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#### Aff happens fast

Schlesinger 8/28/12 (Richard Schlesinger is an American television news reporter and correspondent for 48 Hours Mystery. Schlesinger was born in New York)

(“NUCLEAR aims small” http://www.energybiz.com/magazine/article/281595/nuclear-aims-small)

Third, while several fundamentally different forms of SMRs are in development here and abroad, including high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, molten salt reactors and molten metal reactors, the likelihood is that the DOE will focus on light-water reactors, because that's the technology the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is most familiar with, having already licensed large light-water reactors. "Light-water reactors are most likely to meet NRC licensing requirements within our time frame," says John E. Kelly, deputy assistant secretary for nuclear reactor technologies at the DOE. "We're open to other technologies, but how quickly they can go through the regulatory system is a concern."

The enormous up-front capital investment and the long construction time have been the greatest hurdles to the wider adoption of nuclear plants. SMRs address both issues. Large reactors have, traditionally, been built on-site. Precisely because they are smaller, SMRs are being designed to be built in factories and delivered in finished pieces for on-site installation. A large nuclear plant may take anywhere from eight to 10 years from first spade to first electron. Kathryn J. Jackson, senior vice president and chief technology officer for Westinghouse Electric, estimates construction of the company's factory-built SMRs could take just 24 months.

She notes that time frame is competitive with the 18 to 24 months it takes to construct a combined-cycle gas turbine.

The Westinghouse design is modular in the sense that it will be built in pieces and assembled on-site. "The goal is to be as modular as possible, perhaps 90 percent modular," says Jackson. "Parts will be built in factories and shipped to the site by rail or truck. Building everything in a consistent way saves enormous time. Studies have shown that building this way, every hour spent in a factory equates to about three hours at an assembly facility on-site, and that one hour is equivalent to about eight hours of stick-built construction in the hole, the traditional way of building large nuclear plants." Because construction time is perhaps the largest factor in up-front nuclear costs, cutting that time by as much as 80 percent suddenly brings nuclear into the budgetary range of many more utilities.

Warner Baxter, president and CEO of Ameren Missouri, the utility that is partnering with Westinghouse in the DOE application, agrees. "The SMR, with its smaller footprint, shorter construction period, and factory-based concept mitigates, if it doesn't eliminate, the large up-front capital risk. It makes it more attractive to us and, I believe, will make nuclear more attractive to many more utilities," he says.

Disad

Obama and Romney would handle Iran strikes the same way

**Miller 12**

Aaron David Miller is a distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars MAY 23, 2012 Barack O'Romney http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/05/23/barack\_oromney?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full

Iran: Sorry, I just don't see any significant difference between the way Obama is handling Iran's nuclear program and the way Romney might as president. And that's because there's seems to be an inexorable arc to the Iranian nuclear problem. If by 2013 sanctions and negotiations don't produce a sustainable deal and Iran continues its quest for a nuclear weapon, one of two things is going to happen: Israel is likely to strike, or we will. If it's the former, both Obama and Romney would be there to defend the Israelis and manage the mess that would follow. Both would be prepared to intercede on Israel's behalf if and when it came to that. As for a U.S. strike, it's becoming a bipartisan article of faith that the United States will not permit Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon. And both men are prepared to use military strikes against Iran's nuclear sites as a last resort, even if it only means a delay (and that's what it would mean) in Iran's quest for nukes.

Kritik

**Bobertz admits that environmental legislation is the only possible route to solve our environmental harms – the criticism takes Bobertz’ advocacy out of context and is based upon alternative methods of environmental lawmaking distinct from the plan. Their mischaracterization of scapegoating theory leads to nihilism and inaction.**

**Bobertz 1996** (Bradley C., Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law, NDT-L, http://www.cs.jhu.edu/~jonathan/debate/ceda-l/archive/CEDA-L-Sep-1996/msg00382.html)

I'm writing to clarify some of the ideas in my article, "Legitimizing Pollution Through Pollution Control Laws: Reflections on Scapegoating Theory," published in vol. 73, no. 4 of the Texas Law Review (Mar. 1995).

**I do NOT believe that all affirmative environmental regulation is suspect** either **because** it diverts attention from the real problems or because **it alleviates personal responsibility for these problems.** Certainly some environmental laws have these effects (and I discuss some specific examples as well as the general "scapegoating" phenomenon in my article). But this does not mean that ALL environmental laws exhibit these tendencies. My thoughts about the efficacy of any environmental law depends on the nature of the problem in question and on the how law responds to that problem. Let me give you an example from the article. In Part V, I discuss the saga of the "evil spray can." In essence, research indicating that CFCs could destroy stratospheric ozone evolved into a simpler story in the mid to late 1970s: spray cans that used CFCs as propellants were bad for the environment, and EPA's 1978 ban on CFCs in aerosol products "solved" the problem by banishing these environmental wrongdoers from the scene. As I noted in the article, the problem with this story was that it was incomplete. The EPA ban, while a good thing, affected only one source of CFC emissions (ignoring refigerators and car air conditioners, for example) and, because it applied only in the U.S., did not address the international dimensions of the problem. So I used EPA's 1978 ban on CFCs in spray cans, as well as reactions to this ban by the press and public, as examples of the "scapegoating" phenomenon in action. But this wasn't the end of the story. In 1987 the United States signed (and in 1988 ratified) an extraordinary treaty called the "Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer." The Montreal Protocol froze production and consumption of CFCs and other ozone depleters at 1986 levels, followed by a 50 percent reduction in CFC use by industrialized countries over a ten-year period. As scientists began to discover that ozone depletion posed an even more serious and immediate threat, the Protocol members met in London to consider measures to stregthen the accord. Ultimately, the parties agreed on a TOTAL elimination of CFC production and use by 2000. Separate reduction and phaseout schedules were established for halons and other ozone-depleting chemicals. Five months after the London agreement, the U.S. Congress enacted a number of additional measures to accelerate the elimination of ozone-depleting substances in Title VI of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The European Community accelerated their own CFC haseout, shortening the deadline by three years to 1997. The United States EPA then announced it would beat the EC's new timetable by a year. Governmental and nongovernmental organizations, as well as industry, joined this remarkable race to speed up the ban on ozone depleters. Last December, when the Seventh Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol convened in Vienna, "the developed world was within weeks of halting all production of most ozone-depleting substances that the Protocol initially had only required be cut in half by the year 2000." Robert Percival, et al., "Environmental Regulation," p. 1284 (Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1996). (For other sources on the Montreal Protocol, see footnotes 140 to 149 of my article). The Montreal Protocol and the unilateral and multilateral laws that followed it strike me as an enornmous success story. Obviously, it would have been better if the Protocol had been signed ten years earlier, but all the evidence wasn't in yet. As it was, the Protocol faced and overcame many obstacles (which time prevents me from recounting in detail). Although EPA's 1978 ban, in my view, illustrates the "scapegoating" thesis, the Montreal Protocol just as strongly demonstrates that affirmative environmental measures can be effective, even in the cumbersome and unpredictable arena of international affairs. To sum up, I did not write my "scapegoating" article to advance the idea that ALL environmental laws are wrongheaded, wasteful, or counterproductive because they shift "blame" from the individual consumer (or from the "real" source of a problem) to some other target of regulation. I believed and continue to believe that many laws, environmental or otherwise, exhibit aspects of the scapegoating phenomenon that I wrote about. This does not mean, however, that all laws do so. As I said before, it all depends on the problem at hand and how the law responds to the problem. I wrote the article hoping to encourage BETTER lawmaking, not to suggest that the lawmaking enterprise itself is doomed by our tendencies to oversimplify difficult problems and to transfer blame to symbolic "scapegoats." Such a nihilistic and depressing viewpoint, I sincerely hope, is not supported by a full and fair reading of my article. If I'm wrong about this, then I accomplished exactly the opposite of what I intended. I realize that quotations from the article, removed from the context of the entire piece, can be used to support a variety of positions. I hope this note helps clarify what I actually intended the article to say.