### Oil DA

#### Russian economic collapse inevitable

#### Aron, AEI, ’11 (Leon, Winter, “The Status Quo Fatigue” AEI Russian Outlook)

In the words of Lev Gudkov, a top Russian pollster and political sociologist, despite the “pumping of money” into the economy and “social sphere” (that is, the welfare system), stagnation continues because the regime is “incapable of solving any of the key problems connected to the urgently needed institutional reforms.”13 According to a transformation index, which measures reforms in 125 developing countries, since 2003 Russia sank from 41st to 65th overall, and from 31st to 107th in “effectiveness of governance.”14 Nonexistent before 2008, the budget deficit has reached nearly 4 percent of GDP and, although still relatively low, is being viewed with growing apprehension. According to leading Russian economist Vladimir Mau, the deficit would have reached a dangerous 13.5 percent without the profits from oil sales abroad (“oil transfers”).15 There is little confidence in the government’s promises to eliminate the deficit by 2015.16 The habit of profligate spending and the enormous “corruption tax”17 (not to mention the 2014 Winter Olympics and the 2018 World Cup) will likely prevent the closing of the gap. As a top political analyst said to me, “They have completely unlearned to live within their means. The regime’s spending habits are so ingrained that they won’t end the deficit even with oil over $100 a barrel.”

#### NO impact – Russian military sucks

Goure 11 – Vice President of the Lexington Institute, a thinktank based in Arlington, Virginia, and an analyst on national security and military issues for NBC. (Daniel, “Russian Military’s Decline Continues”, Lexington Institute, July 12, 2011, <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/russian-militarys-decline-continues?a=1&c=1171>, Callahan)

The past 20 years has been a tale of near-continuous decline for the ex-Soviet military. Once it was the largest military force on the planet. Of late it has fallen to a mere shadow of its former self. So low have the fortunes of Russia’s conventional military fallen that it was barely able to defeat Georgia in their short conflict in 2008. The Soviet Union was once known for its massive nuclear arsenal. Now it is barely able to maintain a viable force; most of its systems are obsolescent and aging badly. Even in the absence of new arms control agreements with the United States, Russia would be forced to significantly cut back its nuclear arsenal. According to a senior Russian government official, the situation continues to deteriorate. In a recent interview for a Russian newspaper, reported on by Leon Aron in Foreign Policy, Yuri Solomonov, that country’s chief missile designer, took on his country’s President Dimitry Medvedev. This move is significant for Russian politics, since Medvedev is seeking to extend his tenure against the wishes of current prime minister and former President Vladimir Putin who wants his old job back. Medvedev is associated with a military reform program that was intended to transform the Russian military. But in his critique Solomonov revealed that Russia’s military is heading for the ash heap. According to Solomonov, Russia is now dependent on the West for critical technologies to keep its nuclear forces in operation. The military reform program, which required a massive increase in the production of modern aircraft, ground combat systems and ships, has essentially collapsed because of weaknesses in the Russian defense industrial base. Equally interesting, Solomonov criticizes President Medvedev for his efforts to threaten Europe and the United States over its current plans to deploy a theater missile defense system. The Kremlin leader had suggested that Russia could respond to the deployment of the Aegis Ashore theater missile defense system with countervailing deployments of theater nuclear missiles. Solomonov says that Medvedev is threatening the West with a military deployment that "does not exist, did not exist, and will not exist." In addition, the Russian missile designer pointed out something which Western advocates of limited missile defenses have said for years: the Russian ICBM force could overwhelm such a defense. The Obama Administration’s effort to reset this nation’s strategic relations with Russia is based in large part on the belief that our counterpart in the decades old strategic pas de deux is still a player. In fact, it is clear that Russia continues to decline as a military and economic power even as its politics become more Byzantine. No effort at arms control will be able to mask Russia’s military decline.

#### War with Russia is not an existential threat

Bostrom, Gannon Award for the Continued Pursuit of Human Achievement, ‘9 (Nick, “The Future of Humanity, New Waves in Philosophy of Technology” <http://www.nickbostrom.com/papers/future.pdf>)

Extinction risks constitute an especially severe subset of what could go badly wrong for humanity. There are many possible global catastrophes that would cause immense worldwide damage, maybe even the collapse of modern civilization, yet fall short of terminating the human species. An all-out nuclear war between Russia and the United States might be an example of a global catastrophe that would be unlikely to result in extinction. A terrible pandemic with high virulence and 100% mortality rate among infected individuals might be another example: if some groups of humans could successfully quarantine themselves before being exposed, human extinction could be avoided even if, say, 95% or more of the world's population succumbed. What distinguishes extinction and other existential catastrophes is that a comeback is impossible. A non-existential disaster causing the breakdown of global civilization is, from the perspective of humanity as a whole, a potentially recoverable setback: a giant massacre for man, a small misstep for mankind.

### AT: Link

#### **Dem clean energy love trending up**

VEIA 2012 – Virginia Energy Independence Alliance (September 12, “ Why Liberals and Environmentalists are Embracing Nuclear Energy” <http://www.virginiaenergy.org/2012/09/11/why-liberals-and-environmentalists-are-embracing-nuclear-energy/>)

Fortunately, the tide may be turning away from feelings, anxiety, and fear, and toward reason and science. On Friday, September 7th, a group of environmentalists from the Breakthrough Institute published an article with the subtitle, “Why it’s time for environmentalists to stop worrying and love the atom,” in which they defend nuclear power against the nay-saying of their less reasonable brethren.

Their premise, as you might expect, is that nuclear is a clean, safe, reliable base load power source:

There is no credible path to mitigating climate change without a massive global expansion of nuclear energy. If you care about climate change, nothing is more important than developing the nuclear technologies we will need to get that job done.

### AT: Slow

#### Takes 24 months to build at most

Rosner & Goldberg, Physics Prof @ U Chicago, ’11

[Robert Rosner, William E. Wrather, Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and Physics at The University of Chicago, Director, Energy Policy Institute, Harris School of Public Policy, Stephen Goldberg, Professor of Law Emeritus at Northwestern Law, “Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S.,” Energy Policy Institute at The University of Chicago, November 2011]

SMRs could potentially mitigate such a risk in several ways. First, SMRs have lower precompletion risk due to shorter construction schedules (24-36 months as compared with 48 months). Second, because of their smaller size, SMRs have lower market risk because there is significantly less power than needs to be sold as compared with GW-level plants. Finally, the modular nature of SMRs affords the flexibility to build capacity on an as-needded basis. In the case of unsubsidized financing, particularly relevant to merchant markets, utility decision makers that have significant aversion to risk of future natural gas spikes (i.e., gas prices rising to about $7/Mcf or one standard deviation above the recent average behavior of natural gas prices) would possibly view alternatives to gas-fired generation as attractive options, particularly if the investment requirements are comparable – SMRs could potentially “fit the bill.”