**Romney is making gains- momentum will continue to a win**

**Silver 10/6** “Oct. 6: Romney Maintains Poll Momentum” http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/06/oct-6-romney-maintains-poll-momentum/#more-35637

Mitt Romney continues to show improved numbers in polls published since the presidential debate in Denver on Wednesday and has now made clear gains in the FiveThirtyEight forecast. The forecast gives him roughly a 20 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from about 15 percent before the debate. Mr. Romney’s gains in the polls have been sharp enough that he should continue to advance in the FiveThirtyEight forecast if he can maintain his numbers over the next couple of days.¶ Four of the five national polls published on Saturday showed improvement for Mr. Romney. In the Rasmussen Reports tracking poll, which conducted about two-thirds of its interviews after the debate, we went from a two-point deficit against Barack Obama to a two-point lead. Mr. Romney gained two points in the Gallup tracking poll, which now shows him down by three. He also gained roughly 1.5 percentage points in the RAND Corporation’s online tracking poll, reversing a gain that Mr. Obama had made on Friday. And a companion pair of polls published by [Clarus Research Group](http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/poll-apparent-slide-for-obama-following-debate-20121005) just before and after the debate showed a five-point swing toward Mr. Romney. He trailed Mr. Obama by four points in a poll that Clarus Research Group conducted on Tuesday night, before the debate, but led him by one point in a poll they conducted on Thursday.¶ All of these national surveys except for the Clarus Research Group poll still contain some predebate interviews, meaning that they may underestimate the gains that Mr. Romney may eventually realize. This particularly holds for the Gallup and RAND Corporation tracking polls, which use seven-day filed periods; only about 30 percent of the interviews in those polls postdate the debate. In general, the surveys seem to be consistent with a universe in which Mr. Romney has been polling about evenly with Mr. Obama nationwide in interviews conducted after the debates.¶ There were few state polls published on Saturday, but a Gravis Marketing poll of Colorado also showed a sharp reversal toward Mr. Romney. He led in its newest survey, which was conducted on Thursday after the debate, by 3.5 percentage points. Although Gravis Marketing polls have had a very strong Republican lean so far this cycle, the trend in the poll is nevertheless extremely favorable for Mr. Romney, since he had trailed Mr. Obama by roughly five percentage points in a poll it conducted in September.¶

#### Obama will suffer from a modified Bradley effect – voters will tell pollsters they’ll vote, but won’t turn up without seeing real change.

Wilder ‘12

L. DOUGLAS WILDER was governor of Virginia from 1990 to 1994. He was the nation’s first elected African-American governor. 5/14/12 Obama best look for variation in ‘Bradley effect’ http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76274.html

So is the Bradley effect dead? I would argue that Team Obama should tread cautiously when looking at where the president stands in the polls. Since a variation of the Bradley effect should be anticipated.¶ The New York Times has noted this, with a recent article, “4 Years Later, Race Is Still Issue for Some Voters.”¶ One Ohio law enforcement official, John Corrigan of Jefferson County, talked about this. “Certain precincts in this county,” Corrigan said, “are not going to vote for Obama. I don’t want to say it, but we all know why.”¶ Jason Foreman, also interviewed for this article, had no trouble discussing the reason why, “I’ll say it: It’s because he’s black.”¶ The article continued describing how race in non-urban/nonsuburban areas of swing states — even those populated by union members normally supportive of Democratic candidates — still have a problem supporting Obama, due to his mixed-race heritage.¶ The article made me think of the Bradley effect — and why its classic sense from the 1980s may now be inoperative. Voters today do feel comfortable telling a pollster that they won’t vote for a minority candidate. They are able to do just this in the Times — with their names, hometowns and occupations cited.¶ That’s not the concern in what may be a modernized Bradley effect.¶ This time it’s minorities, students and marginal independent voters who are in the grasp of the effect. In 2008, those groups turned out in large numbers for Obama. When pollsters called, they proudly announced their plans to take part in a national movement — one that would elect Obama to the White House. Some seasoned election watchers questioned whether these groups would actually show up in the overwhelming numbers predicted. On Election Day, they did.¶ So Obama won. And he won big — becoming the first person, black or white, to win more that 51 percent of the vote since 1988. (He won 53 percent of the ballots cast in 2008.)¶ What about 2012?¶ When pollsters call these voting blocs now, many people will likely proclaim their continued loyalty to the president.¶ They won’t be lying to pollsters about whom they really want to vote for. The issue will be whether they actually go to the booth and vote for Obama.¶ Many voted in 2008 with the desire to see racism and racists humiliated by having a qualified black man elected president. Especially after eight years of what was not, and still is not, perceived as a successful presidency.¶ Now, many of these same voters still feel an allegiance to Obama — and he’s their theoretical choice in the election. But along with feeling some allegiance, they also may be left feeling disappointment. And that can lead to a disconnect with what pollsters hear compared with the voters who actually show up on Election Day.¶ What I am hearing from around the country is that many black and brown voters, whom the president might consider his strongest base, feel left behind, taken for granted and largely ignored.¶ The people who need jobs, help with educational costs and improved wages question when their bailout is coming. They question why they were not included in the first stimulus package. They wonder whether this is the best that can be achieved where they are concerned. They wonder why, when they ask these questions, it is considered “whining.” Yet when others make the same “noise,” they get the mother’s milk of politics: money from Washington.¶ Have the president and his administration tended astutely to the special concerns of these voters, who placed so much hope in him and his ability to make life different or better? Too often the answer I hear is, “No.”¶ Will the people who voice such sentiments storm the gates for the Republican nominee? Again, the answer I hear is, “No.”¶ But will a large portion of them feel less likely to make lines unusually long come Election Day 2012 to match what they did in 2008? The answer to that question, might be, “Yes.”¶ And with that, a version of the Bradley effect may be reborn as the Obama effect. Voters who tell pollsters the candidate they support, wanting to still be a part of a post-racial American tableau — but unmotivated to vote by former feelings of hope that saw too little real change.

#### The plan opens a space for these voters to enter the discussion. This breaks down this social invisibility. This means they’re more likely to vote. That’s Nixon and Szentes.

#### High income voters are already voting for Romney.

Zeleny 12, Jeff Zeleny, New York Times, 9/14/12, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/14/poll-obama-holds-narrow-edge-over-romney/

Mr. Obama has an advantage among likely voters of 12 percentage points among women, the poll found, while Mr. Romney holds the upper hand among men by eight percentage points. Mr. Obama leads his Republican rival across all ages of voters, except those who are 65 or older, who favor Mr. Romney by 15 percentage points.¶ The poll found that Mr. Obama holds an advantage of 21 percentage points over Mr. Romney among voters whose household income is under $50,000. Mr. Romney has an edge in higher income groups, including leading Mr. Obama by 16 percentage points among voters whose household income is more than $100,000.¶ Among a wider sample of registered voters, which included fewer voters who identified themselves as Republicans, Mr. Obama has a stronger command of the race. The poll found that 51 percent of those voters supported Mr. Obama and Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., while 43 percent supported Mr. Romney and Representative Paul D. Ryan of Wisconsin.

#### Both candidates support nuclear expansion

Wood 12

Elisa Wood September 13, 2012 What Obama and Romney Don't Say About Energy http://energy.aol.com/2012/09/13/what-obama-and-romney-dont-say-about-energy/

Fossil fuels and renewable energy have become touchy topics in this election, with challenger Mitt Romney painting President Barack Obama as too hard on the first and too fanciful about the second – and Obama saying Romney is out of touch with energy's future. But two other significant resources, nuclear power and energy efficiency, are evoking scant debate. What gives? Nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of US electricity, and just 18 months ago dominated the news because of Japan's Fukushima Daiichi disaster – yet neither candidate has said much about it so far on the campaign trail. Romney mentioned nuclear power only seven times in his recently released white paper, while he brought up oil 150 times. Even wind power did better with 10 mentions. He pushes for less regulatory obstruction of new nuclear plants, but says the same about other forms of energy. Obama's campaign website highlights the grants made by his administration to 70 universities for research into nuclear reactor design and safety. But while it is easy to find his ideas on wind, solar, coal, natural gas and oil, it takes a few more clicks to get to nuclear energy. The Nuclear Energy Institute declined to discuss the candidates' positions pre-election. However, NEI's summer newsletter said that both "Obama and Romney support the use of nuclear energy and the development of new reactors."

#### Polls consistently show the economy is the key issue

Galston 12

William A. Galston is the Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in Governance Studies and senior fellow at Brookings May 10, 2012

Six Months To Go: Where the Presidential Contest Stands as the General Election Begins http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/05/~/media/Research/Files/Papers/2012/5/10%20obama%20campaign%20galston/Where%20the%20Presidential%20Contest%20Stands.pdf

Every survey finds that economic issues dominate public concerns. The most recent survey of the Pew Research Center asked respondents to rank eighteen issues on a four-point scale from “very” to “not at all” important. Eighty-six percent said that the economy was very important, with jobs a close second at 84 percent. By contrast, four hot-button social issues—immigration (42 percent), abortion (39 percent), birth control (34 percent), and gay marriage (28 percent)— came in at the bottom. While defense and foreign policy issues ranked somewhat higher than social issues, none were regarded as very important by even 60 percent of the people. And the Obama administration’s vigorous prosecution of the fight against Al Qaeda, capped by the bold decision that resulted in bin Laden’s death, seems to have neutralized the longstanding Republican advantage in this area. There is nothing at present to suggest that Republicans will be able to turn defense and foreign policy concerns into politically effective attacks on President Obama. (A major confrontation with Iran, North Korea, or China could change this, of course.) The most recent CBS/New York Times survey proceeded differently, asking respondents to select the single issue they regard as the most important. Twenty-six percent named “jobs,” and 22 percent “the economy.” No other issue broke into double digits; defense, foreign policy, and social issues barely registered.

#### More evidence – empirically proven

Stehli 11

Jean-Sébastien Stehli, 10/21 Le Figaro Newspaper, France, “Obama, Gadhafi and the Election”, http://watchingamerica.com/News/126970/obama-gadhafi-and-the-election/

Currently, only 42 percent of Americans approve of Barack Obama's performance. He has been saddled with an economy that is struggling to restart, partly thanks to Republican efforts to block any and all actions to rescue the economy. See, for example, Congress' vote last week to reject the president's jobs plan. According to the classic formula, Americans vote with their wallets. But the death of the Libyan, which didn't require the United States to get dragged into another conflict, could provide a little boost for Barack Obama's sagging popularity. Last May, just after bin Laden's death, his popularity increased to 56 percent according to a joint Pew Center-Washington Post poll — a figure that the 44th president would love to regain. But today, according to an ABC News poll, 51 percent of Americans say that the only thing that matters is the health of the economy. "The election is much more about Americans losing their jobs than about Gadhafi losing his head," explains Glen Bolger, a pollster working for Mitt Romney. Foreign policy is truly foreign for the majority of Americans. After the first Gulf War, won in 100 hours by the elder George Bush, analysts claimed that Bush would be unbeatable in the 1992 elections a year later. But the economy took a nosedive, and Bill Clinton arrived at the White House.

CAP

**Perm do the plan and non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative**

**Plan reformulates capitalist risk analysis- it forces the rich to take responsibility for its excess consumption, which raises the costs of ignoring and exploiting the poor- that’s the basis of the majority of existing structural violence from cap**

Race and economic based explanations are both necessary to explain environmental discrimination.

Lazarus ‘94

Richard J. Lazarus Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri SYMPOSIUM: DISTRIBUTION IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: IS THERE A MIDDLE GROUND? 9 St. John's J.L. Comm. 481 SPRING, 1994

At the outset, I must abandon "the Center." It is very hard to hold on to the Center when you have Dr. Greve on the panel because he pushes things so far over that the Center ends up being pretty far to the Left. To try, nonetheless, to bring things back to the Center, what I would like to do is take up the question that Professor Gregory raised in the first instance, and that is the challenge of the very title of this panel - "Racism or Economics" - which presents a false dichotomy.¶ It is a misguided and false dichotomy at three different levels. The factors, racism and economics, are not mutually preclusive; they are not unrelated; and the dichotomy misapprehends what environmental justice is all about. [n1](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n1)¶ First, the factors are not mutually preclusive. Why not both? Why not sometimes racism, sometimes economics, and sometimes both? Why does not the possibility of "both" mean the problem may be twice as large, rather than half as large, as one might think. Why one and not the other? I do not doubt that there are instances when it is more racism than economics, and that there are instances when it is more economics than racism. But I would like to see somebody defend the thesis that it is just economics. What would make environmental protection so special that it [\*482] would somehow be immune from the kinds of racist attitudes ranging from the most venal to the most subconscious stereotypical decisionmaking that we know otherwise influence decisionmaking on a day to day basis? [n2](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n2)¶ Why should we suppose that environmental protection law policymakers are somehow unencumbered by those same kinds of attitudes? We know that such attitudes affect who is hired, who is fired in the employment sector. We know they affect where one attends school. We know they affect the level of health care that is obtained. We know that they affect the price that one pays for a car. We know that they affect the interest rate one gets for a loan. We know that they affect the extent to which one is arrested, convicted, and the sentence that one receives, including, many believe, the death sentence. We know these attitudes affect who one dates, who one marries. (I have yet to see an interracial couple on the Love Connection). [n3](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n3)¶ What is so special about environmental pollution and law? Why would environmental pollution and environmental protection be somehow immune from all these attitudes? [n4](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n4) Why would the distribution, the benefits, and burdens associated with it, unlike all these other well-established areas, not suffer from these same well-established tendencies? [n5](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n5) I doubt it. And I think that the recent studies that suggest there is an economic dimension to who is subject to pollution and who benefits from cleanup do not question that there is simultaneously a racial dimension.¶ Second, race and economics is a false dichotomy because the two are clearly interrelated. Racism and economics are not independent variables. They are dependent variables. Economics is unrelated to race no more than politics is unrelated to race, which is another false dichotomy I have seen in this area. [\*483] ¶ There was a notable Wall Street Journal Op-Ed piece recently, which said, "it's not racism, it's just politics." [n6](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n6) Those two are no more related or unrelated than yellow is to green. There is, at bottom, a relationship between the two. Yellow is after all part of green, and race is part of the economy. Race is part of politics.¶ The fact that African-Americans and persons of color generally have less economic power, less choice, are less able to resist the risks caused by environmental degradation; is that unrelated to racism? [n7](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n7) To say that their immediate cause may, in some instances, be market forces is not to say it is unrelated to race.¶ After all, a fairly fundamental reason why persons of color have less economic power is related to decades of de jure legalized racist laws in this country and their continuing vestiges, which cause African-Americans and other persons of color to have less economic power and less political power. [n8](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1348092433463&returnToKey=20_T15567066851&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-23.419864.6629958623" \l "n8) It is no more sensible to say that the distribution of such power is unrelated to race than to posit that school segregation patterns are unrelated to race, and just a matter of economics. Can one fairly posit that the reason why there are fewer persons of color in the wealthy suburban schools is merely because they just do not happen to live there, because it costs more to live there? It is therefore simply the result of economics. It is not race. I doubt it.

50 states

## States

#### Perm do both – states can supplement federal incentives

Ben-Moshe’ 09 Financing the Nuclear renaissance: The Benefits and Potential Pitfalls of Federal and State Government Subsidies and the Future of Nuclear Power in California, Sony Ben-Moshe, JOason Crowell, Kelly Gale, Breton Peace, Brett Rosenblatt, Kelly Thomason, Energy Bar Association 2009

7. State Financing of Nuclear Energy¶ In addition to federal subsidies, various states have passed legislation to¶ promote the development of new nuclear power plants that supplement the¶ financial incentives provided by the DOE. The most commonly used incentive¶ for nuclear construction in states with rate-regulated utilities are regulations¶ which allow utilities to recover their capital costs and construction work in¶ progress (CWIP) in rate-bases utilized to determine the regulated rates utilities¶ charge to consumers either during construction or once the plant is either put in¶ service or abandoned. The states that do not permit costs to be recovered during¶ construction have a process by which a state commission can annually approve¶ costs on a non-appealable basis for inclusion in the rate-base at commercial¶ operation or abandonment.¶ Both rate-regulated and restructured states also provide tax credits or¶ exemptions for new nuclear construction. Kansas exempts new nuclear facilities¶ from state property taxes while Texas permits school districts to enter into¶ agreements with developers of new nuclear plants to limit the appraised value of¶ the plants for purposes of assessing school district maintenance and operations¶ property taxes.¶ Florida¶ Georgia¶ Idaho¶ Iowa¶ Kansas¶ Louisiana¶ Michigan¶ Mississippi¶ North¶ Carolina¶ South¶ Carolina¶ Texas¶ Utah¶ Virginia¶ Legislation is also currently pending in Indiana and Oklahoma that would¶ provide cost recovery mechanisms for new nuclear construction.156 Other states¶ have recently implemented legislation or regulations indicating their support for¶ construction of nuclear power plants through programs aside from direct¶ financial incentives. Utah passed a bill establishing a state position of ―energy¶ officer‖ and a policy to promote ―the study of nuclear power generation.‖157¶ Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota and Wisconsin all currently have legislation¶ pending to overturn state moratoria on the construction of new nuclear plants.158¶ Finally, Georgia and Kentucky have issued general resolutions to support¶ development of new nuclear power plants, while many other state or local¶ governments have issued resolutions to support the construction of particular¶ nuclear plants.159 The many states that have recently implemented financial¶ incentives for construction of new nuclear power plants to supplement federal¶ programs, and the states that have released policies in support of nuclear¶ development signify the increasing and widespread support for new nuclear¶ power.¶ Additionally, certain local municipalities and counties have discussed¶ adding nuclear power to their local clean/sustainable energy initiatives. For¶ example, Calvert County in Maryland entered into an agreement with a nuclear¶ power developer providing for a fifty percent tax credit against property taxes for¶ fifteen years so long as the developer invests at least $2.5 million in¶ improvements or equipment in the county and creates at least twenty-five new¶ jobs with salaries above the county median salary.160 It is interesting to note that¶ the Calvert County action reflects a growing recognition that nuclear energy will¶ boost the number of high paying professional jobs in the markets where new¶ nuclear power plants are located.161¶ Having described a number of state-level policies aimed at spurring new¶ development, arguably the most important of all state-level policy initiatives¶ aimed at promoting development of new nuclear power plants is the same policy¶ initiative that drives renewable projects, the renewable portfolio standard, which¶ we describe in detail in the next section

#### Only the federal government can enforce compliance, create uniform standards, and fund long-term commitments.

Byrne, et al., ‘7

(John, Kristen Hughes, Lado Kurdgelashvili, Wilson Rickerson, all from the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy (CEEP), “American policy conflict in the greenhouse: Divergent trends in federal, regional, state, and local green energy and climate change policy”, 2-19-7, RSR)

Effective global mitigation of climate change will require strong leadership by national governments, including that of the US. More specifically, **national governments remain vital in mandating and enforcing compliance among diverse actors** within their jurisdiction. **Only national governments can promote uniform standards for compliance and related programs, thus ensuring achievement of policy goals with maximum fairness and minimal costs** (Rabe, 2002). **National funding also remains vital to underwrite long-term commitments** needed to meet ever more challenging climate action targets (Rabe, 2002).

#### Federal government best for nuclear power – government action needed to repair past mistakes.

Karlow, ‘6

(Edwin, PhD Department of Physics at La Sierra University, February, Physics Today, <http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml>, accessed 8-1-12, RSR)

The US has substantial precedence and rationale for governmental support of the next generation of nuclear power plants (see "Nuclear Power Needs Government Incentives, Says Task Force," PHYSICS TODAY, May 2005, [page 28](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_58/iss_5/28_1.shtml)). The early commercial nuclear plants were built with direct federal subsidies and loan guarantees; an example is the Yankee Rowe nuclear power plant built in 1960 under the Atomic Energy Commission's power-demonstration reactor program. The aim of those early demonstration plants was to prove to a fledgling industry that such facilities could be built and operated economically. A significant era for US nuclear funding was the 1970s and 1980s, when nuclear units came in at costs often many times the original estimates. Some plants with billions of dollars invested were never completed. The overspending and stalled projects stemmed from government actions often in response to activists or legal maneuvering. Organizations and individuals with specific agendas took advantage of the Three Mile Island accident to exploit unrelated issues.[1](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml#ref) Plants already under construction were stymied by new requirements that caused tremendous uncertainty both in building and in the actual start-up of power production. The Long Island Lighting Co's Shoreham nuclear plant, for example, was completed at a cost of $5.6 billion, brought briefly to criticality, and then decommissioned, all because of activism and political demagoguery.[2](http://scitation.aip.org/journals/doc/PHTOAD-ft/vol_59/iss_2/11_1.shtml#ref) Today, the reasons for government loan guarantees and other support programs are somewhat different. Vendors having gained experience with overseas projects know how to build advanced nuclear plants, although some of their advanced designs have yet to be implemented. Not surprisingly, any vendor or electric utility, before investing huge amounts, would want some assurance that it would be allowed to complete the plant at a reasonable cost and then operate it. Particularly important is that safety rules and systems requirements not change drastically during construction without very compelling reasons. Given the way governmental entities contributed to the problems of past nuclear power plant construction, it is only fitting that the federal government share substantially in the investment risk. Building nuclear plants is in the nation's interest.

#### Federal government is key to offset major hurdles to construction- investors only trust federal backing due to its control over licensing and regulations.

-Solves government regulations/red tape

NEI 11

Nuclear Energy Institute, Policy Brief Financing New Nuclear Power Plants, May

Loan guarantees are important to financing new nuclear energy projects because of the enormous financial demands facing electric utilities—most of which are relatively small companies—and the business risk associated with licensing the first new nuclear facilities in many years. Nuclear energy projects are very large compared to electric utility companies. The largest electric utility building a nuclear facility has a market value of approximately $34 billion, but most are much smaller. New nuclear energy facilities are expected to cost $6 billion to $8 billion each. The relatively small electric power companies do not have the financing capability to finance nuclear power projects without project partners and limited investment incentives. The loan guarantee program helps offset the disparity in scale between the electric utilities and these large nuclear facility projects. Many regulated electric companies, especially those pursuing multiple power plant and transmission projects at the same time, may be limited in their ability to finance projects without project finance capability because of substantial pressure on credit quality and debt ratings. Electric companies in deregulated markets will be hard-pressed to build nuclear energy facilities and other large capital-intensive baseload projects except on a project finance basis, with the debt financing secured by the federal government. In addition to the magnitude of the investment challenge facing electric utilities, potential investors are concerned that new nuclear facilities could face political and regulatory risks. The risk may be low, but the potential consequences of licensing delays are high. Although the federal government has created a more efficient and predictable licensing process, which should reduce licensing risk, investors remain concerned because of the high cost and long development times for nuclear energy facilities. The industry can build investor confidence by ensuring that licensing and construction of advanced reactor designs is completed on schedule and within budget. However, since the licensing risk is a function of the federal government’s regulatory process, only the federal government—through the loan guarantee program—can offset that risk.

#### States CPs are a voter they skew the topic away from merits of energy and policy and forces us to debate every round about the USFG. Unified Actor FIAT is bad-completely unrealistic and places a huge research burden on the aff. Voter for fairness and education.

**Way too expensive for states- Obama has asked for over 100 billion.**

**Mosche 09** (Sony Ben-Mosche, Energy Law Journal, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.lw.com%2FthoughtLeadership%2Ffinancing-the-nuclear-renaissance-in-california&ei=okNwUOfuOarK0AHimYHYDQ&usg=AFQjCNF-TqH\_QJQlbBKg9k1lCAA-EglM9g)

Moreover, the sheer magnitude of debt needed to finance a multi-billion dollar reactor will likely require multiple tranches of debt designed to tap different markets in order to raise sufficient capital.22 Each tranche of debt will price construction and other risks relative to its return and expect sponsor or government support to mitigate any risk in excess of its risk profile. Some studies analyzing projected costs of construction of new nuclear power facilities indicate that due to high capital costs and cost recovery, without federal incentives and with all else remaining equal, nuclear power cannot be economically competitive with other forms of energy such as coal or natural gas.23 These simple facts alone drive an obvious conclusion: the historic single-tranche, simple lockbox project finance model, which has served renewable energy projects in the wind, solar, geothermal, ethanol, biofuel, and related spaces so well, simply will not work for new nuclear power projects without substantial customizing. The incentive structures designed to promote renewables, which are predicated on this simple project finance model and serve as the basis for many of the government subsidies that have been proposed for nuclear power, should also be substantially rethought or customized for nuclear power in order to achieve the greatest efficiency possible.2

#### California’s budget is on the brink of collapse- any new spending would devastate it. And California’s budget is key to the US economy. CNBC 12 (accessed 10/9/12 <http://www.cnbc.com/id/31923599>)

#### California is on the verge of an economic meltdown. The state, with the second highest foreclosure rate in the nation, is being hammered by the deep recession, rising unemployment and a growing multi-billion dollar budget deficit. CNBC takes you inside California's economic crisis… speaking to government officials, CEOs, economists and traders. The ramifications of a financial failure here will affect the entire US economy as well as companies and investors worldwide. And, while California may be the biggest state in trouble, it isn't alone.

#### And, California’s economic growth is key to new policies to combat greenhouse gas growth- its linear.

Roland-Holst in ‘6

[David, UC Berkely, August 2006, “Economic Growth and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation in California,” http://calclimate.berkeley.edu/Growth\_Strategies\_Full\_Report.pdf]

The California economy has an enviable record of technological progress, and the challenge presented by climate change is a new opportunity for the state to demonstrate its talent for combining advances in public policy and private sector innovation to enhance environmental quality and economic growth. This research note offers preliminary results on the link between greenhouse gas (GHG) abatement strategies and economic growth from on-going research with a forecasting model of the California economy. The Berkeley Energy and Resources (BEAR) model is a detailed empirical simulation tool that can evaluate the complex linkages between climate policy and economic activity. In the analysis presented here, eight targeted GHG emission policies are combined with an overall cap to meet the state’s targets for 2020. No specific implementation of the cap is assumed; these results can be interpreted as the result of an efficient combination of policies. Examining alternative scenarios for state climate policy over the next fifteen years, a few salient conclusions emerge:

#### And, climate change is the largest risk of extinction- happens before 2050.

U of L in ‘4

[University of Leeds, “Climate Change Threatens A Million Species with Extinction,” 7 January 2004, http://www.leeds.ac.uk/media/current/extinction.htm]

The study found that 15 to 37% of all species in the regions considered could be driven extinct from the climate change that is likely to occur between now and 2050 (i.e., for mid-range climate warming scenarios). The scientists believe that extinctions due to climate change are also likely to occur elsewhere. “If the projections can be extrapolated globally, and to other groups of land animals and plants, our analyses suggest that well over a million species could be threatened with extinction as a result of climate change,” said lead author Chris Thomas of the University of Leeds, England. “This study makes clear that climate change is the biggest new extinction threat,” said co-author Lee Hannah, at Conservation International (CI) in Washington DC. “The combination of increasing habitat loss and climate change together is particularly worrying. Increases in temperature can force a species to move toward its preferred, usually cooler, climate range. If habitat destruction has already altered those habitats, the species will have no safe haven.”

**Perm: Do plan and ban nuclear power in all other instances**

**Doesn’t solve- siting is a problem with all LULU’s, not just nuclear. The counterplan continues the status quo trend of widening the neoliberal distance between decision makers and the people affected by their decisions. Coal and other base load power generation tech will still be sited in minority and poor neighborhoods.**

**Doesn’t generate dialogue- the public might be upset, but not over the energy apartheid. That dialogue is key to ensuring minorities have a voice in the decision making process🡪 Anthony 95**

**The counterplan links- the public likes nuclear energy.**

Gallup Politics ‘12

“Americans Still Favor Nuclear Power a Year After Fukushima Majority also still sees nuclear power as safe”/http://www.gallup.com/poll/153452/Americans-Favor-Nuclear-Power-Year-Fukushima.aspx

PRINCETON, NJ -- One year after the tsunami and resulting failure of the Fukushima nuclear power plant in Japan, a majority of Americans continue to favor the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity for the U.S. The 57% who favor nuclear power this year is identical to the percentage measured in early March 2011, just before the Fukushima incident. These data are from Gallup's annual Environment survey, conducted March 8-11, 2012. Gallup in 1994 first asked Americans if they favored or opposed the use of nuclear power for electricity, and the 57% in favor at that point is identical to what is found today. The highest level of support for nuclear power was 62% in 2010. The lowest was 46% in March 2001, the only reading out of 10 in which less than half of Americans said they favored nuclear power. The majority of Americans also continue to think nuclear power plants are safe. Gallup has asked Americans this question three times over the past four years, and the positive responses each time have been within a narrow 56% to 58% ra

nge. The extensive news coverage of the major problems the Fukushima reactors experienced after power was disrupted as a result of the massive tsunami that hit the Japanese coast on March 11, 2011, does not appear to have had a long-term effect on Americans' attitudes about nuclear power. Although attitudes may have shifted in the immediate aftermath of last year's incident, attitudes now are almost identical to those measured in last year's pre-disaster survey.

Case:

#### Only trades off with FF

Loudermilk 2011 (Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Pursuing a carbon-free world Realistically speaking, a world without nuclear power is not a world full of increased renewable usage, but rather, of fossil fuels instead. The 2007 Japanese Kashiwazaki-Kariwa nuclear outage is an excellent example of this, as is Germany’s post-Fukushima decision to shutter its nuclear plants, which, despite immense development of renewable options, will result in a heavier reliance on coal-based power as its reactors are retired, leading to a 4% increase in annual carbon emissions. On the global level, without nuclear power, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity generation would rise nearly 20% from nine to eleven billion tons per year. When examined in conjunction with the fact that an estimated 300,000 people per year die as a result of energy-based pollutants, the appeal of nuclear power expansion grows further.¶ As the world copes simultaneously with burgeoning power demand and the need for clean energy, nuclear power remains the one consistently viable option on the table. With this in mind, it becomes even more imperative to make nuclear energy as safe as possible, as quickly as possible—a capacity which SMRs can fill with their high degree of safety and security. Additionally, due to their modular nature, SMRs can be quickly constructed and deployed widely. While this is not to say that small reactors should supplant large ones, the US would benefit from diversification and

#### Key to renewables penetration

Loudermilk 2011 (Micah J. Loudermilk is a Research Associate for the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program with the Institute for National Strategic Studies at National Defense University, May 31, 2011, “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs,” Journal of Energy Security, http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=314:small-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&catid=116:content0411&Itemid=375)

Limitations of renewables Renewable energy technologies have made great strides forward during the last decade. In an increasingly carbon emissions and greenhouse gas (GHG) aware global commons, the appeal of solar, wind, and other alternative energy sources is strong, and many countries are moving to increase their renewable electricity generation. However, despite massive expansion on this front, renewable sources struggle to keep pace with increasing demand, to say nothing of decreasing the amount of energy obtained from other sources.¶ The continual problem with solar and wind power is that, lacking efficient energy storage mechanisms, it is difficult to contribute to baseload power demands. Due to the intermittent nature of their energy production, which often does not line up with peak demand usage, electricity grids can only handle a limited amount of renewable energy sources—a situation which Germany is now encountering. Simply put, nuclear power provides virtually carbon-free baseload power generation, and renewable options are unable to replicate this, especially not on the scale required by expanding global energy demands.¶ Small nuclear reactors, however, like renewable sources, can provide enhanced, distributed, and localized power generation. As the US moves towards embracing smart grid technologies, power production at this level becomes a critical piece of the puzzle. Especially since renewable sources, due to sprawl, are of limited utility near crowded population centers, small reactors may in fact prove instrumental to enabling the smart grid to become a reality.¶

### **We control uniqueness- util is impossible now because the realist frame presupposes the neoliberal distance, as well as the so-called rational actions of both- that makes it impossible to calculate possible responses or correctly weight social goods**

### **And, realist utilitarianism is bad- it ignores social goods below the level of the state, sacrificing any and all citizens**

2AC-Util bad [1/1]

**OUR DECESION CALC IS THAT YOU VOTE FOR WHATEVER BEST SOLVES GENOCIDE-PREFER THIS OVER A UTILITARIAN FRAME**

1. **GENOCIDE TURNS UTIL-Util is exclusionary, and disempowering for minorities. The empowerment of minorities is held hostage to the whims of the majority. UTIL IS THE SQUO**
2. **Their utilitarian focus solely on consequences destroys ontology**

Feiser`97 (MORAL SKEPTICISM Encyclopedia of Empiricism (1997) James Fieser, http://www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/vita/research/mskepart.htm)

BENTHAM adapted Hume's theory of utility in his Principles of Morals and Legislation (1789). Not only does Bentham dismiss ontological discussions of moral relations and the moral sense, but he rejects the relevance of any discussion of the psychology of moral motivation or moral perception. For him, pleasing consequences are all that matter, since only these are empirically quantifiable. Bentham's position was no less "skeptical" than Hume's rejection of moral relations. However, the tide had already turned away from the earlier rationalist and objectivist moral ontologies. By the mid 19th century, MILL could freely argue in Utilitarianism (1863) that education (convention) was the principal motivating force behind our pursuit of general happiness. Although Mill's position spawned criticism, moral skepticism was not one of the charges.

**b) That comes first-Ontology outlines understanding and existence**

Dillon ‘99 (Michael Dillon, Prof of Politics, University of Lancaster, Moral Spaces, p. 97-98)

 Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, **the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable**. For **one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought**, in short, always already **carries an ontology sequestered within it**. What **this ontological turn does** to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. **With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic**. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, **the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes** the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, **the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another**. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that **it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being**, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

AT: Natnl Security First [1/2]

1. **That’s what we’re K—ing their natnl security first paradigm kills 18 million a year**
2. **Natnl security first paradigms create more war and death**

Sandy and Perkins`2 Leo and Ray, The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution, 4.2 [www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/4\_2natp.pdf](http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/4_2natp.pdf)

The subsequent suppression of mutual hostile feelings is not taken into account by those who define peace so simply. Their stance is that as long as people are not actively engaged in overt, mutual, violent, physical, and destructive activity, then peace exists. This, of course, is just another way of defining cold war. In other words, this simplistic definition is too broad because it allows us to attribute the term “peace” to states of affairs that are not truly peaceful (Copi and Cohen, p. 194). Unfortunately, this definition of peace appears to be the prevailing one in the world. It is the kind of peace maintained by a “peace through strength” posture that has led to the arms race, stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and the ultimate threat of mutually assured destruction. This version of peace was defended by the “peacekeeper” – a name that actually adorns some U.S. nuclear weapons deployed since 1986.2 Also, versions of this name appear on entrances to some military bases. Keeping “peace” in this manner evokes the theme in Peggy Lee’s old song, “Is That All There is?” What this really comes down to is the idea of massive and indiscriminate killing for peace, which represents a morally dubious notion if not a fault of logic. The point here is that a “peace” that depends upon the threat and intention to kill vast numbers of human beings is hardly a stable or justifiable peace worthy of the name. Those in charge of waging war know that killing is a questionable activity. Otherwise, they would not use such euphemisms as “collateral damage” and “smart bombs” to obfuscate it.

1. **Defining security around U.S. influence causes militarization and exclusionary social norms**

Campbell 98 (David, Professor International Politics at University of New Castle, "Writing Security; United States Foreign Policy the Politics of Identity," 31-33)

Most important just as the source of danger has never been fixed, neither has the identity that it was said to threaten. The contours of this identity have been the subject of constant (re)writing; no rewriting in the sense of changing the meaning, but rewriting in the sense of inscribing something so that which is contingent and subject to flux is rendered more permanent. While one might have expected few if any references to national values or purposes in confidential prepared for the inner sanctum of national security policy (after all, don't they know who they are or what they represent?) the texts of foreign policy are replete with statements about the fulfillment of the republic, the fundamental purpose of the nation, God given rights, moral codes, the principles of European civilization, the fear of cultural and spiritual loss, and the responsibilities and duties thrust upon the gleaming example of America. In this sense, the texts that guided national security policy did more than simply offer strategic analysis of the "reality" they confronted: they actively concerned themselves with the scripting of a particular American identity. Stamped "Top Secret" and read by only the select and power few, the texts effaced the boundary between inside and outside with their quasi-Puritan figurations. In employing this mode of representation, the foreign policy texts of the postwar period recalled the seventeenth-century literary genre of the jeremiad, or political sermon, in which Puritan preachers combined searing critiques with appeals for spiritual renewal. Later to establish the interpretive framework for national identity, these exhortations drew on a European tradition of preaching the omnipresence of sin so as to instill the desire for order but they added a distinctly affirmative moment: The American Puritan jeremiad was the ritual of a culture on an errand - which is to say, a culture based on a faith in process. Substituting teleology for hierarchy, it discarded the Old War ideal of stasis for a New World vision of the future. Its function was to create a climate of anxiety that helped release the restless "progressivist" energies required for the success of the venture. The European jeremiad thrived on anxiety, of course. Like all "Traditionalist" forms of ritual, it used fear and trembling to teach acceptance of fixed social norms. But the American jeremiad went much further. It made anxiety its end as well as its means. Crisis was the social norm it sought to inculcate. The very concept of errand after all, implied a state of *un*fulfillment. The future, though divinely assured, was never quite there, and New England's Jeremiahs set out to provide the sense of insecurity that would ensure the outcome. Whereas the Puritan jeremiads were preached b y religious figures in public, the national security planners entreated in private the urgency of the manifold dangers confronting the republic. But the refrains of their political sermons have occupied a prominent place in postwar political discourse. On two separate occasions (first in 1950, and t hen in 196), private citizens with close ties to the foreign policy bureaucracy established a "Committee on the Present Danger" to alert a public they perceived as lacking resolve and will to necessity of confronting the political and military threat of communism and the Society Union. More recently, with Pentagon planners concerned about the "guerillas, assassins, terrorists, and subversives" said to be "nibbling away" at the United States, proclamations that the fundamental values of the country are under threat have been no less insistent. As Oliver North announced to the U.S. Congress: "It is very important for the

AT: Natnl Security First [2/2]

American people to know that this is a dangerous world; that we live at risk and that this nation is at risk in a dangerous world." And in a State Department report, the 1990s were foreshadowed as an era in which divergent political critiques nonetheless would seek equally to overcome the "corruption" and "profligacy" induced by the "loss" of "American purpose" in Vietnam the "moral renewal." To this end, the rendering of Operation Desert Shield-turn-Storm as an overwhelming exhibition of America's rediscovered mission stands as testament. The cold war, then , was both a struggle that exceeded the military threat of the Soviet Union and a struggle into which any number of potential candidates, regardless of their strategic

capacity, were slotted as a threat. In this sense, the collapse, overcoming, or surrender of one of the protagonists at this historical junction does not mean "it" is over. The cold war's meaning will undoubtedly change, but if we recall that the phrase cold war was coined by a fourteenth century Spanish writer to represent the persistent rivalry between Christians and Arabs, we come to recognize that the sort of struggle the phrase demotes is a struggle over identity: a struggle that is no context-specific and thus not rooted in the existence of a particular kind of Soviet Union. Besides, the United States-led war against Iraq should caution us to the fact that the Western (and particularly American) interpretive dispositions that predominated in the post-World War II international environment - with their zero-sum analyses of international action, the sense of endangerment ascribed to all the activities of the other, the fear of internal challenge and subversion, the tendency to militarize all response, and the willingness to draw the lines of superiority/inferiority between us and them - were not specific to one state or ideology. As a consequence, we need to rethink the convention understanding of foreign policy, and the historicity of the cold war in particular.