IMPACTS

Russia – US cooperation is the largest impact – failure of relations collapses the NPT and great power war. Also solves terrorism, and regional conflicts – only cooperation solves escalation – that’s Arbatov

Us russian cooperation key to leadership and solve prolif

Trenin 3 (Dmitri Trenin, director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, held posts as a Senior Research Fellow at the NATO Defense College in Rome and a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Europe in Moscow, served in the Soviet and Russian armed forces from 1972 to 1993, including experience working as a liaison officer in the External Relations Branch of the Group of Soviet Forces, "Yukos and the State of U.S.-Russian Relations," November 26, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/yukos-and-the-state-of-us-russian-relations/234423.html)

The main thing to keep in mind is that Russia's "democracy deficit" has been created less by the elites than by the "masses," who have yet to become a "demos." It goes without saying that a deterioration in bilateral relations with the United States would have serious and unpleasant consequences for Russia across the board. But this fact only complicates matters for the United States. The following points should be borne in mind: Kicking Russia out of the G-8 and closing the NATO-Russia Council would add another item to the already long list of fundamental differences between the United States and Europe. Refusing to cooperate with Russia in the war on terrorism (in Afghanistan, for example) would compromise U.S. national security. A public rift between the United States and Russia on the issue of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction would only play into the hands of those responsible for this proliferation. Any attempt by Washington to push Russia out of CIS countries would place a further strain on U.S. forces and draw them more deeply into regions where the United States has no vital national interest. Any attempt to pressure Moscow into signing off on energy deals or to alter its stance on the price of oil is fraught with negative consequences for the world energy market. As the 21st century opens, the United States has achieved the pinnacle of power and influence in the world. Yet America's ability to maintain its position depends largely on its ability to create a system for managing global processes founded on the consensus of the world's leading nations -- not only the EU and Japan, but also China, India and Russia. In its long-term strategy, the United States would do well to take into account the consequences of the likely increase in economic and political power of the leading Asian countries, the deepening integration of Europe and Russia's possible emergence as a significant economic power. At this juncture, Washington and Moscow must candidly exchange views on issues capable of influencing bilateral relations, including Russia's policy at home and U.S. foreign and military policy. And this exchange must be predicated on a firm grasp of each country's interests and ambitions. This is not the place for philanthropy or altruism. The Russian leadership must have a clear idea of what the country stands to gain from its relationship with the United States, and in the national interest it must remain committed to partnership. To this point, the Bush administration has proceeded in precisely this manner, but should it attempt to make the U.S. relationship with Russia part of its "global democracy project," it would seriously damage U.S. national interests.

### CTBT Good Module

Obama reelection key to the CTBT – causes entry into force

Schneidmiller 11

Chris Schneidmiller, Global Security Newswire, 07/18/2011, “Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty,” http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20110714\_9351.php]

The Obama administration is preparing for a lobbying campaign that could determine the future of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) (see GSN, July 15). Administration officials have declared in recent months that they intend to follow through on their long-stated pledge to seek the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent on the accord. Still to be determined are when that will occur and whether the White House can overcome entrenched divisions on Capitol Hill to secure necessary Republican support for ratification. The stakes are significant: U.S. approval could draw other holdout nations into the treaty regime, bringing itthat muchcloser to becoming international law, proponents say. Failure would provide those states with continued reason to dismiss the pact -- though critics say they might do that anyway. Before seeking a vote, the administration intends to carry out a program to educate lawmakers and the public on the value of the treaty, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen Tauscher has said on multiple occasions this year (see GSN, May 11). The effort would address issues likely to be debated in the Senate -- the viability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal without testing, whether all CTBT member states have accepted an absolute ban on any trial blasts, and the ability to catch any state that attempts to cheat. “We continue a long, methodical process to lay the groundwork for Senate consideration of the CTBT,” the State Department said last month in a statement toGlobal Security Newswire. “Currently, we are in the process of engaging with members of the Senate and their staff on the importance of the CTBT.” It added: “We are not moving for a Senate vote, don’t expect one anytime soon, and will not push for one until we have done the engagement work needed to secure approval.” Several analysts agreed that the White House would not begin the fight until it felt secure the result would be an improvement on the last time a Democratic president tried to persuade the Senate to approve the treaty. The United States signed the pact in 1996, but three years later the Clinton administration ratification effort ran into a brick wall of skeptical lawmakers. The Senate voted 51-48 against approval. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the United States to become a full participant in the accord. Washington is among 44 capitals that must ratify the test ban before it can enter into force. Thirty-five nations have taken that step, leaving only China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. President Obama might wait to make his push until after publication of a new National Academy of Sciences report on the treaty, said arms control specialist Jeffrey Lewis. The follow-up to a 2002 academy study is expected to assess the effect that ratification would have on the U.S. capability to keep its nuclear weapons in working order without testing and on the capacity to identify atomic detonations in other nations. The new report is undergoing classification review, which could take weeks or years, according to Lewis. A classified National Intelligence Estimate on the matter was sent to Capitol Hill last August, but has not been seen by most lawmakers, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The document is said to offer an updated, thorough assessment of the ability to detect secret nuclear tests, according to Kimball. Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.) suggested at the Arms Control Association’s annual meeting in May that the Senate might not take up the treaty until after the 2012 election. "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don't have a high degree of confidence that we will," the lawmake

r said, echoing time line estimates from other observers. “I don’t think [the Obama administration is], at least in the near term, serious about putting this to a vote,” said Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. “I don’t think there’s a desire to have a vote if they think they’re going to lose, and I don’t think the votes are there yet.” Only 41 lawmakers who considered the treaty in 1999 remain in the Senate, Kimball said in a recent issue brief. Newer senators must be briefed on the matter, while the chamber as a whole must be informed of technical developments since 1999 that would promote entry into force. Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, Kimball said. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, the Senate’s ratification last year of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control pact is cause for optimism about the test ban’s chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START “was relatively fast for a treaty,” according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. “I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there,” Kimball said. “If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort.” That plan, though, would hinge on Obama’s re-election. Should he be defeated next year, the pact would almost certainly remain frozen in place in Washington.

Strong CTBT brings the international community together to solve extinction via nuclear war and natural disasters

Granoff and Tyson 9

Jonathan and Rhianna, “Achieving the Entry-Into-Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty: What UN Member States Can Do Now,” April, Accessed 7-12-09

The treaty remains as important today as ever throughout its long, tortuous history. The threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is arguably greater than at any time since the creation of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which itself is under newfound strains: the 21 st century threat of nuclear terrorism adds a new proliferation dimension against which existing mechanisms are unable to protect; a “renaissance” in nuclear energy highlights inadequacies of the non- proliferation regime; insufficient implementation of the disarmament obligations of the NPT has weakened many nations’ faith in the treaty; suspicious activity has cropped up across the globe in nearly every continent, including the potential quest of existing states to engage in vertical proliferation. After NPT States parties failed to strengthen the NPT at the 2005 Review Conference, it has become ever more imperative to bolster the global disarmament and non- proliferation regime in substantial ways. These challenges will persist despite positive signs coming from a new administration in Washington. From the creation of the NPT, a legal prohibition against testing has been central. States parties have affirmed and reaffirmed this centrality at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference 1 and again at the 2000 Review Conference. 2 Should States parties to the NPT fail to adhere to their own commitments to pursue the CTBT’s entry-into-force, faith in (and commitment to) the NPT—and the global non-proliferation regime at large—will suffer . The CTBT is one of the most effective non-proliferation tools in our shared toolbox. The global verification monitoring system, the International Monitoring System (IMS), can detect all nuclear explosions over a kiloton, (and sometimes smaller), according to a 2002 report from the prestigious US National Academy of Sciences. 3 Smaller tests are unlikely, as they are not useful for major nuclear powers and are unreliable indicators for new proliferators. 4 Beyond these immediate security gains, the CTBT is an important element in the new security paradigm that must emerge. A global norm prohibiting nuclear weapons testing is a light of hope that will help bring us out of the shadow of adversity and aggression. It will advance a cooperative security regime upon which our mutual survival, indeed the survival of the planet, depends.

 Just as the global recession has rendered the interdependence of our economies as conventional wisdom, so too must we realize the interdependence of our security, and build a network of global norms and laws that are non-discriminatory and technically-verifiable. It is for this latter reason that the CTBT is perhaps most important. The treaty is not just an effective arms control and non-proliferation tool. It is, in essence, a game-changer, a way not only by which we will strengthen our collective security, but will actually impel us to cooperate in that collective regime. The IMS is a global, holistic tool that both reinforces and transcends national security interests. It is a global intelligence gatherer which informs all nations, not just with data on nuclear explosions, but on earthquakes, tsunamis and other natural disasters possibly made more frequent by the collective challenge of climate change. 6 It constitutes another part, a physical, tangible part, of the web of relationships that engender the cooperation necessary to address the global challenges that threaten the existence of civilization and the living systems upon which it depends.

Obama reelection key to a global climate deal and alternative energy – Romney wrecks chances for success

Geman 12

Ben Geman, The Hill, “Report says global climate deal hinges on Obama reelection” 01/05/2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202539-report-global-climate-deal-hinges-on-obama-reelection

Prospects for striking a binding global climate deal by 2015 are probably toast ifPresidentObama loses in November. That’s among the conclusions in a wide-ranging, new climate and green energy outlook from banking giant HSBC’s research branch. A major outcome from the United Nations climate talks in December was a plan to craft a deal by 2015 — one that would include big, developing nations such as China — and have it come into force by 2020. But Obama’s main Republican White House rivals are critical of emissions limits and skeptical of climate science. HSBC predicts an international agreement by 2015 is highly unlikely if Obama loses the election. From their research note: [T]he prospects for a new global climate deal in 2015 depend considerably on the election of a pro-climate action president. The election of a President opposed to climate action will not only damage growth prospects for low-carbon solutions in the USA itself, but will make the hard task of negotiating a new global agreement by 2015 almost impossible**.**

UNIQUENESS
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Obama will win now – polling data points to swing state leads and a national average

SILVER 9-20

NATE SILVER is an American statistician, sabermetrician, psephologist, and writer September 20, 2012, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/

Obama’s winning now

Consensus of polls

Cook 9-18

Charlie Cook is Editor and Publisher of The Cook Political Report, and political analyst for National Journal, September 18, 2012 Pollsters Agree: Romney Needs Something to Happen http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/off-to-the-races/pollsters-agree-romney-needs-something-to-happen-20120918?page=1

With both party conventions over and the candidates' bounces having largely subsided, the latest national polls utilizing live callers put President Obama ahead of Mitt Romney by somewhere between 1 percentage point (ABC News/Washington Post) and 6 percentage points (CNN). The Gallup and CBS/New York Times polls have Obama's advantage at 3 points, while Democracy Corps and Fox News put it at 5 points. Private polling on both sides pegs the Obama lead at perhaps 4 or 5 points. The live-caller differential is important because interactive voice-response, or IVR, surveys (so-called “robo polls”) are legally prohibited from calling cell phones; between 30 and 40 percent of voters are now exclusively or primarily served by cell phones. Those polls utilizing cell-phone-only voters reach a constituency disproportionately younger and more likely to be minorities, thus the distinction between IVR and polls by live callers is very important. Interestingly, among these six polls, the narrowest (ABC/Washington Post) and the widest Obama margins were the two that were conducted soonest after the Democratic convention. Gallup at one point soon after Democrats left Charlotte had Obama up by 7 points, but that lead gradually narrowed and seems to have stabilized at 3 points, 48 to 45 percent for Oct. 10-16. It is the one remaining poll of the group still looking at registered voters; the rest have begun focusing on likely voters. At some point in the next few weeks Gallup is expected to begin reporting trial heats both for all voters and from among the likely-voter subgroup. Some on the GOP side say Romney's choice of Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., as his running mate gained the ticket about 2 points, but the combined effect of the conventions negated the gain, putting the Romney campaign back in the position of being down by 4 or 5 points. Contrary to what you might read might on the blogosphere, there is very little disagreement between top Democratic and Republican pollsters on where this race is right now, either on the national level or, more importantly, in the swing states. Keep in mind that there are multiple pollsters involved in each of the swing states: a presidential campaign on each side, one or more super PACs with their own pollsters, plus others done for senatorial and gubernatorial races (and their national party campaign committees) or for ballot initiatives. So there is a whole layer of very expensive, high-quality polling in this race, most of which never sees the light of day. But some pollsters or the strategists who commission such polls will agree to characterize the polling in a race on an off-the-record basis, giving, say, a 2- or 3-point range of what their data shows. Among the broadly defined 11 battleground states, Romney is best situated in North Carolina, where the Elon University poll put him ahead by 4 points at the tail end of the Republican convention. More recent private polling is said to be very close, but insiders on both sides expect it will ultimately end up in the Romney column. New Hampshire seems to be about even, give or take a percentage point. Virginia and Wisconsin are the states with the narrowest Obama leads (he is ahead by between 2 and 4 points), while Obama is thought to be up by between 2 and 5 points in Florida and Nevada. Next comes Iowa and Colorado; the Hawkeye State apparently has Obama ahead by between 3 and 6 points, Colorado between 4 and 6 points. Then come the big-ticket items: Obama ahead by between 5 and 8 points in Ohio, by 6 or more in Michigan, and the high single digits in Pennsylvania. Obviously there are dozens of permutations in the calculus for a Romney path to victory, but as long as Michigan and Pennsylvania are noncompetitive and Ohio continues to look tough for Romney, he would have to come pretty close to running the table to get the 270 electoral votes needed to win. Obama winning Colorado, Iowa, and Nevada would put 276 electoral votes in the Democratic column—six more than necessary for a win—even if Romney carried North Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Florida. At this point Romney is only ahead in one, tied in another, and trailing in the other three. This election is still quite close and could go either way, but Romney badly needs something to happen to change the trajectory of this race. If things remain as they are today, he loses. Presidential debates are scheduled for Oct. 3, 16, and 22. A vice presidential debate is scheduled for Oct. 11, and unemployment numbers are released on Oct. 5 and Nov. 2. These are six events that could prove consequential. Though debates arguably have changed campaign trajectories in 1976 and 1980, in the last seven presidential elections they didn’t materially affect the outcome of the races. Obviously, candidate gaffes or campaign miscues outside the debates can matter as well as external events, domestic or foreign. Anything involving an attack by Israel and/or the United States against Iranian nuclear facilities would certainly create an “all bets are off” situation. Major incidents elsewhere in the Middle East or around the globe—for example, North Korea—could be consequential as well.

Swing states

Obama will win the critical swing states – he has a significant edge

Whitesides 9-21

John Whitesides Sep 21, 2012 Analysis: Romney can still win, but it won't be easy http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/21/us-usa-campaign-romney-analysis-idUSBRE88K06G20120921

Democratic President Barack Obama has opened a slight lead over Romney in national polls, and new surveys indicate that Obama has a significant edge where it matters most: in Ohio, Virginia and Florida, the most coveted of nine politically divided "swing" states that are crucial to cobbling together the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.

Incumbency will carry Obama through the economy issue

Perry 12

[George Perry is a senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution and the co-founder, with Arthur Okun, of the Brookings Panel on Economic Activity and its journal, BPEA. July 31, 2012 Weak Economy, Yes, But Not a Death Knell for Obama http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2012/07/31/weak\_economy\_yes\_but\_not\_a\_death\_knell\_for\_obama\_99792.html]

Where does this leave election prospects in 2012? Last winter, employment gains quickened and a moderately optimistic forecast was that economic expansion in 2012 would be faster than the disappointing growth of 2011, that unemployment would improve to the 7.5 to 8 percent range this year, and that this pick-up would largely defuse the weak economy as an election issue. Some of the reasons for this moderate optimism have materialized: housing continued to recover, auto sales were strong, and prices for oil and gasoline declined. But other areas disappointed: exceptional weakness in Europe and China held back U.S. exports, and business investment has been flat. The virtuous circle of growth in jobs, incomes, consumption, and capacity that characterizes strong cyclical recoveries has not taken hold. And the election is near enough that a meaningful change in how voters see the economy is highly unlikely. It is a disappointing expansion, but not bad enough, by historical standards, to unseat an incumbent. This outlook suggests other things that matter to voters will be important. The Romney camp is making an issue of the new health care law. The Obama camp is pressing for full disclosure of personal finances. And each side is blaming the other for budget problems. It is too soon to tell whether these or any other special issues will resonate with voters. But as of now, incumbency should be enough to see Obama through.

Obama has taken away Romney’s advantage on the economy

ZELENY & THEE-BRENAN 9/14

JEFF ZELENY and MEGAN THEE-BRENAN September 14, 2012 Poll Finds Obama Is Erasing Romney’s Edge on Economy http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/15/us/politics/obama-erases-romneys-edge-on-economy-poll-finds.html?\_r=1&ref=todayspaper&pagewanted=print

President Obama has taken away Mitt Romney’s longstanding advantage as the candidate voters say is most likely to restore the economy and create jobs, according to the latest poll by The New York Times and CBS News, which found a modest sense of optimism among Americans that White House policies are working.

A war chest blitz won’t save Romney – ads are ineffective and he doesn’t have the green

Bouie 9-20

Jamelle Bouie is a staff writer at The American Prospect 09/20/2012 Why all that money won’t save Mitt Romney http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/post/why-all-that-money-wont-save-mitt-romney/2012/09/20/f706aa90-0330-11e2-9132-f2750cd65f97\_blog.html

Yes, both sides will spend to the point of diminishing marginal returns. But the next month is when voters will be the most tuned in to the election, and a flood of ads — positive and negative — could move the dial in Romney’s direction, or at least, improve his favorability with the public. But there are a few things to keep in mind when considering Romney’s potential ad advantage. First, campaign ad effects decay quickly — in a paper analyzing the 2000 election, political scientists at UCLA found rapid turnover for most advertisements. “Even when the persuasive effect of ads on candidate preference is large, 50 to 75 percent of the effect dissipates within the first week and almost all is gone by the end of the second week.” The effects of an ad barrage in early October could disappear by the end of the month. Romney’s best bet would be to coordinate an assault in the final two weeks of the campaign; in a 2008 post, political scientist John Sides notes that, in 2000, voters in swing states were more than twice as likely to see a pro-Bush ad as a pro-Gore ad. Did it matter? Number crunchers estimate that it cost Al Gore as many as 4 points among undecided voters. Can Romney build that kind of advantage over Obama? I doubt it. As it stands, Romney lacks an overwhelming cash advantage. The New York Times notes the extent to which Team Romney is hampered by limited funds:

 “Much of the more than $300 million the campaign reported raising this summer is earmarked for the Republican National Committee, state Republican organizations and Congressional races.” Super PACs will make up the difference, but so far, they’ve been focused on ineffective negative ads — the president is incredibly well-known to most Americans and attacks won’t do much to move opinions. Again, none of this is to say that Romney can’t bounce back. As Trende notes, there’s a fair chance that the race will tighten and Romney will make gains in likely voter polls. But money isn’t a magic bullet; ads require particular circumstances to be effective. They require a strategy grounded in flooding the airwaves in the very last days of the campaign, an overwhelming cash advantage, and opinions of the opponent to not be locked in. At best Romney has only the first of those — so all that money is unlikely to save him

A2: UNEMPLOYMENT

Nuclear doesn’t spillover enough to be popular – and only areas it is popular are strongly republican

Tucker 12 (William Tucker is the author of Terrestrial Energy: How Nuclear Power Will Lead the Green Revolution and End America's Energy Odyssey.)

(4/16/2012 “WILLIAM TUCKER: Nuclear’s Problem — Too Much Energy, Not Enough Jobs” http://www.nucleartownhall.com/blog/william-tucker-nuclear%E2%80%99s-problem-%E2%80%94-too-much-energy-not-enough-jobs/)

Well then, what about the 104 reactors that operate around the country? Don’t they generate some political support? The average reactor employs about 650 people and is extremely popular in its home territory. Bisconti Research has found that support for nuclear increases to around 85 percent in communities that host reactors. But this support tends to be highly localized and reactors create little ancillary employment. Replacing the fuel rods, for instance, requires only six tractor trailers arriving once every 18 months. Illinois gets almost half its electricity from nuclear and even Barack Obama was known to say a few nice things about it while he was Senator from Illinois. But most states with large nuclear complexes are equally committed to coal. Even in a state that is highly dependent on nuclear, the work force is so small as to be inconsequential. Vermont gets 60 percent of its electricity form Vermont Yankee, yet its efforts to close down the reactor have generated very little pushback. Vernon, the tiny town of 2,000 that supplies all this energy, is 100 percent in favor of keeping the reactor. But its interests are completed swamped by 623,000 other Vermonters who only get clean, cheap energy from nuclear and think they can do the same by covering the green mountains with 45-story windmills. The only place where nuclear has built a true constituency is in the South. This is partly because of the many military veterans in the region, since a large portion of the nuclear workforce has come up through the Nuclear Navy. South Carolina is probably the most pro-nuclear state in the country with Georgia and Tennessee also strongly in favor. It is no accident that the four new reactors licensed for construction will be built in Georgia and South Carolina. Areva is also completing its plutonium recycling plant at the Savannah River Site. But all these states are pretty much locked up for Republicans and have very little impact at the national level. So nuclear’s weakness is plain to see. It does very poorly at creating the kind of widespread employment that builds political constituencies. It is only good at producing energy.

LINKS

Government spending is a wedge issue for Romney – ties in with the economy and rallies conservative voters

Kraushaar 12

Spending is the fastest growing priorities for voters

Kohut 12

The plans unpopularity means slow licensing and development

Solan et. al. 10

(David Solan was appointed as Director of the Energy Policy Institute and an Associate Director of the Center for Advanced Energy Studies. Geoffrey Black. Michael Louis. Steve Peterson – University of Idaho. Larry Carter, Sam Peterson, Ryan Bills, Brogan Morton – Idaho State University. Edward Arthur – University of New Mexico.)

(June 2010. “Economic and Employment Impacts of Small Modular Nuclear Reactors”. Energy Policy Institute. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCIQFjAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fsmr.inl.gov%2FDocument.ashx%3Fpath%3DDOCS%252FReading%2BRoom%252FEconomic%2Band%2BEmployment%2BImpacts%2Bof%2BSMRs.pdf&ei=Mk9RUPL-Nara0QHAx4FI&usg=AFQjCNFe\_I-IHiRcZcWANzM9eiX2oTpuEQ&sig2=04m-6OLnC2QswvBX25ADsw)

In addition, the licensing of new SMR facilities is likely to be affected by the degree of public acceptance of nuclear technologies in general. Though the U.S. currently has the highest number of operating nuclear power reactors in the world (IAEA, 2010), growth in the domestic nuclear power industry has stagnated since 1990. While costs have been a factor, segments of the public remain concerned about nuclear waste disposal and, to some extent, safety. Lack of public acceptance toward nuclear energy in general, as well as the public’s lack of familiarity with SMRs and associated technologies, may affect the speed of SMR licensing and deployment in the U.S.

The study you cite assumes clean coal excludes nuclear goes neg

CSI 2AC AUTHOR 12 – the Civil Society Institute

[4/25, http://www.ewg.org/release/survey-strong-bipartisan-support-seen-shift-cleaner-energy0

A key finding: More than three out of four Americans (76 percent) - including 58 percent of Republicans, 83 percent of Independents, and 88 percent of Democrats -- think that the United States should move to a sustainable energy future through "a reduction in our reliance on nuclear power, natural gas and coal, and instead, launch a national initiative to boost renewable energy and energy efficiency."

People believe nuclear contributes to warming

Fukae 10

(Chiyokazu Fukae Institute of Social Research Institute of Nuclear Safety System, Incorporated)

(May 17-21 “MISUNDERSTANDING REGARDING TO GLOBAL WARMING AND NUCLEAR POWER” Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Nuclear Engineering. http://asmedl.org/getabs/servlet/GetabsServlet?prog=normal&id=ASMECP002010049309000403000001&idtype=cvips&gifs=yes&ref=no)

It is surmised that many people have confusion with global warming and other global environmental issues such as ozone layer depletion, resulting in misunderstanding. The idea that nuclear power generation causes global warming was strongly influenced by incorrect perceptions such as: heat of thermal discharge or radioactive materials accelerates global warming. These misunderstanding have an influence that reduces the perception of the effectiveness of nuclear power in preventing global warming. It has become evident that behind such misunderstanding is a negative image of nuclear power. When asked about the relations between nuclear power and global warming, some people without a specific ground view nuclear power as evil due to misunderstanding and fear that nuclear power emits radioactive materials constantly or in the event of an accident and fail to understand that nuclear power is beneficial in terms of global warming. In other words, the intuitive impression brought about by the negative image of nuclear power led to their evaluation of nuclear power regarding global warming. The tendency is strong in young people. It is important to ensure that objective information on energy and environmental issues is given at school, including the merits and demerits of nuclear power so that young people become able to properly consider and select future energy sources.

Climate arguments won’t persuade the public towards nuclear power – fears of government waste management outweigh and there’s a preference for renewables

**Ramana 11**

M. V. Ramana is currently appointed jointly with the Nuclear Futures Laboratory and the Program on Science and Global Security, both at Princeton University, and works on the future of nuclear energy in the context of climate change and nuclear disarmament Ramana is a member of the International Panel on Fissile Materials and the BulletinÕs Science and Security Board. Jul 1, 2011 Nuclear power and the public SAGE Journals

The urgent need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and prevent drastic climate change is possibly the most important argument for expanding nuclear power today. Proponents of nuclear power hope that it can be rc-branded as a solution to climate change and thereby gain legitimacy (Stoett, 2003). The empirical evidence from a number of public opinion surveys, however, is that concern about climate change has at best a modest impact on public support for building new nuclear power plants. A survey by Acccnturc Corporation in 2009 asked: "What actions should be considered to reduce your country's reliance on fossil-fueled power generation (i.e. coal, oil or gas generated power)?" Of those who responded, only 9 percent called for an increase in nuclear power alone, while 34 percent called for increases in both renewable energy and nuclear power. By contrast, 57 percent called for an increase only in renewable energy, without expanding nuclear power. Such a predilection for renewable energy has been demonstrated in a wide variety of polls. Several US polls from 2003 to 2008 showed that the public had a clear preference for renewable sources of energy and major reservations about coal and nuclear fuel to generate electricity (Greenberg, 2009). In the United Kingdom—after a sustained campaign by the government, the nuclear industry, and major scientific leaders and professional societies to reframe nuclear power as necessary to reduce carbon emissions—one study, which used a survey and focus groups to evaluate the impact of this attempt, found "reluctant acceptance" at best (Bickerstaff et al., 2008; Pidgeon et al., 2008). The researchers found that people were concerned about climate change, but radioactive waste trumped climate change in dread. There was also great mistrust of the competence of the nuclear-power establishment and the government to manage nuclear power safely. Again, renewable energy came out looking much better than nuclear power.

IMPACTS

Romney sparks a full scale relations crises with Russia during his first year in office

Richter 12

Paul Richter July 2, 2012 Russian official: Romney's hard line could bring 'full-scale crisis' http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-russian-official-romneys-hard-line-could-bring-fullscale-crisis-20120702,0,3241680,print.story

Mitt Romney’s comment that Russia is America’s “No. 1 geopolitical foe,” a red-meat line for Republicans, is also attracting some attention in Moscow. Alexey Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee of the State Duma, said in a recent interview that Russian leaders have noted Romney’s comments with concern, and are watching with interest as neoconservative and “realist” advisers maneuver for influence within the campaign. “We don’t think that for us Romney will be an easy partner,” said Pushkov, an ally of President Vladimir Putin. “We think that Romney will be, on the rhetorical side, a replay of the Bush administration.” He also noted Romney’s statements that the United States should assert its dominance in the 21st century. “If he is serious about this, I’m afraid he may choose the neocon-type people…In the first year of his presidency, we may have a full-scale crisis,” he said.
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[Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.