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#### Interpretation –

#### Incentives are direct support for a specific activity

Doris, NREL researcher, 12

(Elizabeth Doris, researcher at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, “Policy Building Blocks: Helping Policymakers Determine Policy Staging for the Development of Distributed PV Markets,” Paper to be presented at the 2012 World Renewable Energy Forum, 5/13-5/17, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/54801.pdf>)

3.3 Market Expansion

This stage of policy development targets the development of projects and includes both incentives that attempt to distribute the high first costs of distributed technologies and policies that facilitate project installation. The purpose of this category is to increase the installation of individual projects through monetizing the non-economic benefits of distributed generation for the developer. Because the value of those benefits vary in different contexts, these policies can be politically challenging to put in place and technically challenging to design and implement. There is a large body of literature (encompassing the energy field as well as other fields) that discusses the design and implementation of effective market incentives. Specific policy types include:

• Incentives. In the context of this framework, incentives are defined as direct monetary support for specific project development. Incentives, especially in the current economic environment, can be politically challenging to implement and require detailed design to ensure that they are effectively reaching the intended market at levels that spur development without creating over-subsidization. Because of the complications and expense of these types of policies, they are most used and most cost-effective in environments where the market is prepared for project development. There are three primary types of incentives:

• Investment incentives directly alter the first cost of technologies. These incentives can take the form of grants, rebates, or tax incentives, depending on the market needs. Grants are typically applied to larger scale projects and are paid in advance of development, and so target development that would not take place without advance investment. Rebates are most commonly based on equipment purchases and can be applied at the time of purchase or through a post-purchase mechanism. Tax incentives can be deductions or credits, can be applied to entire installations, and are applied after purchase, annually. Tax incentives target development that does not need direct capital investment, but instead prioritizes reduction in pay-back period.

• Production incentives provide payment for electricity produced from the distributed electricity. These are different from net metering because the aim is not to provide the economic value of electricity sold into the grid, but instead, to monetize the indirect benefits of distributed generation and apply that on a production basis to projects. These incentives do not directly remove the challenge of higher first costs, and so are most effective in situations in which those high first costs can be spread over the course of the project lifetime (e.g., where direct priori investment is not a priority). In the last decade, incentives for distributed generation have tended toward the production type, because it assures the public that the investment is resulting in clean energy development (whereas investment incentives have the potential to be invested in projects that do not materialize).

• Feed-in-Tariffs. This incentive type reduces investment risk by providing fixed payments for projects based on the levelized cost of renewable energy generation. This (among other design characteristics) distinguishes feed-in-tariffs from production-based incentives, which are based on monetizing the value of the electricity to the grid or the value to the electricity purchaser.

#### “For” means the incentive must directly influence energy production

WORDS AND PHRASES 04

(Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “For,” Volume 17, p. 338-343)

 W.D.Tenn. 1942. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 uses the words “production for commerce” as denoting an intention to deal in a restricted way with question of coverage in connection with those employed directly in production of articles to be sold, shipped or transported across state lines in commerce, producing goods “for” a certain purpose implying a direct relation as distinguished from producing something which only “affects” a certain purpose which implies an indirect relation.

#### Energy production of nuclear power is the generation of electricity

US EIA (Energy Information Administration) - October 19, 2011, Annual Energy Review 2010, http://www.eia.gov/totalenergy/data/annual/pdf/aer.pdf

Primary Energy Production: Production of primary energy. The U.S. Energy Information Administration includes the following in U.S. primary energy production: coal production, waste coal supplied, and coal refuse recovery; crude oil and lease condensate production; natural gas plant liquids production; dry natural gas—excluding supplemental gaseous fuels—production; nuclear electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the nuclear heat rates); conventional hydroelectricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates); geothermal electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates), and geothermal heat pump energy and geothermal direct use energy; solar thermal and photovoltaic electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossilfuels heat rates), and solar thermal direct use energy; wind electricity net generation (converted to Btu using the fossil-fuels heat rates); wood and wood-derived fuels consumption; biomass waste consumption; and biofuels feedstock.

#### Violation – The aff does not incentivize the process of transformation nuclear energy into electricity, it only supports the creation of plants/facilities that MIGHT produce electricity LATER

#### Vote Neg

#### Predictable Limits – There are hundreds of factors that influence whether nuclear power gets produced – Allowing affs to promote factors of production means they could incentivize students to go into STEM or subsidize R&D. Only requiring the aff’s incentive be CONTINGENT on production creates a predictable limit on aff mechanisms

#### Ground – Incentivizing capital instead of production means the aff doesn’t have to defend “production good.” At best they are effectually topical which guts stable CP and DA ground and forces us to concede solvency to get back to square 1.
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#### Text: Nuclear Regulatory Commission should remove current licensing regulations for Small Modular nuclear Reactors and establish guidelines staffing levels, security requirements, and construction criteria.

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

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

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

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

Jacobs 11

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

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

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

Ehrenfeld ‘5,

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

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

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

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

Choi, Murphy, and Caro 4

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

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

### 1NC DA

#### Obama is still ahead but Romney is closing the gap --- especially in the critical swing state of Ohio

Murray, 10/3 (Sara, The Wall Street Journal Online, 10/3/2012, “Obama Lead Shrinks in Two Battlegrounds; Polls Tighten in Florida and Virginia, But Romney Still Faces Big Gap in Ohio,” Factiva)

Mitt Romney has closed in on President Barack Obama in the battleground states of Florida and Virginia, new polling shows, but a substantial gap with the president in Ohio leaves the Republican with a daunting path to victory in the Electoral College.

Biting into Mr. Obama's lead over the past three weeks, Mr. Romney now trails the president by a single percentage point among likely voters in Florida and by two points in Virginia, new Wall Street Journal/NBC News/Marist Poll surveys show. Both races are statistical dead heats, as Mr. Obama's leads fall within the surveys' margins of error.

But the GOP nominee trails by eight percentage points among likely voters in Ohio, the nation's largest swing state after Florida and a central component of both candidates' plans for building an Electoral College majority, the new polling shows.

The polls show that the race for the White House remains fiercely competitive roughly a month before Election Day. The state surveys mirror tightening nationwide: Mr. Obama held a three-point lead in a new nationwide Wall Street Journal/NBC News survey released Tuesday, down from five points in early September.

"This is going to be—and always was going to be—a close election," Robert Gibbs, an adviser to the Obama campaign, said in a Politico forum Wednesday. He singled out Ohio and Virginia as particularly important states for both candidates. "Places like Ohio and Virginia…have seen as much if not more attention than almost anything else."

In Florida, Mr. Obama leads Mr. Romney 47% to 46% among likely voters, after holding a five-point lead in early September. In Virginia, the president leads 48% to 46%, after topping Mr. Romney by five points in a September survey.

In Ohio, the new survey finds Mr. Obama with 51%, to 43% for Mr. Romney, after Mr. Obama led by seven percentage points in early September.

The pool of undecided voters is relatively small—just 4% in Ohio, 5% in Virginia and 6% in Florida—but a substantial shift toward Mr. Romney among independent voters in Florida in the past three weeks suggests that a larger subset remains persuadable.

"If Romney can make a better showing for who he is personally, this race could get even tighter," said Andrew Kohut, president of the nonpartisan Pew Research Center. So far, many swing voters "have a negative view of Obama's performance and a negative view of Romney personally."

The Romney campaign will need to make swift progress in Ohio if it hopes to make the state competitive. A major challenge there: More than half of likely Ohio voters—some 51%—had an unfavorable impression of Mr. Romney, compared with 42% who viewed him positively. It was roughly the opposite for the president: 52% viewed Mr. Obama favorably, while 44% had a negative impression of him.

Ben Ginsberg, counsel to the Romney campaign, said in the Politico forum it is possible for Mr. Romney to eke out an Electoral College victory without the Buckeye State, but that "it'd be a lot better to win Ohio."

Across all three swing states, the candidates were at a standoff in molding likely voters' economic perceptions. "Basically Obama and Romney are fighting to a draw as to who's better able to handle the economy," said Lee Miringoff, the director of the Marist Institute for Public Opinion, which conducted the surveys of the three states.

Mr. Romney's Medicare stance remains an issue that is sure to continue to draw attention, particularly in Florida, with its heavy concentration of seniors. Some 48% of likely voters in Florida said Mr. Obama was better prepared to deal with Medicare, compared with 43% who said Mr. Romney was.

But older voters were more amenable to Mr. Romney's plan, which would keep benefits unchanged for people in or near retirement but move younger Americans to a system where they buy insurance policies in retirement subsidized by the government. Of likely Florida voters 60 years or older, 47% said Mr. Romney would do a better job handling Medicare, compared with 43% who said the president would.

#### Obama needs to appear fiscally responsible to avoid alienating key independents

USA Today, 5/26 (5/26/2012, "Obama campaign goes on the defensive on spending, debt," http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/story/2012-05-26/obama-romney-debt-spending/55221120/1)

WASHINGTON (AP) – Government spending and debt are emerging as a campaign tug-of-war, with Mitt Romney blaming President Obama for a "prairie fire of debt" and Obama calling the charge a "cowpie of distortion." House Speaker John Boehner is talking about a debt ceiling that is still more than eight months away.

What gives? In a word, polling.

The American public is growing increasingly distressed about government spending and high budgets. The issue now ranks as high on the worry scale as lack of jobs. And it worked well for Republicans in 2010, who galvanized voters with ads and flyers that drew attention to government red ink and took back control of the U.S. House after four years of Democratic rule.

Republicans are looking for that magic again.

Romney has maintained a drumbeat of criticism over Obama's handling of federal spending and the national debt in recent weeks, forcing the president on the defensive on an issue where public opinion is stacked against him.

In Iowa earlier this month, Romney said a "prairie fire of debt" was sweeping across the nation, threatening the country's future. He accused Obama of inflating the debt that he had pledged to reduce and ballooning the federal budget deficit with the 2009 economic stimulus and 2010 health care bill after saying he would cut it sharply.

Obama, in campaign events in Colorado, California and Iowa this week, argued that federal spending had slowed to rates not seen in decades after he inherited a $1 trillion large debt and later pushed for $2 trillion in spending cuts. The president pointed to Romney's tax proposal, saying it would give millionaires tax cuts at the expense of the debt.

Mitt Romney holds a business roundtable on the economy.

Obama called Romney's claims a "cowpie of distortion" and would saddle the debt with $5 trillion in new tax cuts, likening it to trying to put out "a prairie fire with some gasoline."

"What happens is, the Republicans run up the tab, and then we're sitting there and they've left the restaurant," Obama said at a campaign event in Des Moines. "And then they point and (say), 'Why did you order all those steaks and martinis?'"

Obama's defensive crouch on debt and spending reflect a hard reality: Polls consistently show voters, including sought-after independents, placing more trust in Romney to handle the massive debt. The nation's economy remains a focal point for voters but many remain concerned that years of heavy federal spending on guns and butter could leave the U.S. in a similar position as Greece and other European nations grappling with massive debt.

A Gallup/USA Today poll conducted May 10-13 found that overall, 82% of Americans called the "federal budget deficit and debt" extremely or very important, a level of interest comparable to unemployment. The same poll found Romney with a broad advantage on handling the budget deficit and debt, with 54% saying he would do a better job handling it compared with 39% who chose Obama.

The results mirrored an April Washington Post/ABC News poll, which found 51% of Americans sided with Romney on handling the federal budget deficit, compared with 38% for Obama. Among independents, 60% preferred Romney while 29% thought Obama would do a better job handling it.

The White House has tried to respond. Traveling to Colorado Springs, Colo., White House press secretary Jay Carney cited an analysis by MarketWatch that said spending under Obama had grown more slowly than any president since Dwight Eisenhower.

A few hours later, Obama picked up on the piece, telling donors in Denver that his work to pay down the federal debt in a "balanced and responsible" way was "starting to appear in places — real liberal outlets like the Wall Street Journal— since I've been president, federal spending has risen at the lowest pace in nearly 60 years." MarketWatch is published by Dow Jones & Co., which also publishes the Wall Street Journal.

Yet, Obama's budget stewardship is open to interpretation. The debt now stands at $15.7 trillion, compared to $10.6 trillion on his inauguration day. On a dollar basis, that's the biggest ever jump in the debt. How much the debt has grown can also be measures as a percentage of what he inherited. By that measure, the debt has increased by half during the three-and-a-half year Obama administration. During President Ronald Reagan's eight-year administration, the debt nearly tripled, from about $910 billion to more than $2.6 trillion.

Still, much of the increase during Obama's tenure has been a consequence of the recession. In a poor economy, government spending increases automatically because more Americans become eligible for food stamps, unemployment assistance and Medicaid. Also, a poor economy leads to unemployment which cuts into tax revenue. As a result, deficits are inevitable as more money goes out and less comes in.

To be sure, Obama pushed through a stimulus package that cost more than $800 billion and he and President George Bush both approved spending of the $700 billion bank bailout in 2008 and 2009. But those costs are not recurrent.

"It's important to understand the reason why the debt went up by so much," said Robert Bixby of the budget watchdog group The Concord Coalition. "We certainly do have a very serious long-term debt problem in the country. We have an underlying structural imbalance between what we are promising, mostly in entitlement benefits, and what we're willing to pay for in taxes. But in the short-term there are a lot of factors that are pushing the debt up that aren't related to fiscal policy."

Add to the mix Boehner, who has said when Congress is asked to raise the nation's borrowing cap after the election, he will insist on spending cuts to offset the increase. Democratic leaders call it an irresponsible course of action, noting that the gridlock over the debt ceiling last year caused a downgrading of the U.S. government's credit rating.

All of this is aimed at unaligned, independent voters.

In turning attention to debt, Republicans are tapping a winning issue they deployed in congressional races two years ago. In October of 2010, Republican pollster Wes Anderson said, congressional campaigns shifted "away from jobs and economy to government taking us over the cliff." The emphasis proved to be a success at the ballot box.

These days, the economy remains the preeminent issue in voters' minds, but Anderson says middle-of-the-road votes are the targets of the big government message.

"The middle is angry about where we are at and they really see two villains on this stage, this play has two antagonists. Both of them are big," said Anderson, who is working on congressional and statewide political campaigns in several states that are presidential battlegrounds. "One is big business, big Wall Street, big insurance, big oil, just big, abusing the middle class, abusing small businesses, abusing the taxpayer. The other is big government — big government wildly running up massive deficits and debt which abuse the taxpayer, the middle class and small business."

Independent voters, he said, "hold both of those central tenets to be true."

#### Romney win crushes US-Russian relations – reverse causal evidence

**Larison 6-20-**12, citing Andrew Weiss director of the RAND Center for Russia and Eurasia and executive director of the RAND Business Leaders Forum, Daniel Larison is a reporter for the American Conservative, “The Presidential Election’s Effects on U.S.-Russian Relations” <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/the-presidential-elections-effects-on-u-s-russian-relations/>)

Andrew Weiss considers the reasons for U.S.-Russian tensions, and finds the presidential elections in both countries to be partly responsible: A third big drag on U.S.-Russian relations comes from the so-called silly season that accompanies presidential campaigns in both countries. Of course, 2012 was always supposed to be a dead year in U.S.-Russian relations. Back-to-back presidential campaigns have overshadowed just about everything on the bilateral agenda, and practically no one in Washington or Moscow had been predicting that significant progress could be made this year on the toughest issues. Take missile defense, for example. Putin has shown little interest in cutting deals on major arms control issues with a U.S. president who might not be around in just a few months time to implement them. Not only does Putin have no strong incentive to take risks in pursuing new deals with Obama before the election, but he has good reason to believe that a Romney administration would halt or reverse most or all of Obama’s initiatives related to Russia. If Romney wins in November, Putin has even less incentive to cooperate with the U.S., because he will assume (correctly) that the incoming administration is going to be much more antagonistic. Arms control isn’t likely to be a top priority in a Romney White House. To the extent that he has said anything about arms control, Romney is openly hostile to new agreements and unwilling to make even the smallest concessions on missile defense. The good news is that U.S.-Russian relations might start to recover once the election is over, but that depends on the outcome. Romney’s election would represent the confirmation of Russian hard-liners’ suspicions that the post-2008 thaw in relations was a fluke and couldn’t be sustained. Indeed, the Republican nominee seems to have crafted his Russia policy to maximize distrust and paranoia in Moscow. The 2008 and 2012 campaigns have been unusual in the post-Cold War era for the intensity of anti-Russian sentiment expressed by the Republican nominees in these cycles. If it had just been the 2008 cycle, it could have attributed to McCain’s longstanding anti-Russian attitudes and dismissed as such. The re-emergence of Russophobia as a major theme of Republican foreign policy makes that impossible. Weiss also points to the danger that Putin will contribute to wrecking the relationship for opportunistic domestic reasons: Still, Putin knows how to cater to the two-thirds of the Russian electorate that voted for him in March and reside primarily in Russia’s smaller cities and countryside. He may find it hard to resist the temptation to play upon their worst fears and anti-Western stereotypes. Sacrificing the past several years of dramatic improvement in the U.S.-Russian relationship may seem like a small price to pay if it breathes new life and legitimacy into his rule. If Romney is elected, his desire to scrap good relations with Russia would make it extremely easy for Putin to do just that.

#### **Relations key to solve accidental nuclear war – START is no substitute for relations**

Cohen 10—prof, Russian Studies and History, NYU. Prof emeritus, Princeton (Stephen, US-Russian Relations in an Age of American Triumphalism: An Interview with Stephen F. Cohen, 25 May 2010, http://www.thenation.com/article/us-russian-relations-age-american-triumphalism-interview-stephen-f-cohen, AMiles)

Cohen: The real concern I have with this "we won the Cold War" triumphalism is the mythology that we are safer today than we were when the Soviet Union existed. Though it is blasphemous to say so, we are not safer for several reasons, one being that the Soviet state kept the lid on very dangerous things. The Soviet Union was in control of its nuclear and related arsenals. Post-Soviet Russia is "sorta" in control, but "sorta" is not enough. There is no margin for error. Reagan's goal in the 1980s was not to end the Soviet Union, but to turn it into a permanent partner of the United States. He came very close to achieving that and deserves enormous credit. He did what had to be done by meeting Gorbachev half-way. But since 1991, the arrogance of American policymaking toward Russia has either kept the Cold War from being fully ended or started a new one. The greatest threats to our national security still reside in Russia. This is not because it's communist, but because it is laden with all these nuclear, chemical, and biological devices—that’s the threat. The reaction of the second Bush administration was to junk decades of safe-guarding agreements with Moscow. It was the first time in modern times that we have had no nuclear control reduction agreement with the Russians. What should worry us every day and night is the triumphalist notion that nuclear war is no longer possible. It is now possible in even more ways than before, especially accidental ones. Meanwhile, the former Soviet territories remain a Wal-Mart of dirty material and know-how. If terrorists ever explode a dirty device in the United States, even a small one, the material is likely to come from the former Soviet Union. The Nunn-Lugar Act (1992) was the best program Congress ever enacted to help Russia secure its nuclear material and know-how, a major contribution to American national security. But no one in Washington connects the dots. Take Senator Lugar himself. He seems not to understand that we need Russia's complete cooperation to make his own legislation fully successful, but he repeatedly speaks undiplomatically, even in ugly ways, about Russia’s leaders, thereby limiting their cooperation and undermining his own legacy. In other words, to have a nuclear relationship with Russia that will secure our national security, we must have a fully cooperative, trusting political relationship with Moscow. That’s why all the talk about a replacement for the expired START agreement, which Obama has been having trouble reaching with the Kremlin, is half-witted. Even if the two sides agree, and even if the Senate and Russian Duma ratify a new treaty, the agreement will be unstable because the political relationship is bad and growing worse. Evidently, no one in the Administration, Congress, or the mainstream media, or, I should add in the think tanks, can connect these dots.

### AT: Solvency

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

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

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

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

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Nuke Power Trades off with rare earth metals

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

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

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

#### Berillyium is key to a litany of defense technologies

BEST, no date

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

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

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

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

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

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

### AT: Grid

#### Prevention measures are taken to prevent massive blackouts & escalation.

DoE 9/10/04 – U.S. Department of Energy [Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, “Is Our Power Grid More Reliable One Year After the Blackout?”, State Energy Program, Sept.-Oct./04, http://www.eere.energy.gov/state\_energy\_program/feature\_detail\_info.cfm/fid=32?print]

The U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force publication, The August 14, 2003 Blackout One Year Later: Actions Taken in the United States and Canada to Reduce Blackout Risk (PDF 236 KB) Download Acrobat Reader, details the actions taken to improve grid reliability. For example, shortly after the Task Force identified direct causes of the August 14 blackout, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and NERC set to correct them. The U.S. Canada Power System Outage Task Force conducted a massive investigation into the causes of the blackout and made 42 recommendations to improve power system operations. In December 2003, FERC ordered FirstEnergy to study the adequacy of transmission and generation facilities in northeastern Ohio. The results were submitted in April 2004 and recommendations are now being incorporated into FirstEnergy's operations and strategic plan. In February 2004, NERC directed FirstEnergy, the MISO, PJM Interconnection, and the East Central Area Reliability Coordination Agreement on actions each organization needed by June 30, 2004, to reduce the potential of future blackouts. NERC then approved and verified their compliance plans. In response to the April 2004 Final Report, FERC took the following actions to clarify and develop reliability standards: \* Commissioned a firm to analyze transmission line outages related to inadequate tree trimming — a major contributor to the August 14 blackout — and determine best practices for preventing this problem. See the "Utility Vegetation Management and Bulk Electric Reliability Report from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission" (PDF 92 KB). \* Began to require transmission owners to file reports on their tree trimming practices. \* Affirmed the need to strengthen and clarify NERC's operating reliability standards. Meanwhile, NERC strengthened its policies on emergency operations, operations planning, and reliability coordinator procedures and will include compliance metrics in its operating policies and planning standards by February 2005. New standards for managing vegetation and calculating transmission line ratings are also being developed; procedures for training and certifying operators are being revised.

#### Cyber attacks are all hype – no risk.

Joshua Green 02, editor of Washington Monthly, November, 2002, The Myth of Cyberterrorism, Washington Monthly, p. http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0211.green.html#byline

Why all this brooding over so relatively minor a threat? Ignorance is one reason. Cyberterrorism merges two spheres--terrorism and technology--that most lawmakers and senior administration officials don't fully understand and therefore tend to fear, making them likelier to accede to any measure, if only out of self-preservation. Just as tellingly, many are eager to exploit this ignorance. Numerous technology companies, still reeling from the collapse of the tech bubble, have recast themselves as innovators crucial to national security and boosted their Washington presence in an effort to attract federal dollars. As Ohio State University law professor Peter Swire explained to Mother Jones, "Many companies that rode the dot-com boom need to find big new sources of income. One is direct sales to the federal government; another is federal mandates. If we have a big federal push for new security spending, that could prop up the sagging market." But lately, a third motive has emerged: Stoking fears of cyberterrorism helps maintain the level of public anxiety about terrorism generally, which in turn makes it easier for the administration to pass its agenda.

#### Plan has no effect on oil

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.

#### Military oil dependence inevitable.

**Klare 08** – (Michael T. - a Five Colleges professor of Peace and World Security Studies, July 5, “Energy Self-Sufficiency: Not Military Escorts For Oil,” <http://www.mindfully.org/Energy/2008/Military-Escorts-Oil5jul08.htm>)

Creating real energy security The reality of the US’s increasing reliance on foreign oil only strengthens the conviction in Washington that military force and energy security are inseparable twins. With nearly two-thirds of the country’s daily oil intake imported – and that percentage still going up – it’s hard not to notice that significant amounts of our oil now come from conflict-prone areas of the Middle East, central Asia and Africa. So long as this is the case, US policymakers will instinctively look to the military to ensure the safe delivery of crude oil. It evidently matters little that the use of military force, especially in the Middle East, has surely made the energy situation less stable and less dependable, while fuelling anti-Americanism. This is, of course, not the definition of “energy security” but its opposite. A viable long-term approach to actual energy security would not favour one particular source of energy above all others, or regularly expose American soldiers to a heightened risk of harm and American taxpayers to a heightened risk of bankruptcy. Rather, a US energy policy that made sense would embrace a holistic approach to energy procurement, weighing the relative merits of all potential sources of energy. It would naturally favour the development of domestic, renewable sources of energy that do not degrade the environment or imperil other national interests. At the same time, it would favour a thorough-going programme of energy conservation of a sort notably absent these last two decades – one that would help cut reliance on foreign energy sources in the near future and slow the atmospheric build-up of climate-altering greenhouse gases. Petroleum would continue to play a significant role in any such approach. Oil retains considerable appeal as a source of transportation energy (especially for aircraft) and as a feedstock for many chemical products.

#### DOD renewables would solve.

Kuntz, 2007 (Gordon D. is Fellow at the United States Army War College with the Fellowship at the Army Environmental Policy Institute, "Renewable Energy Systems: Viable Options for Contingency Operations," Environmental Practice 9 (3) September 2007)

Renewable energy expertise is limited in the Army in terms of operation, maintenance, and repair of renewable energy systems. With the continued limited use of renewable energy systems by the Army, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the Army to develop experts in these areas. There is skepticism by some that the industry is ready and able to produce sufficient quantity and quality of deployable renewable energy systems at a reasonable price, and in a timely manner that meet military specifications. Having these requirements clearly identified in military contracts will help overcome this skepticism. Obtaining standardized designs and fabrications for CONOPS is crucial to renewable energy systems use and will most likely not occur without a definite requirement and demand. **With an increased use of renewable energy systems by the Army, renewable energy systems expertise is sure to follow**. Lastly, renewable energy systems can require a fairly significant initial financial investment. While renewable energy systems typically pay for themselves in a few years, payback varies according to the configuration of the individual system, where and when the system is deployed, the frequency and duration of system use, and the efficiency of the particular renewable energy systems. It is difficult to understand how one can maintain the position of renewable energy systems being costly even when compared to the cost of fuel used by conventional generators alone. Even with renewable energy systems being more expensive to by a typical fuel generator, the operational cost payoff in the long run makes the investment worth while. Cost savings can be illustrated by Wal-Mart’s modifications to the second largest commercial trucking fleet in America. Installing auxiliary power units on their trucks will enable drivers to keep their cabs warm or cool during breaks from the road without the use of the primary diesel engine. Wal-Mart estimates it could save up to $26 million a year in fuel costs alone. Wal-Mart’s new sustainability plan seeks to increase the efficiency of its vehicle fleet by 50% over the next ten years and reduce energy demands in their facilities by 30%. Their investment now greatly pays for itself in the future. At a cost of hundreds to even hundreds of thousands of dollars for various renewable energy systems, this investment is greatly cheaper than the millions of dollars currently spent on fuel to run traditional generators for energy. The legislative process also places little importance on use of renewable energy systems as funding for their purchase and use is continually cut. If the Army were to become a major purchaser of renewable energy systems, the cost for renewable energy systems would certainly decrease due to the purchasing power of the Army. As the demand for renewable energy systems increases, the cost for these systems will in turn decrease. Increased demand for renewable energy systems by the Army would significantly leverage manufacturers to meet military demands and specifications, influence improvements in technology, increase availability of renewable energy systems, promote greater system efficiency, and thereby, increase the Army’s use of renewable energy systems.

#### Accessing forward operating bases is key

The Pew Project on National Security, Energy and Climate 2011 (“From Barracks to the Battlefield Clean Energy Innovation and America’s Armed Forces” <http://www.pewenvironment.org/uploadedFiles/PEG/Publications/Report/DoD-Report_FINAL.pdf>)

The Department of Defense manages a prodigious inventory of real estate: more than 500,000 buildings and structures at 500 major installations around the world. The building space under DoD management totals about 2.2 billion square feet, three times the square footage operated by Wal-Mart and more than 10 times that of the U.S. government’s General Services Administration. 123 In theater, DoD also manages a number of forward operating bases that require energy to power electronics, provide lighting, and heat or cool air and water. Because of increased energy requirements during wartime and rising costs, the department has placed a priority on ways to better manage its energy usage at battlefield facilities. There are currently thousands of forward operating bases deployed throughout Iraq and Afghanistan. Across its fixed building stock and forward operating bases, DoD has ample opportunities to save energy and deploy new alternative energy sources. Efficiency opportunities exist in improved design, operations and power management technologies as well as energys aving “smart” products and microgrids. Many of these enhancements can be integrated with the deployment and use of new renewable energy technologies. And all of these efforts can be utilized as key strategies in the effort to reduce costs, increase security and improve the operational effectiveness of the U.S. military. DoD has been a leader in U.S. federal energy management efforts at its installations for several decades. Since 1985, DoD has reduced its facility energy consumption by more than 30 percent.

### AT: China

#### China rise good – key to solve North Korea, Sudan, Somali piracy, the global economy, and climate change

Christensen ’11,

(Thomas, William P. Boswell Professor of World Politics of Peace and War, Princeton University, “The Advantages of an Assertive China”, Foreign Affairs Mar/Apr2011, Vol. 90 Issue 2, p54-67)

Despite the image of a more powerful China seeking to drive events under the rubric of a new grand strategy, Beijing--with a few important exceptions--has been reacting, however abrasively, to unwelcome and unforeseen events that have often been initiated by others. In many ways, Chinas foreign policy was more creative and proactive in the two years leading up to the financial crisis than it is today. Between 2006 and 2008, China adopted constructive and assertive policies toward North Korea, Sudan, and Somali piracy that were unprecedented in the history of the People's Republic of China's foreign relations. The United States and its diplomatic partners should promote the return of such an assertive China--without which Washington will face greater difficulty in addressing pressing global challenges such as nuclear proliferation, climate change, and global economic instability. China has become far too big to stand on the sidelines--let alone to stand in the way--while others attempt to resolve these issues.

#### Korean tensions high now – risk miscalculation

AAP 10/6/12

(“N Korean soldier kills 2, defects south”, http://www.perthnow.com.au/news/breaking-news/n-korean-soldier-kills-2-defects-to-south/story-e6frg13l-1226489726483)

A NORTH Korean soldier has defected to the South through the heavily militarised border, saying he shot dead two superior officers in the process, the South Korean military said. It is only the fourth such defection reported in the past 10 years, with none of the previous incidents involving fatal shootings, and could raise already heightened tensions ahead of the South's presidential election in December. "Six gunshots were heard and our guards spotted a North Korean soldier crossing the military demarcation line," a spokesman for Seoul's Joint Chiefs of Staff told reporters. "Through loudspeakers, we confirmed he wanted to defect to the South and we led him to safety," the spokesman said, adding that the soldier was being held in protective custody. Under initial interrogation, the soldier said he had shot and killed his squad and platoon leaders before making his escape. There was no independent confirmation of any casualties, but Yonhap news agency cited an unidentified military official as saying two North Korean soldiers had been seen "lying on the ground". There was no comment from Pyongyang. Military defections across the land border between the two Koreas are rare, with the last reported crossing by a North Korean soldier in 2010 and previous instances in 2008 and 2002. Once described by former US president Bill Clinton as "the scariest place on earth", the demilitarised zone (DMZ) that divides the Korean peninsula between North and South was created after the 1950-53 Korean War. Four kilometres wide and 248km long, it is a depopulated no-man's land of heavily fortified fences, bristling with the landmines and listening posts of two nations that technically remain at war. Saturday's defection occurred at the only functioning transport link across the land border, a narrow road-and-rail corridor between the South and an industrial zone where southern companies have invested on the northern side. South Korean soldiers in the area, on the western part of the frontier, were put on alert afterwards. More than 23,500 North Koreans have escaped and resettled in the South since the end of the Korean War, but virtually all cross the North's border with China and most travel on to South-East Asia in the hope of eventually reaching Seoul. They face repatriation if discovered in China. The latest defection came at a sensitive time, with both Koreas trading accusations of provocative behaviour in the run-up to the December 19 presidential election in the South. Last month, Seoul's navy fired warning shots to turn back North Korean fishing vessels after a series of incursions over their disputed Yellow Sea border. A week later, South Korean President Lee Myung-Bak warned Pyongyang against any attempt to sway the presidential ballot and said the South's military would "retaliate strongly" against any provocation. A few days later, a spokesman for the North's powerful National Defence Commission accused Lee's conservative party of "war-mongering" to win votes.

#### North Korean prolif causes nuclear war – extinction

Hayes & Hamel-Green, 10 – \*Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development, AND \*\* Executive Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development act Victoria University (1/5/10, Executive Dean at Victoria, “The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia,” http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf)

The international community is increasingly aware that cooperative diplomacy is the most productive way to tackle the multiple, interconnected global challenges facing humanity, not least of which is the increasing proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Korea and Northeast Asia are instances where risks of nuclear proliferation and actual nuclear use arguably have increased in recent years. This negative trend is a product of continued US nuclear threat projection against the DPRK as part of a general program of coercive diplomacy in this region, North Korea’s nuclear weapons programme, the breakdown in the Chinese-hosted Six Party Talks towards the end of the Bush Administration, regional concerns over China’s increasing military power, and concerns within some quarters in regional states (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) about whether US extended deterrence (“nuclear umbrella”) afforded under bilateral security treaties can be relied upon for protection. The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

#### US-China cooperation solves warming and global clean tech

Walsh ‘9,

(Bryan, Staff Writer for *Time*, U.S. vs. China: Working Together on Global Warming?, Nov. 17, 2009, http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1929071\_1929070\_1940013,00.html)

Global warming is a problem that spans the entire world, but when it comes to figuring out how to stop it, the burden will largely fall on two countries: the U.S. and China. The U.S. is the world's largest historic carbon emitter, responsible for putting more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere over the past century and a half than any other nation. China recently surpassed the U.S. as the top emitter and will be responsible for more greenhouse gases in the future than any other country. "These two countries hold the key to sustainability or catastrophe," says Jake Schmidt, international climate policy director for the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). If that's the case, it might seem as if the world is headed toward catastrophe. Over the weekend, world leaders at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit made explicit what had long been expected — that a legal, global treaty to reduce carbon emissions was no longer possible at next month's U.N. summit in Copenhagen. The deadlock between the U.S. and China is a big reason: Beijing expects Washington to take the lead on cutting carbon, but the U.S. won't sign on to a deal that doesn't including measurable action from the Chinese. From that perspective, climate change is one more competition between the world's reigning superpower and its No. 1 challenger. But the U.S.-China relationship is never as simple as it seems — and that includes their positions on climate change. The two countries signed a memorandum of understanding in July on enhanced cooperation on climate change, energy and the environment, and new U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu, whose parents hail from China, is reaching out to Chinese scientists. Major U.S. corporations, including the utility Duke Energy, have established joint projects with their Chinese counterparts on clean energy and low-carbon technology. Most important, cooperation is beginning at the top: both U.S. President Barack Obama and Chinese President Hu Jintao have put energy and climate change high on their agendas. "As the two largest consumers and producers of energy, there can be no solution to this challenge without the efforts of both China and the United States," said Obama in Beijing. "That is why we've agreed to a series of important new initiatives in this area." There were no agreements for specific numbers or emissions cuts at Obama and Hu's meeting. The White House has made clear that the Senate must take the lead on setting emissions levels, and China has been loath to name numbers for its own emissions. But the two Presidents did agree to establish a joint clean-energy research center, supported by at least $150 million in funding over five years, a partnership on developing electric vehicles, a renewable-energy road map and an action plan on energy efficiency. It fit the expectations of observers before the summit-broad cooperation on technology, but with little specificity. "The big chance for cooperation is on technology," says Michael Levi, director of the program on energy security and climate change for the Council on Foreign Relations. "Early-stage cooperation can help defuse some of the tensions of later-stage technology transfer." Despite being years apart in economic development, with U.S. per capita carbon emissions nearly 10 times the number of Chinese levels, the two countries have similar concerns on energy. Both are major coal users, with half of U.S. electricity and 70% of Chinese energy derived from the carbon-intense fuel. Carbon capture and sequestration technology — where coal could be burned but carbon could be buried in the ground — is a perfect example of where the two countries' interests overlap, environmentally and economically. Indeed, Hu and Obama introduced a program called "21st Century Coal" to promote the development of large-scale clean-coal programs, which includes separate agreements among several Chinese and American companies on the issue. Another area where the two countries can combine forces is in the development of a smart grid, which would marry electrical distribution to the intelligent-networking power of the Internet. China has embarked on a vast expansion of its electrical grid, as it seeks to power its enormous manufacturing engine. At the same time the U.S. is slowly overhauling its own grid, turning it smart — the White House channeled over $3 billion to smart-grid projects last month. The cooperation is natural. China is now the world's biggest industrial canvas, and it has a government willing to pay big money for big infrastructure projects. At the same time, the U.S. still has the lead on green innovation." Smart grid is going to happen, and China is going to set the technical standards," says Jennifer Turner, director of the China Environment Forum at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. "You have your Googles and your Ciscos, and they'll go to China because China sets the path for the development of clean technology." Indeed, U.S. corporations like Duke Energy are going to China because the People's Republic is betting on a future of green tech, for better or worse. The country already has some of the biggest manufacturers of solar panels and wind turbines. Though most of those products are exported to the West, China is emerging as a major consumer market for clean tech as well. It helps that Beijing, more than Washington, is willing to spend long-term on clean tech — China's green stimulus funding this past spring ran into the hundreds of billions of dollars. "U.S. companies are having considerable success in China," says Jonathan Lewis, staff attorney and climate specialist for the Clean Air Task Force. "China has the institutional capacity and it has the ready cash." There's a reason Chinese leaders have begun to focus on clean tech: after years of growing heedlessly, the nation of 1.3 billion is coming up against its ecological limits. Already a dry country, climate change could make China even drier, and glacial retreat in the Himalayas will negatively impact the country's major river systems. Without greater energy efficiency, China could bankrupt itself as it keeps growing — hence Hu's pledge at the U.N. in September that the country would improve its carbon intensity over the coming years. "They realize they have to work with the U.S. to achieve their goals in this area," says Jonathan Adams, an associate in the climate and energy program at the World Resources Institute. But for all the areas of potential cooperation and good feeling, there is a need for firm negotiation between the U.S. and China on climate change — as there is in nearly every other aspect of their relationship. At some point, the two nations will have to sit down and figure out how to save the planet from the global warming that they, more than any other countries, have created. That didn't happen in Beijing this past week — and it won't happen in Copenhagen in December. But it needs to happen soon. "This isn't like a Sputnik-style space race where one country wins and the other loses," says Barbara Finamore, China program director for the NRDC. "They both stand to benefit." And if they don't, the whole world loses.

#### Leads to extinction

Mazo 10 – PhD in Paleoclimatology from UCLA

Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122

The best estimates for global warming to the end of the century range from 2.5-4.~C above pre-industrial levels, depending on the scenario. Even in the best-case scenario, the low end of the likely range is 1.goC, and in the worst 'business as usual' projections, which actual emissions have been matching, the range of likely warming runs from 3.1--7.1°C. Even keeping emissions at constant 2000 levels (which have already been exceeded), global temperature would still be expected to reach 1.2°C (O'9""1.5°C)above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century." Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation." What is certain is that there is no precedent in human experience for such rapid change or such climatic conditions, and even in the best case adaptation to these extremes would mean profound social, cultural and political changes.

#### China will be peaceful – they’re democratizing now.

Liu & Chen, ’12 (Yu is an associate professor of political science at Qinghua University. Dingding is an assistant professor of government and public administration at the University of Macau. “Why China Will Democratize,” The Washington Quarterly 35:1 pp. 41)

Although the mega-trends identified in our assessment point to a clear outcome – the democratization of China – we believe that the process is neither linear nor deterministic. Our forecast is only probabilistic, though the probability is high. Other factors beyond the four mega-trends are also likely to shape China’s democratization. Moreover, the road to democracy in China will not be an easy one, as those with vested interests will try hard to maintain their grip on power. Extreme events may delay or even reverse the process. However, evidence suggests that the momentum for democratization in China will accelerate in the not-too-distant future. The form of democracy which China will ultimately take is uncertain. There is good reason to believe that the U.S. model of democracy will not be accepted by Chinese people for historical, cultural, and social reasons. Policymakers in Washington should be careful not to impose their own values and views on the Chinese, as doing so is likely to cause a domestic backlash within China and could ultimately delay or derail the democratization process. In general, a democratizing China will be gentler, kinder, and more confident and peaceful in domestic and international affairs. This is good news for China and the rest of the world, as a large body of empirical evidence suggests that democratic states rarely, if ever, go to war with one another.67 It is in the mutual interests of the world and China, therefore, to see China entering the journey of democratization in the next two decades.

#### No risk of power conflict over Africa.

Robert Barrett 5, PhD Military & Strategic Studies, U of Calgary, 6/1, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\_ID726162\_code327511.pdf?abstractid=726162&mirid=1

Westerners eager to promote democracy must be wary of African politicians who promise democratic reform without sincere commitment to the process. Offering money to corrupt leaders in exchange for their taking small steps away from autocracy may in fact be a way of pushing countries into anocracy. As such, world financial lenders and interventionists who wield leverage and influence must take responsibility in considering the ramifications of African nations who adopt democracy in order to maintain elite political privileges. The obvious reason for this, aside from the potential costs in human life should conflict arise from hastily constructed democratic reforms, is the fact that Western donors, in the face of intrastate war would then be faced with channeling funds and resources away from democratization efforts and toward conflict intervention based on issues of human security. This is a problem, as Western nations may be increasingly wary of intervening in Africa hotspots after experiencing firsthand the unpredictable and unforgiving nature of societal warfare in both Somalia and Rwanda. On a costbenefit basis, the West continues to be somewhat reluctant to get involved in Africa’s dirty wars, evidenced by its political hesitation when discussing ongoing sanguinary grassroots conflicts in Africa. Even as the world apologizes for bearing witness to the Rwandan genocide without having intervened, the U nited S tates, recently using the label ‘genocide’in the context of the Sudanese conflict (in September of 2004), has only proclaimed sanctions against Sudan, while dismissing any suggestions at actual intervention (Giry, 2005). Part of the problem is that traditional military and diplomatic approaches at separating combatants and enforcing ceasefires have yielded little in Africa. No powerful nations want to get embroiled in conflicts they cannot win – especially those conflicts in which the intervening nation has very little interest.