti-nuclear activists like Stewart Brand, nuclear power is a dangerous form of energy production. It is also incredibly inefficient if one contrasts the construction and security costs and the problems with waste disposal with the relatively brief life of nuclear power plants and the increase in energy costs to the consumer such plants entail in a profit-driven industry. Nuclear power is not green energy, no matter what the industry’s spokespeople or the likes of Stewart Brand say. The daily operation of nuclear power plants change the ecology in their immediate vicinity, heating water near the discharge facilities and releasing various waste elements of the process into the air. If an accident occurs, the ecological devastation is incalculable and continues for generations. In addition, a 1000-MWe nuclear power plant produces about 27 tons of spent nuclear fuel (unreprocessed) every year. The problems associated with the spent fuels disposal and storage are costly and dangerous (for centuries). The environmental and safety reasons barely touched on here are reason enough to oppose nuclear power. So are the costs associated with this form of energy production. It seems likely that other safer alternative forms of power production that don’t involve fossil fuels could be developed and produced for less than the overall costs of nuclear power. Yet, these forms, such as solar and wind, are not given the same emphasis as nuclear energy. Why? Could it be that the energy industry fears the loss of extraordinary profits and centralized control those forms might create? If one does not oppose nuclear energy for health and safety reasons, yet opposes war and the nature of neoliberal capitalism, then the fact that the energy industry’s love affair with nuclear power development is based on corporate efforts to maximize profits and recoup past investments rather than on meeting our real energy needs provides another reason to oppose it. So does the direct relationship between nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons. Where do you think all that depleted uranium (DU) ammunition came from? That’s right, the waste product of nuclear power — the gift that keeps on giving. Pretending that nuclear power is not dangerous, inefficient, and ridiculously expensive is no longer viable. The events in Japan once again make that perfectly clear.

#### The impact is extinction – the environmental byproducts of neoliberalism create gaps in ecosystem services, creating multiple, mutually reinforcing feedback effects – causes climate change, resource collapse, disease spread, and biodiversity collapse

Ehrenfeld ‘5,

(David, Dept. of Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources @ Rutgers University, “The Environmental Limits to Globalization”, *Conservation Biology* Vol. 19 No. 2 April 2005)

The known effects of globalization on the environment are numerous and highly significant. Many others are undoubtedly unknown. Given these circumstances, the first question that suggests itself is: Will globalization, as we see it now, remain a permanent state of affairs (Rees 2002; Ehrenfeld 2003a)? The principal environmental side effects of globalization—climate change, resource exhaustion (particularly cheap energy), damage to agroecosystems, and the spread of exotic species, including pathogens (plant, animal, and human)—are sufficient to make this economic system unstable and short-lived. The socioeconomic consequences of globalization are likely to do the same. In my book *The Arrogance of Humanism* (1981), I claimed that our ability to manage global systems, which depends on our being able to predict the results of the things we do, or even to understand the systems we have created, has been greatly exaggerated. Much of our alleged control is science fiction; it doesn’t work because of theoretical limits that we ignore at our peril. We live in a dream world in which reality testing is something we must never, never do, lest we awake. In 1984 Charles Perrow explored the reasons why we have trouble predicting what so many of our own created systems will do, and why they surprise us so unpleasantly while we think we are managing them. In his book *Normal Accidents*, which does not concern globalization, he listed the critical characteristics of some of today’s complex systems. They are highly interlinked, so a change in one part can affect many others, even those that seem quite distant. Results of some processes feed back on themselves in unexpected ways. The controls of the system often interact with each other unpredictably. We have only indirect ways of finding out what is happening inside the system. And we have an incomplete understanding of some of the system’s processes. His example of such a system is a nuclear power plant, and this, he explained, is why system-wide accidents in nuclear plants cannot be predicted or eliminated by system design. I would argue that globalization is a similar system, also subject to catastrophic accidents, many of them environmental—events that we cannot define until after they have occurred, and perhaps not even then. The comparatively few commentators who have predicted the collapse of globalization have generally given social reasons to support their arguments. These deserve some consideration here, if only because the environmental and social consequences of globalization interact so strongly with each other. In 1998, the British political economist John Gray, giving scant attention to environmental factors, nevertheless came to the conclusion that globalization is unstable and will be short-lived. He said, “There is nothing in today’s global market that buffers it against the social strains arising from highly uneven economic development within and between the world’s diverse societies.” The result, Gray states, is that “The combination of [an] unceasing stream of new technologies, unfettered market competition and weak or fractured social institutions” has weakened both sovereign states and multinational corporations in their ability to control important events. Note that Gray claims that not only nations but also multinational corporations, which are widely touted as controlling the world, are being weakened by globalization. This idea may come as a surprise, considering the growth of multinationals in the past few decades, but I believe it is true. Neither governments nor giant corporations are even remotely capable of controlling the environmental or social forces released by globalization, without first controlling globalization itself. Two of the social critics of globalization with the most dire predictions about its doom are themselves masters of the process. The late Sir James Goldsmith, billionaire financier, wrote in 1994, It must surely be a mistake to adopt an economic policy which makes you rich if you eliminate your national workforce and transfer production abroad, and which bankrupts you if you continue to employ your own people.... It is the poor in the rich countries who will subsidize the rich in the poor countries. This will have a serious impact on the social cohesion of nations. Another free-trade billionaire, George Soros, said much the same thing in 1995: “The collapse of the global marketplace would be a traumatic event with unimaginable consequences. Yet I find it easier to imagine than the continuation of the present regime.” How much more powerful these statements are if we factor in the environment! As globalization collapses, what will happen to people, biodiversity, and ecosystems? With respect to people, the gift of prophecy is not required to answer this question. What will happen depends on where you are and how you live. Many citizens of the Third World are still comparatively self-sufficient; an unknown number of these will survive the breakdown of globalization and its attendant chaos. In the developed world, there are also people with resources of self-sufficiency and a growing understanding of the nature of our social and environmental problems, which may help them bridge the years of crisis. Some species are adaptable; some are not. For the non- human residents of Earth, not all news will be bad. Who would have predicted that wild turkeys (Meleagris gallopavo), one of the wiliest and most evasive of woodland birds, extinct in New Jersey 50 years ago, would now be found in every county of this the most densely populated state, and even, occasionally, in adjacent Manhattan? Who would have predicted that black bears (Ursus americanus), also virtually extinct in the state in the mid-twentieth century, would now number in the thousands (Ehrenfeld 2001)? Of course these recoveries are unusual—rare bright spots in a darker landscape. Finally, a few ecological systems may survive in a comparatively undamaged state; most will be stressed to the breaking point, directly or indirectly, by many environmental and social factors interacting unpredictably. Lady Luck, as always, will have much to say. In his book *The Collapse of Complex Societies,* the archaeologist Joseph Tainter (1988) notes that collapse, which has happened to all past empires, inevitably results in human systems of lower complexity and less specialization, less centralized control, lower economic activity, less information flow, lower population levels, less trade, and less redistribution of resources. All of these changes are inimical to globalization. This less-complex, less-globalized condition is probably what human societies will be like when the dust settles. I do not think, however, that we can make such specific predictions about the ultimate state of the environment after globalization, because we have never experienced anything like this exceptionally rapid, global environmental damage before. History and science have little to tell us in this situation. The end of the current economic system and the transition to a postglobalized state is and will be accompanied by a desperate last raid on resources and a chaotic flurry of environmental destruction whose results cannot possibly be told in advance. All one can say is that the surviving species, ecosystems, and resources will be greatly impoverished compared with what we have now, and our descendants will not thank us for having adopted, however briefly, an economic system that consumed their inheritance and damaged their planet so wantonly. Environment is a true bottom line—concern for its condition must trump all purely economic growth strategies if both the developed and developing nations are to survive and prosper. Awareness of the environmental limits that globalized industrial society denies or ignores should not, however, bring us to an extreme position of environmental determinism. Those whose preoccupations with modern civilization’s very real social problems cause them to reject or minimize the environmental constraints discussed here ( Hollander 2003) are guilty of seeing only half the picture. Environmental scientists sometimes fall into the same error. It is tempting to see the salvation of civilization and environment solely in terms of technological improvements in efficiency of energy extraction and use, control of pollution, conservation of water, and regulation of environmentally harmful activities. But such needed developments will not be sufficient—or may not even occur— without corresponding social change, including an end to human population growth and the glorification of consumption, along with the elimination of economic mechanisms that increase the gap between rich and poor. The environmental and social problems inherent in globalization are completely interrelated—any attempt to treat them as separate entities is unlikely to succeed in easing the transition to a postglobalized world. Integrated change that combines environmental awareness, technological innovation, and an altered world view is the only answer to the life-threatening problems exacerbated by globalization (Ehrenfeld 2003b). If such integrated change occurs in time, it will likely happen partly by our own design and partly as an unplanned response to the constraints imposed by social unrest, disease, and the economics of scarcity. With respect to the planned component of change, we are facing, as eloquently described by Rees (2002), “the ultimate challenge to human intelligence and self-awareness, those vital qualities we humans claim as uniquely our own. *Homo sapiens* will either. . .become fully human or wink out ignominiously, a guttering candle in a violent storm of our own making.” If change does not come quickly, our global civilization will join Tainter’s (1988) list as the latest and most dramatic example of collapsed complex societies. Is there anything that could slow globalization quickly, before it collapses disastrously of its own environmental and social weight? It is still not too late to curtail the use of energy, reinvigorate local and regional communities while restoring a culture of concern for each other, reduce nonessential global trade and especially global finance (Daly & Cobb 1989), do more to control introductions of exotic species (including pathogens), and accelerate the growth of sustainable agriculture. Many of the needed technologies are already in place. It is true that some of the damage to our environment—species extinctions, loss of crop and domestic animal varieties, many exotic species introductions, and some climatic change— will be beyond repair. Nevertheless, the opportunity to help our society move past globalization in an orderly way, while there is time, is worth our most creative and passionate efforts. The citizens of the United States and other nations have to understand that our global economic system has placed both our environment and our society in peril, a peril as great as that posed by any war of the twentieth century. This understanding, and the actions that follow, must come not only from enlightened leadership, but also from grassroots consciousness raising. It is still possible to reclaim the planet from a self-destructive economic system that is bringing us all down together, and this can be a task that bridges the divide between conservatives and liberals. The crisis is here, now. What we have to do has become obvious. Globalization can be scaled back to manageable proportions only in the context of an altered world view that rejects materialism even as it restores a sense of communal obligation. In this way, alone, can we achieve real homeland security, not just in the United States, but also in other nations, whose fates have become so thoroughly entwined with ours within the global environment we share.

#### The judge should vote negative to endorse globalization from below

#### The alt develops an alternative ethical orientation towards economics, grounding it in an ethical empathy towards the other – re-orienting our methodological approach to the economy produces a new system of democratic institution and unites transnational movements

Choi, Murphy, and Caro 4

Jung Min, John W, Manuel J, Professor of Sociology SDSU, Professor of Sociology University of Miami, Professor of Sociology Barry University, Globalization with a Human Face, pg. 6-9

Many critics have begun to wonder why hamburgers and jeans can be globalized, but the spread of themes such as peace or justice is thought by many politicians to be impossible to generalize. What many persons are calling for, especially in the Third World, is an alternative approach to globalization. Along with justice, they want to globalize resistance to current historical trends. They want to call a halt, for example, to the economic hardships and rape of the environment that have accompanied the rise of neoliberalism. This new strategy is referred to in many circles as "globalization from below." The point is that current policies have been driven from above from the capitalist centers around the world—and reflect the economic and cultural interests of these powerful classes. Most other persons, accordingly, are viewed as simply a cheap source of labor or a possible market for cheap goods. And because of this role in the world capitalist system, their opportunities are severely restricted. Even if they conform to the cultural mandates of the market, the likelihood of economic advancement is not very great. This sort of mobility is simply not a part of the role persons play on the economic periphery. What actually occurs, indeed, is that the system of controls, which are found in the economic centers, are reproduced on the periphery, but with more immediate devastation. The imposition of consumerism and materialism, for example, undermine the local economy and community supports, thereby increasing strife and reinforcing local elites and their ties to foreign investors. The old oligarchies are thus strengthened, while local institutions become more dependent on outside intervention. The resulting hierarchy, accordingly, is more powerful than ever before. As might be imagined, globalization from below has a very different agenda. Different values guide economic development, in short, while new ways of organizing society are sought. Instead of profit, for example, the general improvement of a community may be of prime importance. Likewise, emphasis may be placed on strengthening civil society, and thus ,advancing democracy, rather than identifying markets and potential investors. In general, globalization from below is driven by local concerns and the masses of persons who have little influence in corporate boardrooms. These are the people--the majority of the world's inhabitants--who are ignored unless their labor is suddenly profitable. At the core of this new globalization is often the call for a postcapitalist logic. Novel ways of looking at, for example, production and consumption are regularly a part of this project, in addition to new definitions of work and personal and group identity. Central to this scenario is that persons can remake themselves entirely, and nothing is exempt from revision. What proponents of globalization from below have done, in effect, is to seize control of their history and invent a new future. They have decided that history can be made, rather than merely experienced, and that there is no inherent *telos* to this process. The past is nothing, therefore, other than a point of departure of a new course of action. In the truest sense of the term, these activists are utopian thinkers. They are not enamored by reality and are convinced that new social arrangements, which have never existed and may be very difficult to create, are possible. As many students chanted during the 1960s, they are demanding the impossible and do not want to settle for more pragmatic substitutes. They are simply asking that persons strive to fulfill their dreams. But these demands are not based on fantasy. Instead, proponents of globalization from below are trying to emphasize an idea advanced by Marx: that is, nothing that humans imagine is foreign to them. Consequently, utopian ideals or practices are simply inventions that have not , yet been realized. Through effort and determination, and the absence foreign subversion, an economic system that is founded on justice might eventually be enacted. Merely because this vision has not been actualized, does not necessarily signal that such an aim contravenes human nature or is hopelessly flawed. The problem may simply be that persons have been unwilling or unable to purge themselves of certain biases or predispositions, and thus have never embarked on the creation of a new reality. Those who champion globalization from below, however, are not politically naive. They understand that powerful interests that benefit from injustice and inequality have intervened in the past to undermine various utopian projects. The proper dream is important, but so is the ability to implement this vision. These new utopians are thus trying to convince the public to restrain those who want to destroy these projects. What they are saying, in short, is that justice should be given the opportunity to thrive. THE RESTORATION OF COMMUNITY Various critics are saying that only the restoration of a strong sense of community can guarantee the success of globalization. What is meant by community, however, is in dispute. After all, even neoliberals lament the current loss of community that has ensued in the world economy. From their perspective, a community of effective traders would strengthen everyone's position at the marketplace. Advocates of globalization from below, as might be expected, have something very different in mind. They are not calling for the general assimilation of persons to a cosmopolitan ideal, which is thought to instill civility and enforce rationality. Persons who want to join the world market, as was noted earlier, are thought to need a good dose of these traits. Nonetheless, there is a high price for entry into this community—cultural or personal uniqueness must be sacrificed to promote effective economic discourse. Such reductionism, however, is simply unacceptable in a large part of the globe that is beginning to appreciate local customs and the resulting diversity. What these new activists want, therefore, is a community predicated on human solidarity. This sort of community, as Emmanuel Levinas describes, is focused on ethics rather than metaphysics." His point is that establishing order does not require the internalization of a single ideal by all persons, but simply their mutual recognition. The recognition of others as different, but connected to a common fate, is a powerful and unifying principle. Persons are basically united through the recognition and appreciation of their uniqueness. As should be noted, this image is encompassing but not abstract. Uniformity, in other words, is replaced by the juxtaposition of diversity as the cement that binds a community together. Like a montage, a community based on human solidarity is engendered at the boundaries of its various and diverse elements. The genius of this rendition of community is that no one is by nature an outsider, and thus deserving of special treatment. Many of the problems that exist today, in fact, result from persons sitting idly while their neighbors are singled out as different and discriminated against or exploited. When persons view themselves to be fundamentally united, on the other hand, such mistreatment is unlikely, because community members protect and encourage one another. Indeed, this sort of obligation is neither selective nor optional among those who belong to a true community. Basically the idea is that if no one is an outsider, there are no persons or groups to exploit. Such a community, moreover, does not require extraordinary actions on the part of its members to end racism, sexism, or economic exploitation. All that is required is persons refuse to turn away and say nothing when such discrimination is witnessed. By refusing to go along with these practices, any system that survives because of discrimination or exploitation will eventually grind to a halt. Clearly, there is an implicit threat behind current trends of globalization. Because globalization as it is currently defined is inevitable, anyone who expects to be treated as rational and civilized must accept some temporary pain. Old cultural ways will simply have to be abandoned, and a transition to the new economic realities. Those who cannot tolerate the mistreatment of fellow community members any longer appear to be a part of this change, however, they are obligated to bare witness to these abuses. And by refusing to be complicit these actions, business as usual cannot continue. A globalization of can be mounted, therefore, that might be able to create a more humane world. In the face of mounting darkness—increasing economic hardship and degradation—why not seriously entertain the possibility that social life can be organized in less alienating ways? With little left to why not pursue alternative visions?

## Case

### Desalination

#### Incentives won’t work absent a water shortage and desalination being competitive

Kupitz and Misra, IAEA, 2004

[2/16/04, J. Kupitz and B.M. Misra of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), “The role of nuclear desalination I nmeeting the potable water needs in water scarce areas in the next decades,” <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0011916404002590>]

The broader picture however, is that the worldwide use of desalination is still negligible compared to the demand for fresh water. To become a noticeable (and quantifiable) market for nuclear energy, desalination needs to compete successfully with alternative means of increasing fresh water supply. For nuclear desalination to be attractive in any given country, two factors must be in place simultaneously: a lack of water and the ability to use nuclear energy for desalination. In most regions, only one of the two is present. Both are present for example in China, the Republic of Korea and, even more so, in India and Pakistan. These regions already account for almost half the world's population, and thus represent a potential long-term market for nuclear desalination. There are already plans in these countries to deploy large size nuclear desalination plants in this decade. The market will expand further to the extent that regions with high projected water needs, such as the Middle East and North Africa, increase their nuclear expertise and capabilities.

#### Empirics disprove and no statistical date to support their claims – no risk of escalation

Katz, Enviro Studies Prof at Tel Aviv, ’11 (David, February, “Hydro-Political Hyperbole: Examining Incentives for Overemphasizing the Risks of Water Wars” Global Environmental Politics, Vol 11 No 1, ProjectMuse)

Critiques of the Water War Hypothesis A number critiques have been leveled against both the theory and the empirical evidence behind the water wars hypothesis. One critique of the environmental security literature, of which much of the published material on water wars is guilty, is that warnings and threats of future violence are often considered as evidence.28 Statements from the 1980s that the next war in the Middle East will be over water have already proven false. Research has shown, however, that even the more general predictions of imminent water wars that are based on comments by officials may be suspect. Leng, for instance, found no correlation between the frequency of threats of war and the onset of war.29 Examining conflict and cooperation over water resources, Yoffe and colleagues noted over 400 incidents of water-related verbal exchanges by political figures between 1948 and 1999 that were conflictual in nature, but only 37 instances of violent conflict of varying levels of intensity. Thirty of these were from the Middle East, none were [End Page 15] more recent than 1970, none were all-out wars, and in none was water the central cause of conflict.30 Proponents of water war scenarios often premise their dire conclusions on the fact that water is essential for life and non-substitutable.31 Yet water for basic needs represents a small share of total water use, even in arid countries.32 Economists and others point out that over 80 percent of world freshwater withdrawals are for the agricultural sector, a relatively low-value use and one in which large gains in efficiency could be made by changes in irrigation techniques and choice of crops. Thus, economic critiques of the water war hypothesis stress that the value of water that would be gained from military conflict is unlikely to outweigh the economic costs of military preparation and battle, much less the loss of life.33 Some authors have even questioned the empirical basis for the conclusion that freshwater is increasingly scarce,34 an assumption on which the water war hypothesis relies. Such a “cornucopian” view claims that people adapt to scarcity through improvements in technology, pricing, and efficiency—rendering water less scarce, not more so. Perhaps the strongest case against the likelihood of water wars is the lack of empirical evidence of precedents. Wolf found only one documented case of war explicitly over water, and this took place over 4500 years ago.35 Moreover, he could document only seven cases of acute conflict over water. Yoffe and colleagues also find that armed conflict over water resources has been uncommon.36 They found that cooperation was much more common than conflict, both globally and in all world regions except the Middle East/North Africa. This pattern may explain why only a limited number of case studies of water conflict are presented in the water wars literature. Analysts have criticized environmental security arguments that are based on case studies because such works tend to have no variation in the dependent variable.37 Many large sample statistical studies have attempted to address such shortcomings, however, in several cases these studies too have come under fire. For instance, a number of large-sample statistical studies find correlations between water-related variables and conflict, however, few, if any, provide convincing support for causal relationships. Moreover, several studies found that water availability had no impact on the likelihood of either domestic or international conflict,38 including at least one study that attempted to replicate earlier studies [End Page 16] that claimed to have found such correlations.39 Moreover, the results of several studies that do find correlations between water and conflict are either not robust or are contrasted by other findings. For instance, Raleigh and Urdal find that the statistical significance of water scarcity variables is highly dependent on one or two observations, leading them to conclude that actual effects of water scarcity “are weak, negligible or insignificant.”40 Jensen and Gleditsch find that the results of Miguel and colleagues are less robust when using a recoding of the original dataset.41 Gleditsch and colleagues found that shared basins do predict an increased propensity for conflict, but found no correlation between conflict and drought, the number of river crossings, or the share of the basin upstream, leading them to state that “support for a scarcity theory of water conflict is somewhat ambiguous.”42 Evidence and Perception In sum, despite some instances of violent conflict over water, there is little systematic evidence of war over water resources. Evidence for a deterministic relationship between water scarcity and the outbreak of armed conflict is particularly weak. Less ambitious claims that water shortages will contribute to insecurity, which can, in turn, lead to violent conflict, have more empirical support. Even here, however, the importance of water as a causal variable is questionable. Several studies have found that variables such as regime type and institutional capacity are much more important indicators of conflict potential,43 and may have mitigating effects on any water-conflict link. As a consequence of accumulated research, many scholars have concluded that risks of water wars are low,44 and others have toned down or qualified their statements about the likelihood of future water wars.45 Some governmental reports have limited their contentions to highlighting that water scarcity can aggravate conflicts and increase insecurity,46 and many studies now emphasize water as a tool for cooperation.47 Warnings and predictions of imminent water [End Page 17] wars continue to be commonplace, however. In a review of published academic literature, Gupta and van der Zaag find that articles on water conflict outnumber those on cooperation by nearly three to one, and are five times more likely to be cited.48

#### Technology solves water shortages

BBC News ‘4

October 19, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/3747724.stm

New technology can help, however, especially by cleaning up pollution and so making more water useable, and in agriculture, where water use can be made far more efficient. Drought-resistant plants can also help. Drip irrigation drastically cuts the amount of water needed, low-pressure sprinklers are an improvement, and even building simple earth walls to trap rainfall is helpful. Some countries are now treating waste water so that it can be used - and drunk - several times over. Desalinisation makes sea water available , but takes huge quantities of energy and leaves vast amounts of brine. The optimists say "virtual water" may save the day - the water contained in crops which can be exported from water-rich countries to arid ones.

### Nuclear Leadership

#### Nuclear plant design not key – Stronger incentives/opportunities to prolif

Gronlund, et. Al, Director, Nuclear Safety Project, Union of Concerned Scientists Global Security Program, 2007

[December 2007, Lisbeth Gronlund, Co-Director and Senior Scientist of the Union of Concerned Scientists Global Security Program (UCSGSP), David Lochbaum, Director of the Nuclear Safety Project in the UCSGSP, Edwin Lyman, Senior Staff Scientist in the UCSGSP, “Nuclear Power in a Warming World: Assessing the Risks, Addressing the Challenges,” http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear\_power/nuclear-power-in-a-warming-world.pdf]

An expansion of nuclear power could—but need not—make it more likely that more nations will acquire nuclear weapons. In any event, it is only one factor of many that will affect this outcome. Many states that do not now have nuclear weapons already have the technical ability to produce them, should they decide to do so. In other countries without such a capability, nuclear power facilities could aid a nuclear weapons program—in some cases significantly. However, the political incentives for a nation to acquire nuclear weapons are the most significant factor, and there is little the United States or international community can do to prevent a determined nation from eventually acquiring such weapons. The nuclear facilities that present the greatest proliferation risk are those that can be used to produce the materials needed to make nuclear weapons— plutonium and highly enriched uranium (HEU). Reprocessing plants extract plutonium from used reactor fuel, while uranium enrichment facilities that make low-enriched uranium for reactor fuel can be used to make HEU.

#### Can’t solve – expanding nuclear power makes waste more vulnerable

Makhijani, president of IEER, 2011

[9/8/11, Arjun, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, electrical and nuclear engineer with 37 years of experience, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists round table discussion, “Is nuclear energy different than other energy sources?,” “Why nuclear energy is not the answer,” http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/nuclear-energy-different-other-energy-sources]

2. Proliferation. President Eisenhower spoke of "Atoms for Peace" at the United Nations in 1953; he thought it would be too depressing only to mention the horrors of thermonuclear weapons. It was just a fig leaf to mask the bomb: Much of the interest in nuclear power is mainly a cover for acquiring bomb-making know-how. To make a real dent in carbon dioxide emissions, about 3,000 large reactors would have to be built worldwide in the next 40 years -- creating enough plutonium annually to create 90,000 bombs, if separated. Two or three commercial uranium enrichment plants would also be needed yearly -- and it has only taken one, Iran's, to give the world a nuclear security headache.

#### No arms races

Waltz Poli Sci Cal‘3

(Kenneth, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, p. 29-30)

One may believe that old American and Soviet military doctrines set the pattern that new nuclear states will follow. One may also believe that they will suffer the fate of the United States and the former Soviet Union, that they will compete in building larger and larger nuclear arsenals while continuing to accumulate conventional weapons. These are doubtful beliefs. One can infer the future from the past only insofar as future situations may be like past ones. For three main reasons, new nuclear states are likely to decrease, rather than to increase, their military spending. First, nuclear weapons alter the dynamics of arms races. In a competition of two or more parties, it may be hard to say who is pushing and who is being pushed, who is leading and who is following. If one party seeks to increase its capabilities, it may seem that others must too. The dynamic may be built into the competition and may unfold despite a mutual wish to resist it. But need this be the case in a strategic competition among nuclear countries? It need not be if the conditions of competition make deterrent logic dominant. Deterrent logic dominates if the conditions of competition make it nearly impossible for any of the competing parties to achieve a first- strike capability. Early in the nuclear age, the implications of deterrent strategy were clearly seen. "When dealing with the absolute weapon," as William T. R. Fox put it, "arguments based on relative advantage lose their point."29 The United States has sometimes designed its forces according to that logic. Donald A. Quarles, when he was President Eisenhower's secretary of the Air Force, argued that "sufficiency of air power" is determined by "the force required to accomplish the mission assigned." Avoidance of total war then does not depend on the "relative strength of the two opposed forces." Instead, it depends on the "absolute power in the hands of each, and in the substantial invulnerability of this power to interdiction." 30 In other words, if no state can launch a disarming attack with high confidence, force comparisons are irrelevant. Strategic arms races are then pointless. Deterrent strategies offer this great advantage: Within wide ranges neither side need respond to increases in the other side's military capabilities.

#### No way to credibly assess meltdown risk – their advantage is flawed

Makhijani, president of IEER, 2011

[7/21/11, Arjun, president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, electrical and nuclear engineer with 37 years of experience, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists round table discussion, “Is nuclear energy different than other energy sources?,” “The Fukushima tragedy demonstrates that nuclear energy doesn’t make sense,” http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/roundtables/nuclear-energy-different-other-energy-sources]

Meltdown rates and bureaucracy. Those who promote nuclear power have hidden behind two related assumptions: first, that severe accidents will be extremely rare -- once every several hundred years if several hundred reactors are operational; and, second, that we are prescient enough to know the accident mechanisms and calculate their probabilities. The current tally: one in every 100 commercial light water power reactors, the most common design in the world (including all operating US commercial reactors), has now had a partial or full meltdown before its first 40-year license period has expired -- three at Fukushima Daiichi and one at Three Mile Island. The Fukushima meltdowns have had serious containment failures. In addition, there have been four hydrogen explosions and heating up or boiling of one or more spent fuel pools, which often have larger stores of long-lived radioactivity than the reactors. This severe accident rate -- one every five to 10 years for which a few hundred reactors have been operational -- is far greater than regulators and proponents imagine. So, we simply do not know how to reliably calculate the probabilities of such events, which remain rare in theory, but evidently not so rare in practice. And each accident sequence has been unique. There even appear to be differences among the meltdowns at the Fukushima reactors. Still, the US regulatory process moves ahead, relying on the perilous notion that these terribly dangerous events can be calculated -- though the official numbers are now in the realm of statistical fiction.

### Solvency

#### Trades off with rare earth metals

Zyga, Science Reporter for PhysOrg, quoting analysis by Abbott, Prof. of Electrical Engineering, 2011

[5/11/11, Lisa, BA in rhetoric from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, known science reporter for PhysOrg, Derek Abbott, Professor of Electrical and Electronic Engineering at the University of Adelaide in Australia, “Why nuclear power will never supply the world’s energy needs,” PhysOrg, <http://phys.org/news/2011-05-nuclear-power-world-energy.html>]

Exotic metals: The nuclear containment vessel is made of a variety of exotic rare metals that control and contain the nuclear reaction: hafnium as a neutron absorber, beryllium as a neutron reflector, zirconium for cladding, and niobium to alloy steel and make it last 40-60 years against neutron embrittlement. Extracting these metals raises issues involving cost, sustainability, and environmental impact. In addition, these metals have many competing industrial uses; for example, hafnium is used in microchips and beryllium by the semiconductor industry. If a nuclear reactor is built every day, the global supply of these exotic metals needed to build nuclear containment vessels would quickly run down and create a mineral resource crisis. This is a new argument that Abbott puts on the table, which places resource limits on all future-generation nuclear reactors, whether they are fueled by thorium or uranium.

#### That’s key to a litany of defense technologies

BEST, no date

[Beryllium Science & Technology Association, “Uses & Applications of Beryllium,” http://beryllium.eu/about-beryllium-and-beryllium-alloys/uses-and-applications-of-beryllium/]

Beryllium is crucial to the defense of the nation, the protection of our allies and the security of the homeland. The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) reported in 2008 that of all the metals used in its systems, only high purity beryllium was deemed “critical.” DoD stated that beryllium is “essential for important defense systems and unique in the function it performs.” NATO and the EU have presented similar conclusions. Systems. Military systems depend heavily on electronics for navigation, target acquisition and firing. In critical situations and equipment, stiff, lightweight beryllium components ensure precise operation under extreme conditions. In military fighter jets, pure beryllium saves weight critical to speed and maneuverability, while also ensuring razor-sharp targeting and strike capabilities. Copper beryllium is used for electrical connectors, fasteners and structural components in fixed-wing aircraft and fighters including the: F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter F-22 Raptor F-18 Super Hornet F-16 Fighting Falcon, and, F-15 Strike Eagle. Eurofighter BAE Tornado Dassualt Rafael In optical systems of military helicopters, beryllium components are designed into enhanced surveillance and targeting systems that help keep crews safe. The nation’s unmanned aerial systems count on beryllium optical systems for real-time imagery and targeting on surveillance and reconnaissance flights. For battle tanks on the move, stiff beryllium mirrors dampen vibration and provide a jitter-free optical path for targeting and firing controls. Beryllium is also integral to the airborne equipment used to detect and destroy improvised explosive devices (IED) and tactical mines. In emerging guided missile defense systems, beryllium is critical to assure a first line of defense in directing, targeting and ultimately destroying missile threats. U.S. military satellites rely on beryllium metal for structural and dimensional stability, as well as reliability, in the electrical systems that deliver reliable intelligence from space. Command and Control Communications. Military communications depend on copper beryllium alloys in network hubs, switches and routers. The strength, electrical and thermal conductivity of this material ensures reliability while maximizing signal speed and bandwidth. Homeland Security. Behind the scenes at airports, ports, border stations and other public assets, beryllium and beryllium-containing materials support surveillance, inspection and countermeasures vital to security. At countless locations, beryllium components operate in the x-ray machines, sorting equipment and scanners used to inspect baggage and cargo for illegal and dangerous substances.

#### Air and space power solve multiple nuclear wars

Khalilzad and Lesser, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., 1998

[Zalmay, Permanent United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Ian, Senior Transatlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States in Washington, “Sources of Conflict in the 21st Century,” http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf]

The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several sub-regions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuously on the Korean peninsula and to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and therefore has pre-planned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, US airpower would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service, (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report. The second key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that air and space power will function as a vital rapid reaction force in a breaking crisis. Current guidance tasks the Air Force to prepare for two major regional conflicts that could break out in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula. In other areas of Asia, however, such as the Indian subcontinent, the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, and Myanmar, the United States has no treaty obligations requiring it to commit the use of its military forces. But as past experience has shown, American policymakers have regularly displayed the disconcerting habit of discovering strategic interests in parts of the world previously neglected after conflicts have already broken out. Mindful of this trend, it would behoove U.S. Air Force planners to prudently plan for regional contingencies in nontraditional areas of interest, because naval and air power will of necessity be the primary instruments constituting the American response. Such responses would be necessitated by three general classes of contingencies. The first involves the politico-military collapse of a key regional actor, as might occur in the case of North Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Pakistan. The second involves acute political military crises that have a potential for rapid escalation, as may occur in the Taiwan Strait, the Spratlys, the Indian subcontinent, or on the Korean peninsula. The third involves cases of prolonged domestic instability that may have either spillover or contagion effects, as in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, or North Korea.

#### Incentives fail – natural gas saps support

Ferguson, Director of the Nuclear Policy Project for the Federation of American Scientists, 2012

[3/15/12, Charles D., President of the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), worked for FAS on nuclear proliferation and arms control issues as a senior research analyst and director of the nuclear policy project, project director of the Independent Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, former Scientist-in-residence with the Monterey Institute’s Center for Nonproliferation Studies, PhD in Physics from Boston University, “Nuclear Power’s Uncertain Future,” http://nationalinterest.org/print/commentary/nuclear%27s-uncertain-future-6643]

On March 8, 2011, just three days before the huge earthquake and tsunami that triggered the series of events resulting in three reactor meltdowns at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, industry leader John Rowe said [3] that “natural gas is queen.” The CEO of Exelon, the U.S. utility with the largest share of nuclear-power plants, Rowe is avowedly pronuclear and a smart businessman. He has a responsibility to his shareholders (full disclosure: I’m one of them) and his customers to provide competitively priced and reliable electricity. Knowing that widespread use of hydraulic fracturing has unlocked massive supplies of cheap shale natural gas in the United States, Rowe foresees that natural-gas power plants will make nuclear power uncompetitive economically.¶ On March 11, 2012, another pronuclear but pragmatic analyst Dale Klein, a former chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, cautioned [4] that nuclear plants will not “move off the blackboard and into construction. . . . Not as long as natural gas remains as cheap and plentiful as it is today.” Joining Klein’s ranks is The Economist magazine, which declared in its March 10th issue that nuclear power is “the dream that failed [5]”: the plants are too costly and uncompetitive with alternatives. The Economist does point out, however, that a price on greenhouse emissions would favor nuclear power. A carbon tax would disfavor fossil fuels, which emit carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas, when burned in power plants. But the political will has been lacking in the United States and most parts of the world for taxing carbon or enacting a cap-and-trade scheme.

#### Five reasons nuke power can’t and won’t develop in the U.S.

Cooper, Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis, Institute for Energy and the Environment, 2011

[Mark, Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis, Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School, former Yale University and Fulbright Fellow, PhD from Yale, “Mark cooper: Why Nuclear Reactor Loan Guarantees Are Now More Imprudent Than Ever,” <http://yubanet.com/opinions/Mark-Cooper-Why-Nuclear-Reactor-Loan-Guarantees-Are-Now-More-Imprudent-Than-Ever.php#.UCn1FKGPXng>]

The nuclear power industry is dead in the water today in the U.S. because nuclear power is simply too expensive. Only a French-style socialist arrangement under which the industry (by government fiat) has unlimited access to taxpayer-backed loan guarantees and the pocketbooks of ratepayers prior to and during the reactor construction process would allow utilities to even contemplate building new nuclear reactors. Even with these massive subsidies their prospects are murky, at best.¶ Four marketplace developments ended the nuclear renaissance before it began. Those factors are:¶ • Skyrocketing cost of building new nuclear reactors, with no end in sight to the upward spiral;¶ • Falling natural gas prices that could stay low for decades, as new technologies have dramatically increased the amount of natural gas that is recoverable;¶ • Lower cost alternatives that are widely available and afford utilities much more flexibility in meeting the need for electricity in an uncertain economic and policy environment.¶ • Declining demand growth for electricity, with growing evidence that there has been a permanent shift in the pattern of growth; and¶ Public policy cannot repeal economic reality. Nuclear economics are so bad that subsidies (in the form of federal loan guarantees or unfunded mandates like a federal "Clean Energy Standard"), as well as the infusion of capital from foreign equipment vendors and/or foreign governments, are not enough to kick start reactor construction. The nuclear industry is demanding state ratepayers subsidize and guarantee to pay the construction costs, even if the reactors are not built. The nation does not need -- and the federal government should not force taxpayer and ratepayers to fund -- another multi-billion-dollar bailout of an industry that is totally uneconomic and has no chance of standing on its own.

#### Loan guarantees fail and nuclear power is ineffective

Goodman, well-recognized reporter quoting numerous studies, 2010

[2/16/10, Amy, Anthropology degree from Harvard, executive producer and host of Democracy Now!, Columnist for Truthdig.com, “Obama’s Nuclear Option,” http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/obamas\_nuclear\_option\_20100216/]

Opponents of the plan, which includes a tripling of existing nuclear plant construction-loan guarantees to $54.5 billion, span the ideological spectrum. On its most basic level, the economics of nuclear power generation simply doesn’t make sense. The cost to construct these behemoths is so huge, and the risks are so great, that no sensible investor, no banks, no hedge funds will invest in their construction.No one will loan a power company the money to build a power plant, and the power companies refuse to spend their own money. Obama himself professes a passion for the free market, telling Bloomberg BusinessWeek, “We are fierce advocates for a thriving, dynamic free market.” Well, the free market long ago abandoned nuclear power. The right-wing think tank Heritage Foundation remarked, “Expansive loan guarantee programs ... are wrought with problems. At a minimum, they create taxpayer liabilities, give recipients preferential treatment, and distort capital markets.” Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute, a longtime critic of the nuclear power industry, told me, “If you buy more nuclear plants, you’re going to get about two to 10 times less climate solution per dollar, and you’ll get it about 20 to 40 times slower, than if you buy instead the cheaper, faster stuff that is walloping nuclear and coal and gas.” In his 2008 report “The Nuclear Illusion,” Lovins writes, “Nuclear power is continuing its decades-long collapse in the global marketplace because it’s grossly uncompetitive, unneeded, and obsolete—so hopelessly uneconomic that one needn’t debate whether it’s clean and safe; it weakens electric reliability and national security; and it worsens climate change compared with devoting the same money and time to more effective options.”

#### Nuclear power research is inaccurate – biases and secrecy prevent accurate assessment

Al Jazeera, 2011

[8/11/11, D. Parvaz, “Nuclear safety: A dangerous veil of secrecy,” <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2011/08/2011877118599802.html>]

Even most academic nuclear experts, seen by many as the middle ground between the anti-nuclear activists and nuclear lobby itself, were reluctant to say what was happening: That in Fukushima, a community of farms, schools and fishing ports, was experiencing a full-tilt meltdown, and that, as Al Jazeera reported in June, that the accident had most likely caused more radioactive contamination than the Chernobyl disaster 25 years ago. As recently as early August, those seeking information on the real extent of the damage at the Daiichi plant and on the extent of radioactive contamination have mostly been reassured by the nuclear community that there’s no need to worry. This is troubling because while both anti-nuclear activists and the nuclear lobby both have openly stated biases, academics and researchers are seen as the middle ground - a place to get accurate, unbiased information. David Biello, the energy and climate editor at Scientific American Online, said that trying to get clear information on a scenario such as the Daiichi disaster is tough. “There's a lot of secrecy that can surround nuclear power because some of the same processes can be involved in generating electricity that can also be involved in developing a weapon, so there's a kind of a veil of secrecy that gets dropped over this stuff, that can also obscure the truth” said Biello. "So, for example in Fukushima, it was pretty apparent that a total meltdown had occurred just based on what they were experiencing there ... but nobody in a position of authority was willing to say that."