### Safety Add-On

#### Domestic nuclear industry key to prevent global accidents

Wallace and Williams, Senior Adviser on U.S. Nuclear Energy Project at CSIS and Nuclear Policy Analyst at Partnership for Global Security, 12

(Nuclear Energy in America:Preventing its Early Demise, csis.org/files/publication/120417\_gf\_wallace\_williams.pdf)

Second, setting global norms and standards for safety, security, operations, and emergency response. As the world learned with past nuclear accidents and more recently with Fukushima, a major accident anywhere can have lasting repercussions everywhere. As with nonproliferation and security, America’s ability to exert leadership and influence in this area is directly linked to the strength of our domestic industry and our active involvement in the global nuclear enterprise. A strong domestic civilian industry and regulatory structure have immediate national security significance in that they help support the nuclear capabilities of the U.S. Navy, national laboratories, weapons complex, and research institutions. Third, in the past, the U.S. government could exert influence by striking export agreements with countries whose regulatory and legal frameworks reflected and were consistent with our own nonproliferation standards and commitments. At the same time, our nation set the global standard for effective, independent safety regulation (in the form of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission), led international efforts to reduce proliferation risks (through the 1970 NPT Treaty and other initiatives), and provided a model for industry self-regulation. The results were not perfect, but America’s institutional support for global nonproliferation goals and the regulatory behaviors it modeled clearly helped shape the way nuclear technology was adopted and used elsewhere around the world. This influence seems certain to wane if the United States is no longer a major supplier or user of nuclear technology. With existing nonproliferation and safety and security regimes looking increasingly inadequate in this rapidly changing global nuclear landscape, American leadership and leverage is more important and more central to our national security interests than ever. To maintain its leadership role in the development, design, and operation of a growing global nuclear energy infrastructure, the next administration, whether Democrat or Republican, must recognize the invaluable role played by the commercial U.S. nuclear industry and take action to prevent its early demise.

#### Fukushima proves accidents getting worse – extinction

Chossudovsky, Professor of Economics at University of Ottawa, 12

(1/25, Fukushima: A Nuclear War without a War: The Unspoken Crisis of Worldwide Nuclear Radiation, www.globalresearch.ca/fukushima-a-nuclear-war-without-a-war-the-unspoken-crisis-of-worldwide-nuclear-radiation/)

The World is at a critical crossroads. The Fukushima disaster in Japan has brought to the forefront the dangers of Worldwide nuclear radiation. The crisis in Japan has been described as “a nuclear war without a war”. In the words of renowned novelist Haruki Murakami: “This time no one dropped a bomb on us … We set the stage, we committed the crime with our own hands, we are destroying our own lands, and we are destroying our own lives.” Nuclear radiation –which threatens life on planet earth– is not front page news in comparison to the most insignificant issues of public concern, including the local level crime scene or the tabloid gossip reports on Hollywood celebrities. While the long-term repercussions of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster are yet to be fully assessed, they are far more serious than those pertaining to the 1986 Chernobyl disaster in the Ukraine, which resulted in almost one million deaths (New Book Concludes – Chernobyl death toll: 985,000, mostly from cancer Global Research, September 10, 2010, See also Matthew Penney and Mark Selden The Severity of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Disaster: Comparing Chernobyl and Fukushima, Global Research, May 25, 2011) Moreover, while all eyes were riveted on the Fukushima Daiichi plant, news coverage both in Japan and internationally failed to fully acknowledge the impacts of a second catastrophe at TEPCO’s (Tokyo Electric Power Co Inc) Fukushima Daini nuclear power plant. The shaky political consensus both in Japan, the U.S. and Western Europe is that the crisis at Fukushima has been contained. The realties, however, are otherwise. Fukushima 3 was leaking unconfirmed amounts of plutonium. According to Dr. Helen Caldicott, “one millionth of a gram of plutonium, if inhaled can cause cancer”. The Impacts in Japan The Japanese government has been obliged to acknowledge that “the severity rating of its nuclear crisis … matches that of the 1986 Chernobyl disaster”. In a bitter irony, however, this tacit admission by the Japanese authorities has proven to been part of the cover-up of a significantly larger catastrophe, resulting in a process of global nuclear radiation and contamination: “While Chernobyl was an enormous unprecedented disaster, it only occurred at one reactor and rapidly melted down. Once cooled, it was able to be covered with a concrete sarcophagus that was constructed with 100,000 workers. There are a staggering 4400 tons of nuclear fuel rods at Fukushima, which greatly dwarfs the total size of radiation sources at Chernobyl.” ( Extremely High Radiation Levels in Japan: University Researchers Challenge Official Data, Global Research, April 11, 2011) Worldwide Contamination The dumping of highly radioactive water into the Pacific Ocean constitutes a potential trigger to a process of global radioactive contamination. Radioactive elements have not only been detected in the food chain in Japan, radioactive rain water has been recorded in California: “While Chernobyl was an enormous unprecedented disaster, it only occurred at one reactor and rapidly melted down. Once cooled, it was able to be covered with a concrete sarcophagus that was constructed with 100,000 workers. There are a staggering 4400 tons of nuclear fuel rods at Fukushima, which greatly dwarfs the total size of radiation sources at Chernobyl.” ( Extremely High Radiation Levels in Japan: University Researchers Challenge Official Data, Global Research, April 11, 2011)

### AT: Microgrids

#### Microgrids fail – failure of renewables during power outage

Sater 2011 - Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office in Washington, DC (August, Daniel, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions” http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf)

Microgrids are not without their drawbacks. Similar to the problems with the departing load charge utilities levy on installations that produce renewable energy, many utilities try to restrict the use of renewable energy generation as backup power during a power outage. The utilities’ reasoning is that, if there was any electricity in the grid during an outage, their workers would be at risk while repairing any damage. According to the GAO, four out of five installations it visited could not use their renewable energy during a power outage due to utility worker safety concerns. However, one of the bases was able to negotiate a contract to allow the installation’s solar array to provide power to the critical loads of the base during a power outage. 70 For an installation to fully benefit from the installation of a microgrid, the base must first negotiate with the utility to allow for renewable energy sources to remain in use during a power outage. The ability of a microgrid to island an installation from the civilian grid should nullify any danger to utility workers as they perform any maintenance work.

### AT: Prolif Good (Short)

#### None of their evidence is specific to the Middle East – no survivability, historic tensions, and short flight times make war uniquely likely – that’s Edelman and **Krepinevich and Russell**

#### New nuclear states cause war – that’s Horowitz – inexperience, military control, and foreign perception mean transitions increase instability and conflict – prefer evidence that doesn’t look at proliferation in a vacuum

#### Each state with weapons increases the risk – that’s Below – prolif increases tension and creates pressures for arms racing

#### Prolif optimists rely on theorizing over data – models are insufficient for policymaking

Busch, Professor of Government at Christopher Newport University, ‘4 (Nathan, “No End in Sight: The Continuing Menace of Nuclear Proliferation” p 281-314)

Until now, the proliferation debate has largely taken place on an abstract, theoretical level. No doubt this orientation partly reflects perfectly legitimate scholarly concerns: in order to improve our understanding of international affairs, we of course need to establish theories to explain and predict state action. Participants in the proliferation debate have gone astray, however, in placing theorizing at the beginning, rather than at the end of their thinking. Instead of building theories on solid evidence gathered from rigorous empirical studies, they have too often predicted future state actions only on the basis of preexisting theories. From a scholarly point of view, one of the most important lessons from the present study is that we cannot afford anything other than a relentlessly empirical foundation for—and testing of— social science theory.

While abstract theorizing can be found on both sides of the debate, it is especially common among the optimists. Rather than asking how NWSs actually do act, optimists have begun with theories of how states should act—that is, in accordance with supposedly "realist" rational-actor models—and predicted the actions of states on that basis. One need only recall Waltz's confident statement, "We do not have to wonder whether they [NWSs] will take good care of their weapons. They have every incentive to do so.""" On the contrary, the proper approach to theory would begin with wonder about whether states do, in fact, always act with such rational incentives in mind. As the present study has demonstrated, there is little empirical support for such an optimistic position where nuclear proliferation is concerned. While realist theories may be useful for explaining certain types of state actions, they are inappropriate models for predicting specific policies and actions that NWSs will take.

Having oversimplified the causes and motivations of state action, the optimists make highly inappropriate policy recommendations regarding nuclear proliferation. Indeed, those recommendations go beyond what the optimists' own theories could possibly support. In a context other than the proliferation debate, Waltz argues that his theories cannot predict specific policies or particular actions by individual states; instead, he maintains, they can predict only general trends.1" But, as Jeffrey Knopf has pointed out, when one is advocating a further proliferation of nuclear weapons, predicting general trends is not enough: one must be certain that one's theories are correct all of the time. It is likely that a certain awareness of the special dangers attending nuclear weapons policy leads Waltz to misapply his own realist theory and predict that NWSs will act rationally without exception. But that awareness must be replaced by fully conscious practical reasoning. Empirically grounded theories, combined with the prudence of the policymaker, would lead to policy recommendations that are more sound.

Absent a nuclear exchange, or a series of nuclear exchanges, we will lack conclusive proof that a further spread of nuclear weapons will lead to nuclear catastrophes. May such a proof never be forthcoming. In the meantime, however, I hope this study will contribute to more nuanced and accurate theorizing about state action—theories acknowledging that while states sometimes act rationally, they often fail to do so when constrained by certain political, bureaucratic, economic, and other factors. I also hope this study will contribute to better-informed policymaking on nuclear issues. Although continued study of the historical record and future developments will surely provide additional relevant information, it is already fairly clear that U.S. and global interests lie in preventing a further spread of nuclear weapons and reducing nuclear dangers among current NWSs as much as possible. If the United States takes the lead in these areas, we will make progress toward making the world a safer place.

#### Prolif makes preemption likely – state uncertainty

Jeffrey W. Knopf, Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, October 2002, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 60-61

The second implication of pressures to seek damage limitation is therefore that optimists are too quick to dismiss the possibility of preemption. Optimists argue that states will never attempt a first strike because they can never be certain of achieving 100 percent success, and the possibility of retaliation with even a few nuclear weapons makes preemption too great a risk.54 As long as state leaders value the survival of their society,55 this is certainly true for any premeditated “bolt from the blue.” If one believes, however, that an attack by the other side is about to take place, then one might not require a guarantee of a perfect first strike, but merely a reasonable chance that one can destroy enough of the other side’s forces to make a meaningful difference in the damage one suffers.

Waltz simply does not get this point. In the revised version of the debate book, he writes: “The initial advantage [of striking first] is insignificant if the cost of gaining it is half a dozen cities.”56 If leaders believe, however, that the choice has boiled down to losing six cities or losing twelve, they may see a first strike as a way to save six cities. If prospect theory—which suggests that people are especially willing to gamble to try to reduce what appear to be certain losses—is correct, the chances of such a choice are even greater than RDT would anticipate.57

This reveals the problem with phrasing the second requirement for deterrence stability as the existence of second-strike capabilities. Secure secondstrike forces add greatly to crisis stability, but they are not sufficient to ensure that there are no deliberate decisions to launch first. In circumstances where there are growing doubts about whether nuclear deterrence will continue to hold, damage-limitation pressures could potentially lead to an intentional decision to preempt even with an expectation that the opponent will have some forces that could survive and strike second.

#### Prolif increases tension that results in escalation – changed perceptions of motivation and posturing

Jeffrey W. Knopf, Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, October 2002, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 57-58

Nuclear weapons can exacerbate tensions in two ways: by creating an increased perception of threat and by prompting efforts to limit damage in the event of nuclear war. On the first point, proliferation optimists write as if potential adversaries exist at a given, fixed level of hostility. This is unlikely to be the case. Rather, a state that acquires nuclear weapons is likely to be perceived as more threatening than it was before. This will be partly because of the new, more destructive capabilities at its disposal. In some cases, however, a state’s pursuit of nuclear weapons may also change how other states view its intentions.

This is especially likely because new and aspiring nuclear states are not always circumspect in their pronouncements. In March 1994, in the midst of a crisis over North Korea’s suspected nuclear weapons program, the North’s chief negotiator threatened his South Korean counterpart that a war could break out in which the South would be turned into “a sea of fire.”47 After the May 1998 nuclear tests in India, Prime Minister Vajpayee wrote President Clinton and explicitly cited a threat from China as a motivation for the tests. Statements by Defense Minister Fernandes shortly before and again shortly after the tests also described China as “potential threat number one” to India.48 Other Indian officials publicly warned Pakistan to end its support for separatist insurgents in Kashmir. Home Minister Advani called on Islamabad to “realize the change in the geostrategic situation” and said that in the new circumstances even the option of “hot pursuit” would not be ruled out.49 Such statements are bound to be provocative to the states against which they are directed. States on the receiving end of new, public nuclear threats will likely feel a need to display their toughness as a way to show they will not be intimidated. While nuclear weapons do encourage caution, they can also create pressures to demonstrate resolve, and any such demonstration carries with it some risk of escalation.

### AT: Expensive

#### SMRs are inexpensive – small size

Marston, CTO Electric Power Research Institute, ’12

[Dr. Theodore U. Marston, Former Chief Technology Officer of the Electric Power Research Institute, PhD Mechanical Engineering from the University of Michigan, Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, “Status of Small Modular Light Water Reactors in the US,” The Nuclear Decarbonization Option: Profiles of Selected Advanced Reactor Technologies, March 2012]

Regulatory challenges could make smLWRs non-competitive. If the licensing of smLWRs become protracted affairs, the attractiveness of such small plants will vanish. The best hope for smLWRs to be competitive lies in the assumption that they can be licensed, built and commissioned quickly. The primary economic challenge to the commercialization of smLWRs is whether the electricity production costs are (1) affordable and (2) competitive with other forms of generation. With regard to affordability, smLWRs offer potential optionality to the US electric utilities, when the only real options for large generation additions are gas fired, coal fired or large nuclear plants. SmLWRs, being smaller and modular, potentially offer a more manageable nuclear option. SmLWRs are more ‘affordable’, i.e. less of a fiscal risk. They can be deployed in much smaller increments, matching the utilities’ load growths better and reduce the ‘single shaft’ generation risk to an acceptable level. Competing with other forms of electricity generation is a much greater challenge today. Vast amounts of natural gas are being discovered across the US in so-called tight gas (shale) deposits, resulting in cheap and abundant natural gas. The current spot market price of natural gas is less than $3.00/MMBTU. Carbon restraints (taxes or credits), which would improve the competitiveness of smLWRs, appear unlikely to arise in the near future. However it is expected that carbon emissions from large stationary sources will be reduced systematically over time one way or another, and US utilities are very interested in reducing their ‘carbon footprints’. If the economics of the smLWRs are what some of the designs claim, there is a real chance to compete with natural gas fired plants, particularly when carbon constraints are in place. The cost competitiveness of smLWR depend heavily on achieving the following opportunities: lStreamline design and manufacturing are necessary to ffset the economies of scale of other generation op- tions, particularly nuclear plants. ALWRs are becoming larger and larger due to the economies of scale. The only prospect to reverse this effect for the smaller smLWRs is to streamline the shop fabrication of the NSSS and other modules, ship them to the site and install them rapidly. The requisite quality standards must be maintained throughout the entire process. l Modularity of the smLWRs provides the opportunity to transform how we design, build, operate and decom- mission nuclear power plants. lReduce construction time by modularization and con- struction efficiencies. SMRs do not require loan guarantees. This sets the smLWR apart from the larger ALWR, which currently benefit from federal loan guarantees, especially for regulated utilities. Experience shows the loan guarantee process to be a protracted and expensive affair, requiring the expenditure of significant political and fiscal capital. How the impacts of the Fukushima accident affect smLWR development and deployment is unclear. The passive nature of the safety systems and the reduced need for AC power following shutdown should be positive at- tributes. Likewise, the depth of the containment should mitigate certain security concerns, but may raise flooding concerns. However, the idea of locating a number, up to twelve, of smLWRs at a single plant site may become a liability in the eyes of the public. The sequential failure of the Fukushima reactors followed by the hydrogen explo- sions will be long lasting memories for the public. It may be difficult to convince the public that more reactors at a site is safe, in spite of the fact that the single reactor fail- ure source term is much smaller than current reactors and that there is little chance for system interaction in the new designs. US Market Potential for smLWRs The potential smLWR market in the US is quite large, with three primary opportunities for deployment. The nearest term opportunity is to build the initial plants to provide low emission electricity to DOE and DoD facilities that are subject to the Executive Order. This opportunity will be part of the current DOE SMR Program. The second opportunity for smLWR deployment is to provide baseload (or near baseload) generation capacity resulting from general load growth. Baseload generation has not been installed to any degree since the 1970s and 1980s in the US. Most of the recent generation additions have been combined cycle turbines fueled by natural gas. The net demand for the US will grow by 30% in the next 20 years, however. There are renewable portfolio standards in 30 states in the US, so some of this growth will be met with renewable generation, but others, like Ohio, have clean energy standards which include the traditional renewables and other forms of non-emitting generation, such as nuclear plants and large dams. Even with renewables and some gas, a role for nuclear could emerge due to general demand growth.

### AT: States CP 2AC

#### 50 state fiat is a voting issue –

#### Interpretation – the negative should not be able to fiat sub-national actors without a comparative solvency evidence

#### First, not logical – no precedent for uniform action – not real world

#### Second, literature base – no solvency advocate for the CP in terms of the plan – not predictable

#### Third, infinitely regressive – legitimizes any permutation of non-USFG actors – kills clash and forces substance crowdout

#### Does nothing involving the aff – nuclear isn’t renewable, uranium is a finite resource

#### Perm – do both – states can fund DOD PPAs

GAO 9, “Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Take Actions to Address Challenges in Meeting Federal

Renewable Energy Goals”, December, http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/299755.html

DOD has also joined with private sector entities, entering into various types of arrangements to develop renewable energy projects. Because these different arrangements with the private sector provide DOD with an alternative to using only up-front appropriations to fund renewable energy projects, we refer to these arrangements as alternative financing approaches. For the purposes of this report, we define an alternative financing approach as any funding arrangement other than projects in which total project costs are funded only through full up- front appropriations. DOD has entered into several different types of these approaches that have resulted in renewable energy projects.

#### Doublebind – either

#### a. the CP doesn’t result in DOD action and can’t address military grid concerns

#### b. CP links to the net benefit – DOD has to spend money to integrate the electricity

#### DOD renewable energy fails – costs too much, fails as backup energy

Sater 2011 - Research Fellow at Global Green USA’s Security and Sustainability Office in Washington, DC (August, Daniel, “Military Energy Security: Current Efforts and Future Solutions” http://globalgreen.org/docs/publication-185-1.pdf)

The DOD’s efforts to increase renewable energy usage raise three key issues: cost, problematic state laws, and unintended effects. Electricity generated through renewable sources tends to be more expensive than conventionally generated electricity because of the high upfront costs of building solar and wind farms, the two most common sources of renewable energy. By focusing so heavily on renewable energygeneration projects, the DOD diverts resources away from other energy efficient investments that are often more cost-effective. The guiding directive of the ECIP instructs military bases that “additional consideration can be given to projects that substitute renewable energy for nonrenewable energy.” 40 The same document states that all projects should have a savings-toinvestment ratio of more than 1.25 and a payback period of ten years or less. However, the ECIP reports show that many renewable energy-generation projects do not meet either of these standards. However, only once since 2007 have renewable energy projects funded by ECIP averaged a payback period of less than ten years and in every year since 2007 the savings-toinvestment ratio for renewable energy projects was below that of the ratio for all projects. Despite their long payback periods and low savings –to-investment ratio, renewable energy projects constitute a large portion of ECIP funds every year. For FY 2010, the only year in which the DOD provides neither a SIR or payback period, renewable energy-generation projects received 52% of the $120 million of ECIP funds. The DSB, in 2008, encouraged the DOD to pursue renewable energy-generation projects but “to a level commensurate with their operational and financial value”.

41 The heavy focus on renewable energy generation, as a result of ECIP regulations and the Energy Policy Act of 2005, crowds out other projects that would be more cost efficient and lower the DOD’s energy usage to a greater degree. Furthermore, renewable energy sources, due to their non-continuous flow of electricity, are unsuitable as backup sources of power, though the implementation of a smart microgrid can mitigate this problem.

#### Multiple conditional options bad – it’s a voter – rejecting the arg incentivizes abuse

#### First is skew – aff can’t read their best offense because the neg can just kick their argument and can cross-apply offense, kills fairness

#### Second is research – they can advocate contradictory positions, kills education and advocacy skills

#### One conditional advocacy solves their offense – we should get to advocate perms – only reciprocal option

### AT: Oil DA

#### Nuclear renaissance makes the DA inevitable

#### Link is super long term – no hydrogen cars now

#### **Russian oil prices low - New global oil reserves and high production costs**

Mead 7/8 (Walter Russell, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, “The Energy Revolution Part One: The Biggest Losers.” <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/07/08/the-energy-revolution-part-one-the-biggest-losers/>)

If the US, Canada and Israel are the likeliest big winners, the biggest losers in the coming shift will be the Gulf petro-states and Russia. Their Gulf losses aren’t going to be economic; the Gulf will still have the world’s cheapest oil to produce and so its oilfields will be the most profitable at any given price point.¶ ¶ Russia, on the other hand, is going to have a harder time. Its oil and gas are more expensive to produce and so Russia’s profit margins are likely to fall.¶ ¶ But regardless of the simple economic impact, in different ways and different degrees the Gulf countries and Russia are going to lose a lot of the political advantages that their energy wealth now gives them. They will have less ability to restrict supply and to manipulate prices than they have had in the past. Oil and gas are going to be less special when supplies are more abundant and more broadly distributed.

#### US nuclear power legislation is increasing now

Silverstein 12

(Ken, Energy Central editor, contributor to Forbes, "Nuclear Energy Won’t Die," 5-7-12, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kensilverstein/2012/05/07/nuclear-energy-wont-die/>)

Some thought that nuclear energy may get buried after the Japanese Fukushima deluge. But the rumblings in this country are suggesting that it won’t die.Several issues are creeping back into the American consciousness at once: The revival of Yucca Mountain, the safety measures enacted and the possibilities of surviving a nuclear accident here and finally, the licensing of two new nuclear sites after 33 years. The message that is radiating from those seemingly disparate events is that the nuclear resurgence is gathering more steam. “The United States is building new nuclear energy facilities under an improved licensing process that exhaustively addresses safety considerations,” says Marvin Fertel, chief executive officer of the Nuclear Energy Institute. “It also assures that the lessons learned from the industry’s licensing and construction experience are properly applied to future projects.” The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) granted two separate licenses to build nuclear reactors this year: One went to Southern Company and the other to Scana Corp. so that both companies could build two reactors on existing sites. Now, if those utilities can stay on time and on budget, the consensus among energy insiders here is that it would lead to more such construction. But according to Fertel, the nuclear revolution — to this point — has been a quiet one: U.S. electricity demand has risen more than 80 percent since the NRC last approved a construction permit in 1979. Unbeknownst to most people is that at least half of that demand has been met by nuclear facilities that have increased their rate of production by 40 percent during much of that time.

#### Nuclear power doesn’t compete with oil

Toth, IAEA Energy Economist, ’06

[Ferenc Toth, Senior Energy Economist @ IAEA, and Hans-Holger Rogner, section head @ IAEA, 2006, “Oil and nuclear power: Past, present, and future”, Energy Economics 28, 2006, p. 22]

While the past expansion of nuclear energy occurred to the detriment of oil in the power sector, this is no longer the case today and highly unlikely to reoccur in the future. The respective market structures in which nuclear and oil operate now display little overlap and an expansion of nuclear power would not impinge on oil sales to power generation. Nuclear supplies base load to large grid-integrated markets where oil provides some peak supply, back-up capacity, small-scale and non-grid applications. Oil’s main markets are the low energy demand intensity rural and remote areas usually with little or no grid integration. In an environmentally unconstrained future, nuclear power competes primarily against coal and possibly natural gas, depending on how closely natural gas prices track oil market prices and whether or not gas infrastructures are in place. However, current trends towards electricity market liberalization relying more on private sector shareholder value maximization create economic barriers to the expansion of present-day nuclear plants because of their high up-front capital costs and long amortization periods. In the absence of public policy support and/or the emergence of innovative reactor designs that lower the costs and further improve operating safety, nuclear power’s market share might indeed follow a downward trajectory. Yet there is some evidence to the contrary. The order of the new Olkiluoto reactor in Finland is based on several studies, each confirming that nuclear generation is the best economic option to satisfy increasing demand for electricity (WNA, 2004).

#### No DOD Link

Bartis, ’11

James Bartis, PhD chemical physics – MIT, senior policy researcher – RAND, 2012, Promoting International Energy Security: Volume 1, Understanding Potential Air Force Roles, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\_reports/2012/RAND\_TR1144z1.pdf

As fuel purchasers, neither the Air Force nor DoD has enough power to influence the world oil market. Their fuel purchases are simply too small. But as part of the armed forces of the United States, the Air Force plays an important and productive role in the world oil market. The armed services are the backbone of the U.S. national security policy that assures access to the energy supplies of the Persian Gulf and the stability and security of key friendly states in the region. Moreover, the U.S. Navy’s global presence assures freedom of passage in the sea- lanes that are crucial to the international trade in petroleum and natural gas.

#### High oil prices cause Russian adventurism.

Mufson, Staff Writer @ The Washington Post, 2007

Steven, Staff Writer @ the Washington Post, Oil Price Rise Causes Global Shift in Wealth, November 10th http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/09/AR2007110902573\_pf.html

Russia, the world's No. 2 oil exporter, shows oil's transformational impact in the political as well as the economic realm. When Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000, less than two years after the collapse of the ruble and Russia's default on its international debt, the country's policymakers worried that 2003 could bring another financial crisis. The country's foreign-debt repayments were scheduled to peak at $17 billion that year.¶ Inside the Kremlin, with Putin nearing the end of his second and final term as president, that sum now looks like peanuts. Russia's gold and foreign-currency reserves have risen by more than that amount just since July. The soaring price of oil has helped Russia increase the federal budget tenfold since 1999 while paying off its foreign debt and building the third-largest gold and hard-currency reserves in the world, about $425 billion.¶ "The government is much stronger, much more self-assured and self-confident," said Vladimir Milov, head of the Institute of Energy Policy in Moscow and a former deputy minister of energy. "It believes it can cope with any economic crisis at home."¶ With good reason. Using energy revenue, the government has built up a $150 billion rainy-day account called the Stabilization Fund.¶ "This financial independence has contributed to more assertive actions by Russia in the international arena," Milov said. "There is a strong drive within part of the elite to show that we are off our knees."¶ The result: Russia is trying to reclaim former Soviet republics as part of its sphere of influence. Freed of the need to curry favor with foreign oil companies and Western bankers, Russia can resist what it views as American expansionism, particularly regarding NATO enlargement and U.S. missile defense in Eastern Europe, and forge an independent approach to contentious issues like Iran's nuclear program.

#### High prices result in economic stagnation and civil disorder.

Tsyvinski, Professor @ Yale, 2010

[Aleh and Sergei Guriev, Professor of economics at Yale University, Director of the New Economic School in Moscow, July – August, Russia's "Resource Curse": How High Oil Prices Are Stunting Reforms, http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/123/article/1273/]

Can Russia escape the "resource curse” implied by high oil prices, or will it succumb to what we call a "70-80” scenario? That is the question confronting Russians today, and we fear that their fate will be the latter: if oil prices remain at $70-80 per barrel, Russia is likely to relive key features of the Brezhnev era of the 1970s and 1980s ― with a stagnating economy and 70-80 percent approval ratings for its political leaders.¶ The resource curse means, of course, that Russian elites will prefer to postpone restructuring the economy and modernizing the country’s political and economic institutions. This will undermine economic performance, making it very unlikely that Russia will catch up with the advanced economies in the next 10-15 years, as officials promise.¶ Fast and sustainable economic growth requires the rule of law, accountable, meritocratic, and non-corrupt bureaucrats, protection of property rights, contract enforcement, and competitive markets. Such institutions are difficult to build in every society. In Russia, the task is especially problematic, because the ruling elite’s interests run counter to undertaking it.¶ In post-crisis Russia, the resource curse is reinforced by two factors. First, massive renationalization since 2004 has left state-owned companies once again controlling the commanding heights of the economy. These firms have no interest in developing modern institutions that protect private property and promote the rule of law. ¶ Second, Russia’s high degree of economic inequality sustains the majority’s preference for redistribution rather than private entrepreneurship.¶ Russia’s leaders acknowledge the need for modernization, and pay it frequent lip-service, as is evidenced by President Dmitri Medvedev’s manifesto "Go, Russia!” But the incentives to escape the resource trap are weakened by the overwhelming importance of the resource rents to the wider political elite.¶ When the economy was near collapse during the recent crisis, we thought that the government would recognize the need to push ahead with radical reforms that would eventually lead to a diverse, de-centralized, and fast-growing economy. But, while stimulus policies were mostly effective in dealing with the immediate crisis, they did not address the long-term issues that impede growth.¶ Still, the government continues to tout plans to boost the economy. Vertical industrial policy, horizontal industrial policy, investment in education ― all have been tried in the last 10 years. Yet Russia’s public institutions remain as weak as ever (for example, corruption is as prevalent as it was 10 years ago, if not more so), and the economy is no less dependent on commodity prices.¶ Today’s economic silver bullet is an "innovation city” in Skolkovo, which the government hopes will spur inflows of modern technology. But there are no magic recipes for modernization. Moreover, there is no need to reinvent the wheel. A comprehensive and consistent reform plan was already included in then-President Vladimir Putin’s own economic agenda at the beginning of his first term in 2000.¶ The so-called Gref Program (named after former Minister of the Economy German Gref) foresaw many of the reforms that are vitally needed ― privatization, deregulation, accession to the World Trade Organization, and reform of the government, natural monopolies, and social security. Many of these reforms are outlined in the current government’s own "Long-Term Strategy for 2020.” The problem is that ― as with the Gref program in 2000 ― the Strategy is unlikely to be fully implemented, owing to the same old weak incentives.¶ Even the recently announced privatization of non-controlling stakes in the largest state-owned firms ― while timely and laudable ― will not create an irreversible commitment to reform. So far, the government does not want to let control over these firms get into private hands. Hence, the sales that Prime Minister Putin announced will not increase the demand for pro-market institutions. ¶ By contrast, the "70-80” scenario seems increasingly likely. In June, during the St. Petersburg Economic Forum, participants in two sessions ― Russian government and business leaders, as well as influential foreign players ― were asked about the future of Russia’s economy. The results were drearily similar. ¶ In one session, 61 percent of participants foresaw stagnation in the next 2-5 years (33 percent predicted growth and 5 percent expected a crisis). In the other session, 55 percent of participants foresaw stagnation in the next 10 years (with 41 percent projecting growth and 4 percent expecting collapse).¶ The factors that drove the Putin era of rapid economic growth ― high and rising oil prices, cheap labor, and unused production capacity ― are all exhausted. Russia will thus be forced to start spending the reserves that saved the economy in the recent crisis. ¶ The "70-80” scenario will preserve the status quo, but eventually the economy will reach a dead end, at which point the only choice will be genuine economic reform or decline and dangerous civil disorder.

### AT: Obama Good Elections (Kentucky)

#### The plan won’t pass before the election --- the affirmative only has to defend the most realistic and likely means of passage. Forcing the affirmative to defend abnormal means undermines political decision making skills.

#### A. Congress is in recess now for campaign --- nothing will be done until after election

#### B. Promotes best reasoning skills --- the politics disad is good because it teaches an understanding of the political process and policy tradeoffs but their interpretation of fiat bastardizes this because it forces an illogical, abnormal means of passage.

#### C. Improves debate content --- causes the negative to dispute why the expansion of SMRs is bad or read other political arguments --- like a lame duck or Obama 2nd term disad.

#### Obama win inevitable ----

#### --- Women

Edwards-Levy, 8/31 (Ariel, 8/31/2012, “Female Voters Prefer Obama To Romney, Are Focused On Economy, Poll Says,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/30/female-voters-obama-romney-poll\_n\_1844312.html?1346360706)

WASHINGTON -- As women have found themselves in the center of much of 2012's political wrangling -- their bodies a topic for debate, and their hearts and minds a top campaign priority -- many are embracing their status as key voters, according to a poll released Thursday by Lifetime television.

Female voters strongly favor President Barack Obama over GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney, according to the survey, which was conducted by Republican pollster Kellyanne Conway of the polling company, inc./WomanTrend and Democratic pollster Celinda Lake of Lake Research Partners.

"Both parties have women that they can appeal to," Lake said. "Women are the key swing vote and will probably decide the election, but I think women are more self-conscious about the role. I think the really interesting part is that women are poised to take things into their own hands."

Obama received support from 52 percent of likely female voters, compared to 36 percent for Romney. That double-digit lead tracks with Obama's performance in 2008 exit polls, although it's a few points higher than Obama's lead among women in other recent polls.

Half of the women polled said Obama deserved an "A" or "B" for his time in office, while 29 percent gave him a "D" or an "F."

Michelle Obama also fared well, with 72 percent of women viewing her favorably. Ann Romney, who exclaimed "I love you women!" during her Wednesday convention speech, was far less well-known, with 30 percent viewing her favorably, and 45 percent saying they hadn't heard of her or had no opinion. The survey was conducted prior to the speech.

As with the general electorate, women largely gave top priority to the economy and jobs. And although nine out of 10 women said it was important that a candidate understand women, even more prioritized an understanding of the middle class, with 94 percent calling it important.

Many women have been turned off by the campaign's tendency to veer toward issues like abortion, Lake said. "Women want to know, why are we talking about this at all? Why aren't we focusing on the economy?"

Four years after she lost the Democratic primary, Hillary Clinton retains strong support among women voters, with 60 percent of all women saying she should run again. Fifty-eight percent said they would definitely or probably vote for her. A third said she would have done better as president than Obama.

Only 27 percent of women expressed concern that the nation never has had a female president, although a higher number -- 45 percent -- said the United States would be in better shape to face the future with a female leader. Nine in 10 said they would encourage the young women in their life to run for office; 8 percent said they were likely to run themselves.

"There's been a gradual evolution of women as engaged voters ... They're no less skeptical or cynical toward politics, but they're more open to the importance of participating in the process," Conway said. "They're finally realizing that saying, 'I hate politics' means you don't care about education, or wars or the state of health care. Politics is the means to achieve the policy ends about which they care, and you can't win if you don't play."

#### If the first debate didn’t swing the election nothing is likely to

Klein, 10/4 (Ezra, 10/4/2012, “How much will the debate move the polls?” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/10/04/how-much-will-the-debate-move-the-polls/>)

Overall, I’d expect the polls to tighten, perhaps even substantially. But how much they tighten will be very telling. Wednesday was as good a night as Romney can expect to have in the rest of this campaign, in front of as big an audience as he’ll get, with a maximum of media coverage. So his bounce will help tell us how many voters really remain persuadable, or at least how many of the persuadable voters are paying attention to the final events of the campaign. If that number is high, Romney should close the gap substantially, if not pull slightly ahead. If it’s low, he won’t see much bounce, and it will be that much harder to see his path to victory.

Think about the people you know: How many of the Obama voters who thought Romney won the debate seem ready to change their vote today? Personally, I don’t know any Obama voters who thought he won the debate. But I also don’t know any Obama voters who have said they’re now supporting Romney. Now, my circles are unusually politically active, and so their preferences are unusually hard to move. But remember that the most persuadable voters pay the least attention to politics, so they may not know or care that Obama lost a debate. The polls, in other words, will quickly tell us whether Obama simply looked bad or whether he lost real support.

#### Single event won’t swing the election

Feldmann, 10/3 (Linda, 10/3/2012, “Why Mitt Romney trails in polls, as presidential debates begin,” <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2012/1003/Why-Mitt-Romney-trails-in-polls-as-presidential-debates-begin-video>)

Fully two-thirds of voters know that it was Romney who made the statement, and among those voters, 55 percent reacted negatively, versus 23 percent who saw it positively, according to Pew. Most damaging to Romney is the reaction of independent voters. Some 55 percent of independents who are aware of Romney’s comment say they had a negative reaction to it, while only 18 percent viewed it positively.

But Gallup asked voters if the 47 percent comment has made them more or less likely to vote for Romney, and a plurality said it made no difference.

Indeed, analysts say it’s nearly impossible to isolate an individual event or comment as being decisive in turning a race.

“Voters are confronting a big wide Mississippi River of information flowing at them, and as a consequence it’s difficult to isolate the effect of any one thing,” says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University in Washington. “That said, there’s no question it’s been several weeks of relatively bad news for the Romney campaign. It hasn’t enabled him to close the post-convention gap. If anything, that gap has grown.”

#### Winning allows Obama to build momentum and swing the reverse the tide

Creamer, 11 --- long-time political organizer and strategist (12/23/2011, Robert, “Why GOP Collapse on the Payroll Tax Could Be a Turning Point Moment,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/gop-payroll-tax\_b\_1167491.html)

The outcome of the battle was unambiguous. No one could doubt who stood up for the economic interests of the middle class and who did not. And no one could doubt who won and who lost.

National Journal reported that, "House Republicans on Thursday crumpled under the weight of White House and public pressure and have agreed to pass a two-month extension of the two percent payroll-tax cut, Republican and Democratic sources told National Journal."

In the end, Republican intransigence transformed a moment that would have been a modest win for President Obama into an iconic victory.

2) Strength and victory are enormous political assets. Going into the New Year, they now belong to the president and the Democrats.

One of the reasons why the debt ceiling battle inflicted political damage on President Obama is that it made him appear ineffectual -- a powerful figure who had been ensnared and held hostage by the Lilliputian pettiness of hundreds of swarming Tea Party ideological zealots.

In the last few months -- as he campaigned for the American Jobs Act -- he has shaken free of those bonds. Now voters have just watched James Bond or Indiana Jones escape and turn the tables on his adversary.

Great stories are about a protagonist who meets and overcomes a challenge and is victorious. The capitulation of the House Tea Party Republicans is so important because it feels like the beginning of that kind of heroic narrative.

Even today most Americans believe that George Bush and the big Wall Street banks -- not by President Obama -- caused the economic crisis. Swing voters have never lost their fondness for the President and don't doubt his sincerity. But they had begun to doubt his effectiveness. They have had increasing doubts that Obama was up to the challenge of leading them back to economic prosperity.

The narrative set in motion by the events of the last several weeks could be a turning point in voter perception. It could well begin to convince skeptical voters that Obama is precisely the kind of leader they thought he was back in 2008 -- a guy with the ability to lead them out of adversity -- a leader with the strength, patience, skill, will and resoluteness to lead them to victory.

That now contrasts with the sheer political incompetence of the House Republican leadership that allowed themselves to be cornered and now find themselves in political disarray. And it certainly contrasts with the political circus we have been watching in the Republican Presidential primary campaign.

3) This victory will inspire the dispirited Democratic base.

Inspiration is the feeling of empowerment -- the feeling that you are part of something larger than yourself and can personally play a significant role in achieving that goal. It comes from feeling that together you can overcome challenges and win.

Nothing will do more to inspire committed Democrats than the sight of their leader -- President Obama -- out-maneuvering the House Republicans and forcing them into complete capitulation.

The events of the last several weeks will send a jolt of electricity through the progressive community.

The right is counting on progressives to be demoralized and dispirited in the coming election. The president's victory on the payroll tax and unemployment will make it ever more likely that they will be wrong.

4) When you have them on the run, that's the time to chase them.

The most important thing about the outcome of the battle over the payroll tax and unemployment is that it shifts the political momentum at a critical time. Momentum is an independent variable in any competitive activity -- including politics.

In a football or basketball game you can feel the momentum shift. The tide of battle is all about momentum. The same is true in politics. And in politics it is even more important because the "spectators" are also the players -- the voters.

People follow -- and vote -- for winners. The bandwagon effect is enormously important in political decision-making. Human beings like to travel in packs. They like to be at the center of the mainstream. Momentum shifts affect their perceptions of the mainstream.

For the last two years, the right wing has been on the offensive. Its Tea Party shock troops took the battle to Democratic members of Congress. In the mid-terms Democrats were routed in district after district.

Now the tide has turned. And when the tide turns -- when you have them on the run -- that's the time to chase them.

We won't know for sure until next November whether this moment will take on the same iconic importance as Clinton's battle with Gingrich in 1995. But there is no doubt that the political wind has shifted. It's up to progressives to make the most of it.

#### No link – Obama avoids crises

Rogers, 9/17 (Ed, 9/17/2012, “Obama's 21st-century Teflon is working,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-insiders/post/obamas-21st-century-teflon-is-working/2012/09/17/82b05da8-00bf-11e2-bbf0-e33b4ee2f0e8_blog.html?wprss=rss_opinions> )

It is safe to say that America's outreach to the world under President Obama has been a complete failure. Does America enjoy more or less respect than it did four years ago? If you think more, please let me know where.

Last weekend was the end of Obama's foreign policy. Diplomats are being called in and troops are being sent out — at least to where our enemies will allow them. The likes of Sudan know they can refuse Obama's wish for more troops to protect our embassies. Obama will probably tell us the Sudanese promise to provide adequate protection for Americans was a hard-fought concession.

Anyway, for the first time since the 2012 campaign began, Obama might want to talk about the economy. The images of the fires burning and the angry crowds on the Arab streets all underscore the complete failure of Obama's foreign policy, reminding us of his naivete and the price we pay for his on-the-job-training. Remember, this is a man who thought he was worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize just for being who he was.

The planet would heal because of his desire for it to do so. His very presence meant tension in the Middle East would subside. And why not? He had some new ideas: Remember his instructions to his NASA administrator that there was no higher priority than to make Arabs feel better about themselves?

With the world mostly either disrespecting America or just sadly shaking its head and wondering where America has gone, perhaps the Obama campaign could use a few days of blaming George W. Bush for the Obama administration's economic failures.

Foreign policy can't win elections, but it can lose them. Obama is pushing his luck as it becomes more and more clear that he can't influence events that endanger America and American interests. Meanwhile, he has outsourced America's economic management to the Federal Reserve, an abdication of responsibility that will be the subject of books to come. By announcing another quantitative easing program, the Federal Reserve was irrefutably saying that Obama's policies are not working, that the economy is so weak it has to step in to do something to try and generate the jobs that Obama's policies haven't — and won't — deliver.

So as the campaign heads for the debates, voters must be asking themselves what a vote for Obama is really about. It's not about peace and prosperity. It's not about respect abroad and certainty at home. There is nothing about Obama's tenure in office that voters should want more of. So why is he winning? I'm not sure, but based on his record at home and the sorry state of affairs his foreign policy has produced, the fact that he isn't cratering suggests a 21st-century coat of Teflon that makes Reagan's legendary resilience look small-time.

#### Military spending is immune to political backlash

Norris, Executive director of Sustainable Security program at Center for American Progress, 12

(7/31, Money Pit on the Potomac, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/31/money\_pit\_on\_the\_potomac?page=0,0)

July was a tough month for the Pentagon. The Washington Post revealed that three U.S. special operations soldiers died in Mali when their vehicle plunged off a bridge with three Moroccan prostitutes in the vehicle at the time. The special inspector general for Iraq reconstruction issued one of his final reports on U.S. reconstruction efforts in that country and estimated that $6 billion to $8 billion of the $51 billion spent on reconstruction was likely wasted, embezzled, or misplaced. The inspector general's investigations have produced 90 indictments, 72 convictions, and $177 million in fines and other penalties, with the highest percentage of convictions coming against military officers and defense contractors. Worse still, this came not long after the bean counters at the Government Accountability Office had issued yet another damning report on the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, finding that the cost estimate for developing the F-35 had jumped an additional $15 billion since 2010. The reaction from the political class was swift and decisive, but not in the way you would think. Republican standard-bearer Mitt Romney called for an additional $2.1 trillion in defense spending over the next decade and called for adding 100,000 additional active-duty military personnel -- even as the United States winds down wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Adam Smith, made an impassioned plea supporting the Defense Department's foreign assistance programs. And much of Congress continues to react as if sequestration budget cuts -- a sword of Damocles that they themselves voted for -- would prove apocalyptic even though they only reduce Pentagon spending to 2006 levels. The Pentagon has become the federal bureaucracy's version of a perpetual motion machine. Despite the fact that the military budget has roughly doubled over the last decade and the United States spends more on defense than China, Britain, France, Japan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Germany, India, and Brazil combined, most members of Congress continue to see a vote for more defense spending as the safest vote in town. And for good reason. But because voting for defense spending is a painless vote for members of Congress, more and more lobbyists and interest groups have pushed their activities under the broad umbrella of the Pentagon in order to find safe harbor. This has led to the Pentagon to take on more and more activities that have very little to do with traditional definitions of national security. Take breast cancer, for example. As the Post notes, the Pentagon has received more than $3.6 billion for cancer research over the last 20 years, despite the fact that no president has ever requested this funding and that breast cancer research has nothing to do with the Pentagon's traditional limited purview in health -- battlefield medicine. Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin once bragged to his constituents that he had been able to double spending on breast cancer research by putting the additional funds in the Pentagon's budget. Of course, since the Defense Department doesn't have much expertise in breast cancer research, it turns around and relies on agencies like the National Institutes of Health, where the money should have been put in the first place, to oversee its grants under these programs. But Congress is not solely to blame for the Pentagon's ever growing mandate. The Defense Department itself has become increasingly fixated on the idea of "expeditionary economics." In a nutshell, the concept is that small teams of military professionals well versed in economics will be deployed to assist in the reconstruction of war-torn and disaster-prone countries. Any post-conflict expert worth his or her salt agrees that getting economic life restarted after a conflict is vital. However, the idea of putting an institution that has become synonymous with billion-dollar cost overruns in charge of setting economic policy in postwar settings seems risible. Indeed, there is probably no agency in the world that has been more insulated from basic economic realities over the last decade than the Pentagon. But still, no other federal agency is willing to say that the emperor across the Potomac has no clothes. Let us remember that Pentagon-led projects in Iraq and Afghanistan have been flush with cash but rife with problems. Just this week, the special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction reported that about $400 million in large infrastructure projects in Afghanistan are badly behind schedule and unlikely to make a dent in the Taliban insurgency. And this only underscores the Pentagon's power to get what it wants. When every other agency fails, Congress threatens to reduce its budget. When the Defense Department fails or makes grievous mistakes, it is automatically assumed that it went astray because it did not have enough money. But both Congress and the Pentagon itself should recognize the fundamental long-term risk of turning America's military budget into a catchall for everything from breast cancer research to roving teams of economists in combat boots. Military officers are great at fighting and winning wars because that is what they are trained to do. It's bad enough that there are already more people in U.S. military bands than in the entire Foreign Service, but does the country really want to train fighting men and women to build swimming pools in Iraq? The more amorphous America makes the U.S. military's purpose as an institution, the more likely the Pentagon will turn into a giant, muddled marshmallow of bureaucratic excess. Back in the 1990s, Republicans routinely wrung their hands over the idea that "mission creep" was undermining the military. Those concerns seem to have been quietly set aside as both parties acquiesce in building a military that can't say no. With major budget battles brewing, don't be surprised when people try to slip everything from domestic road building to arts funding into the behemoth defense budget.

#### Strong public support for federal nuclear power incentives – no effect from Fukushima

WNA 12

(September, World Nuclear Association, US Nuclear Power Policy, www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41\_US\_nuclear\_power\_policy.html)

Public opinion regarding nuclear power has generally been fairly positive, and has grown more so as people have had to think about security of energy supplies. Different polls show continuing increase in public opinion favourable to nuclear power in the USA. More than three times as many strongly support nuclear energy than strongly oppose it. Two-thirds of self-described environmentalists favour it. A May 2008 survey (N=2925) by Zogby International showed 67% of Americans favoured building new nuclear power plants, with 46% registering strong support; 23% were opposed. Asked which kind of power plant they would prefer if it were sited in their community, 43% said nuclear, 26% gas, 8% coal. Men (60%) were more than twice as likely as women (28%) to be supportive of a nuclear power plant. A March 2010 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed that strong public support for nuclear energy was being sustained, with 74% in favour of it11. In particular, 87% think nuclear will be important in meeting electricity needs in the years ahead, 87% support licence renewal for nuclear plants, 84% believe utilities should prepare to build more nuclear plants, 72% supported an active federal role in encouraging investment in "energy technology that reduces greenhouse gases", 82% agree that US nuclear plants are safe and secure, 77% would support adding a new reactor at the nearest nuclear plant, and 70% say that USA should definitely build more plants in the future. Only 10% of people said they strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy. In relation to recycling used nuclear fuel, 79% supported this (contra past US policy), and the figure rose to 85% if "a panel of independent experts" recommended it. Although 59% were confident that used reactor fuel could be stored safely at nuclear power plant sites, 81% expressed a strong desire for the federal government to move used nuclear fuel to centralised, secure storage facilities away from the plant sites until a permanent disposal facility is ready. Half of those surveyed considered themselves to be environmentalists. A February 2011 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed similar figures, and that 89% of Americans agree that all low-carbon energy sources – including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy – should be taken advantage of to generate electricity while limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Just 10% disagreed. Also some 84% of respondents said that they associate nuclear energy "a lot" or "a little" with reliable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with affordable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with economic growth and job creation; and 77% associate nuclear energy and clean air. A more general March 2010 Gallup poll (N=1014) on energy showed 62% in favour of using nuclear power, including 28% strongly so, and 33% against, the most favourable figures since Gallup began polling the question in 1994. However, only 51% of Democrat voters were in favour12. An early March 2011 Gallup poll just before the Fukushima accident showed 57% in favour and 38% against, and in March 2012 (N=1024) still 57% in favour with 40% against (men: 72%-27%, women 42%-51%). Regarding plant safety, the polls showed consistent 56-58% positive views over 2009-12, but men-women split similar. A survey conducted in September 2011 by Bisconti Research Inc. with GfK Roper showed that although support for nuclear power decreased following the Fukushima accident and compared with a year earlier (a survey carried out in March 2010 by Bisconti Research found 74% of Americans favoured nuclear power), 62% of the 1000 adults surveyed in the latest poll were supportive of utilizing nuclear power while 35% expressed opposition. The survey found that 82% of Americans believed that lessons had been learned from Fukushima and 67% of respondents considered US nuclear power plants safe (the same level as reported one month before the nuclear accident in Japan occurred). Also 85% of said that an extension of commercial operation should be granted to those plants that comply with federal safety standards, and 59% believed more nuclear power plants should definitely be built in the future, while 75% contend that “Electric utilities should prepare now so that new nuclear power plants could be built if needed in the next decade.” Finally, further expansion of the site of the nearest already operating nuclear power plant is supported by 67% and opposed by 28%.

#### No president can get anything done after the election

Dadush, et. al, 8/2---director of Carnegie’s International Economics Program (8/2/2012, Uri Dadush, Shimelse Ali --- economist in the International Economics Program, and Zaahira Wyne --- managing editor of Carnegie’s International Economic Bulletin, “What Does the U.S. Election Mean for the World Economy?” <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/08/02/what-does-u.s.-election-mean-for-world-economy/d5mp> )

Few things are certain, especially given the threat to the U.S. economy posed by the crisis in Europe. But some pundits have already begun forecasting that Obama will beat Romney by a fair number of electoral votes despite a dead heat in the popular vote. The FiveThirtyEight blog in the New York Times, one of the few outlets venturing a forecast for toss-up states, projects 294 electoral votes for Obama versus 244 for Romney and a one-percentage-point win for Obama in the popular vote. The Washington Post’s The Fix blog offers a more cautious assessment, one that nonetheless shows Obama winning and closer to the decisive 270 mark. However, Republicans are expected to easily retain control of the House of Representatives and may also regain control of the Senate by a small margin.

Two crucial points emerge. First, even if Obama wins and Democrats retain the Senate, the president will have to seek a compromise with a Republican House. Second, in no scenario, including a Romney win, would either party gain a filibuster-proof 60 seats in the Senate. This means that the victorious candidate, whoever he is, would have to try to compromise with senators of the opposite party, not to mention members of his own party whose views may differ on a particular issue, in order to pass meaningful legislation.

It follows that the implications of the U.S. elections for the global economy depend less on precise electoral platforms than on the shape of the compromise reached on the big issues, and, against a background of fraying consensus, whether compromise can be reached at all. Thus, the U.S. electoral outcome is likely far less predictive of policy than, say, the Socialists’ sweep in France in May or even last year’s Conservative/Liberal Democrat victory in the UK.

#### Election outcome not key to relations --- they will inevitably decline

Bovt, 9/12 --- political analyst (9/12/2012, “Whether Obama or Romney, the Reset Is Dead,” <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/whether-obama-or-romney-the-reset-is-dead/467947.html> )

During every U.S. presidential election campaign, there is a debate in Russia over whether the Republican or Democratic candidate would be more beneficial for the Kremlin. Russian analysts and politicians always fail to understand that Americans have shown little interest in foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. Even when foreign policy is mentioned in the campaign, Russia is far down the list as a priority item.

The volume of U.S-Russian trade remains small. The recent Exxon-Rosneft deal notwithstanding, U.S. interest in Russia's energy projects has fallen, particularly as the Kremlin has increased its role in this sector. To make matters worse, the United States is determined to establish clean energy and energy independence, while Russia's gas exports are feeling the pinch from stiff competition with the U.S. development of shale gas production.

Of course, traditional areas of cooperation remain: the transit of shipments to and from Afghanistan through Russia, Iran's nuclear program and the struggle against international terrorism. But the transit route into Afghanistan cannot, by itself, greatly influence bilateral relations as a whole, and progress on the other two points seems to have reached a plateau beyond which little potential remains for bringing the two countries into closer cooperation.

On the positive side, a new visa agreement came into force this week that will facilitate greater contact between both countries' citizens. But it will be years before that significantly influences overall U.S.-Russian relations. A new agreement regarding child adoptions has also been implemented after a few disturbing adoption stories prompted Russia's media, with the help of government propaganda, to spoil the U.S. image in Russia.

Meanwhile, both U.S. President Barack Obama and Republican candidate Mitt Romney support the U.S. missile defense program in principle, although the exact form and scope of its deployment differ among the candidates. Even though President Vladimir Putin, during his interview with RT state television last week, expressed guarded optimism over the prospect of reaching an agreement on missile defense with Obama, Russia seems to underestimate the degree to which Americans are fixated on missile defense as a central component of their national security. It is highly unlikely that any U.S. administration — Democratic or Republican — will ever agree to major concessions on missile defense.

It even seemed that Kremlin propagandists were happy when in March Romney called Russia the United States' No. 1 foe. They were given another present when Obama, addressing the Democratic National Convention last week, said Romney's comment only proved that he lacked foreign policy experience and was locked in Cold War thinking. For the next two months, however, the two candidates are unlikely to devote much attention to Russia.

Russia's internal politics will also be one of the key factors shaping future U.S.-Russian relations. The two-year jail sentence slapped on three members of Pussy Riot for their anti-Putin prayer in Moscow's main cathedral has already become a subject of discussion between Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Even the most pragmatic "pro-reset" U.S. administration would criticize to one degree or another Russia's poor record on human rights.

It appears that Russia is moving increasingly toward confrontation rather than rapprochement with the West. The Kremlin now seems fully committed to spreading the myth that the U.S. State Department is the cause behind most of Russia's domestic problems and is bent on undermining its national security by deploying missile defense installations in Europe and by supporting the opposition.

There are other disturbing signals as well. Take, for example, the United Russia bill that would prohibit Russian officials from owning bank accounts and property overseas, with particular attention paid to their holdings in the West. The ideological underpinning of this bill is that assets located in the West are tantamount to betrayal of the motherland. Then there is Russia's opposition to the U.S. Magnitsky Act. The Kremlin interprets this initiative as yet another confirmation of its suspicions that Washington is conspiring against it and that the bill's real U.S. motive is to blackmail Russian officials by threatening to freeze their overseas bank accounts and property.

An increase in these anti-Western attitudes does not bode well for U.S.-Russian relations, even if Obama is re-elected in November. Regardless of which candidate wins, the reset is bound to either slowly die a natural death under Obama or be extinguished outright under Romney. As a result, the most we can likely expect from U.S.-Russian relations in the next four years is cooperation on a limited range of mundane issues. Under these conditions, avoiding excessive anti-Russian or anti-U.S. rhetoric from both sides would itself be considered a major achievement in bilateral relations.

### AT: Pivot DA

#### Military efficiency spending is expensive – outstrips SMR spending

TDC 2012 (April 2, “Military sees threats, worry in climate change” <http://wwwp.dailyclimate.org/tdc-newsroom/2012/04/climate-security>)

Detractors of the military's clean-energy efforts have taken another view, focusing on the immediate, higher costs and uncertainties of developing and testing technologies, like running jets on biofuels, while the Pentagon faces cuts to weapons programs and other areas. After President Obama doubled Defense Department energy efficiency spending to $1 billion in his 2012 spending plan, Republican lawmakers hauled Navy Secretary Ray Mabus before Congress in February to justify his department's programs. Mabus told Congress that biofuel prices could be competitive with oil by 2020 – and that cost parity could be helped along as the military's different branches test alternative fuels and work with researchers and scientists. After all, GPS, Internet, microchips and nuclear power all got a boost from the Navy's nuclear submarine program, McGinn noted. "The military had mission needs and they made investments." "They paid more than the private sector would ever consider," he added. "But the results were benefits for larger society."

#### DOD spending on nuclear power is a drop in the bucket

Sustainable Business 2011 (October 17, “US Military to Invest $10 Billion a Year in Renewable Energy” <http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/23039>)

Military spending on renewable energy spiked over 300% between 2006-2009, to $1.2 billion, and is expected to exceed $10 billion a year by 2030, according to "From Barracks to the Battlefield: Clean Energy Innovation and America's Armed Forces," by the Pew Project on National Security, Energy and Climate. DOD currently spends about $20 billion a year on energy - 75% for fuel and 25% for facilities and infrastructure, according to Pike Research. DOD is focusing on vehicle efficiency, advanced biofuels, and energy efficiency and renewable energy at bases. It's expected to spend $2.25 billion a year by 2015 for efficient vehicles used in the air, land, and sea, while improving the energy efficiency of its buildings around the world - more than 500,000 of them.

#### Energy efficiency increases consumption – rebound effect

Green, Resident Scholar at AEI, 12

(7/2, End the DoD's green energy fuelishness, www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/end-the-dods-green-energy-fuelishness/)

Finally, while efficiency improvements are often a good thing, it's very easy to be fooled by false economies to one's ultimate regret. As we've learned with hybrid vehicles, for example, the technology for greater efficiency is significant, it's more complex and more difficult to maintain, and, worst of all, the savings are subject to the Jevon's Paradox: if you really make it cheaper for a person to drive a mile, they drive more. As the Breakthrough Institute (a generally liberal, pro-environmental) group concluded in a comprehensive analysis of the Jevon's Paradox (or rebound effect), "Energy Emergence: Rebound and Backfire as Emergent Phenomena" finds extensive evidence and a strong expert consensus that a large amount of the energy savings from below-cost energy efficiency are eroded by demand 'rebound effects,' and that in some cases the rebound exceeds the savings, resulting in increased energy consumption from efficiency, known as backfire."

#### No link – PPA’s don’t spend money up front

**DOE, ’11**

[“Funding Federal Energy and Water Projects”, July, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/52085.pdf>]

On-site renewable PPAs allow Federal agencies to fund on-site renewable energy projects with no upfront capital costs incurred. A developer installs a renewable energy system on agency property under an agreement that the agency will purchase the power generated by the system. The agency pays for the system through these power purchase payments over the life of the contract. After installation, the developer owns, operates, and maintains the system for the life of the contract. The PPA price is typically determined through a competitive procurement process.

### AT: Only DOD Action CP

#### 1) Perm - do both

#### 2) Perm - do the counterplan

#### Perm do the plan and the process of the CP that ends in plan implementation – not a lie perm, perm guarantees plan implementation

#### Artificially Competitive CP’s are a voter –

#### A. CP doesn’t logically reject the plan. Just because an external action is good or preferable to the plan isn’t a reason the CP is preferable – prevents learning decision-making skills. That should be the primary focus on debate as it’s the only skill we learn that’s immediately portable to everyday life.

#### B. Fails to test the desirability of the plan. Internal net benefits don’t test the desirability of plan action and destroy topic specific education.

#### C. interpretation – considerations of process should be allowed in plan passage – key to the politics DA which helps neg ground and other process considerations – forcing immediacy means the aff has to defend abnormal means – artificially creates neg CP ground like consult which is impossible

#### 3) No private spillover – expanding the government’s role beyond financial incentives eliminates demonstration value – means they can’t solve prolif

Deutch and Ansolabehere, Professor of chemistry at MIT and Professor of Political Science at MIT, 03 (The Future of Nuclear Power, <http://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/>)

The second type of “demonstration” project is a first nuclear project carried out by industry, whose success would demonstrate to other private generators that the risks associated with nuclear power are manageable and the cost of new nuclear power is acceptable. Evidently, this type of demonstration is credible only if the government is not involved in design and construction or involved in an indirect manner. Otherwise the project has no “demonstration” value to practical investors considering future investments. The purpose of this demonstration is not to demonstrate a new technology but rather to demonstrate the cost of practical realization of a technology selected by private investors. But a first project bears a risk that subsequent projects do not bear. Investors in subsequent projects have the knowledge that the first of a kind project has been successful (in which case they proceed with greater confidence) or that it has failed (in which case they do not proceed).3 Yet, if the plant successfully meets its cost targets, a large number of additional plants will be built by the industry, taking advantage of the resolution of risk accomplished by the first project were it to proceed. The initial project backers cannot capture the value of the information they provide to subsequent projects. Clearly there is a value to going second and a rational reason to share the risk of the first plant among an entire industry. Such sharing of risk is a matter of bargaining and difficult to achieve in practice. So it may well be in the government’s interest to step in to assure that the demonstration occurs and the uncertainty is resolved. Given the circumstances of nuclear power today, this government interest in the demonstration of actual cost is justified, even when the technology selected is known and plants have been built in the past (although at a cost that today would be considered unaffordable). There must, of course, be a credible basis for believing that technology and industry practices have changed so that a lower capital cost outcome is a reasonable possibility. If the demonstration project results are to be credible to the private sector, the government’s involvement must not be intrusive. We believe the government should step in and increase the likelihood of practical demonstration of nuclear power by providing financial incentive to first movers. We propose a production tax credit of up to $200 per kWe of the construction cost of up to ten “first mover” plants. This benefit might be paid out at 1.7 cents per kWe-hr, over a year and a half of full-power plant operation, since the annual value of this production credit for a 1000 MWe plant operating at 90% capacity factor is $134 million. The $200 per kWe government subsidy would provide $200 million for a 1000 MWe nuclear plant, about 10% of the historically-based total construction cost estimate; accordingly the total outlay for the program could be up to $2 billion paid out over several years.

#### 4) Expertise failure – the counterplan falls outside of DOD capabilities

King, Associate Director of Research and Associate Research Professor of International Affairs at George Washington, 11

(March, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations, http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military)

A significant liability to DoD ownership and operation is having full responsibility for all risks associated with such an undertaking. The risks are made worse by the fact that such an undertaking would require expertise that is outside DoD core capabilities. All aspects of preparing for, building, and operating nuclear power plants are both complicated and technically challenging. DoD cannot expect to own and/or operate such a project with satisfactory results without devoting considerable time and resources to developing a competent team. Since the expertise of those involved in such a team would be outside core DoD capabilities, it would be difficult for DoD to maintain a satisfactory career path for those personnel. There could be some advantages to creating shore assignments for Navy personnel that would be similar to assignments managing and operating nuclear reactors on ships and submarines. The degree of similarity that would be possible would depend on the type of nuclear power plant built on a DoD installation.

#### 5) The counterplan will be massively delayed and DOD staff won’t be able to operate and maintain SMR’s

GAO 2012

(April, RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT FINANCING

Improved Guidance and Information Sharing Needed for DOD Project-Level Officials, Report to Congressional Committees)

Up-front appropriations versus long-term finance charges. Some officials mentioned the length of time it can take to navigate the programming and budgeting process and to obtain appropriations as a drawback to using the up-front appropriated funding approaches for renewable energy projects. Specifically, some officials stated that it can take three to five years from project submission within the service through beginning construction for projects funded through military construction appropriations—including the Energy Conservation Investment Program—because of the length of the budget and appropriations cycle. In contrast, when financing a renewable energy project with an alternative-financing approach, the installation can pay back the costs over time while obtaining the benefit of the project— such as renewable energy production—almost immediately after the project is constructed. However, several officials noted that paying for the project using an alternative-financing approach often leads to a costlier project in the long term when compared to the same project paid for using up-front appropriated funding because of the cost of private financing. We have previously reported that alternative- financing approaches may be more expensive over time than full, up-front appropriations since the federal government’s cost of capital is lower than that of the private sector Operation and maintenance of equipment. According to several officials, the operation and maintenance of equipment is a benefit of most alternatively financed projects and a drawback of projects funded with up-front appropriations. Projects financed with an alternative-financing approach generally involve the contractor operating and maintaining the equipment during the contract period, whereas the government typically is responsible for the operation and maintenance of equipment purchased with appropriated funds. Officials cited this as a significant benefit of alternatively financed projects—and a drawback of projects funded with up-front appropriations—because, according to the officials, installations often do not have personnel on-staff with the knowledge, skills, or expertise to operate and maintain the equipment needed to generate renewable energy. Officials noted, however, that for projects financed with Energy Savings Performance Contracts or Utility Energy Service Contracts, the contract period could be a relatively short period of time. According to these officials, after the contract period ends, the installation assumes ownership—and therefore the operation and maintenance—of the equipment, which can be a drawback of these two approaches.

#### No DOD expertise – ensures failure of military operations

Carmen, Commander US Navy and Senior Military Fellow at the Center for a New

American Security, 10

(Broadening Horizons: Climate Change and the U.S. Armed Forces, www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Broadening%20Horizons\_Carmen%20Parthemore%20Rogers.pdf)

Many serious complications must be weighed as well. Military base personnel often do not have the necessary training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials. Nuclear reactors would necessitate additional qualified personnel and improved physical security requirements to meet the 24/7 operations needs. As with siting for all energy production, local public resistance could be problematic. When considering the impact of a reactor casualty, the resulting impact on the operational mission effectiveness of the tenant commands on the base must also be considered so as to avoid a single point vulnerability that disables all military operations on site. And while many private companies are touting new designs for small reactors that would work well in this capacity, the technology may still be years away from fully meeting technical requirements and federal regulatory standards. Proliferation considerations would also need to be part of any adjudication of what types of reactors are most suitable for these purposes.