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#### Financial incentives are rebates, grants, loans, Tax Incentives, green building incentives, and industrial recruitment. Distinct from Community Investment & Rules & regulations

#### The aff isn’t an example of a topical incentive

Gouchoe 2k—North Carolina State University, National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Susan, December 2000, Local Government and Community Programs and Incentives for Renewable Energy— National Report, http://seg.fsu.edu/Library/casestudy%20of%20incentives.pdf]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents a summary of the renewable energy programs and incentives of 45¶ communities in 23 states as collected and catalogued by the Interstate Renewable Energy¶ Council’s (IREC) Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy (DSIRE) project. Also included are summaries of state initiatives that impact implementation of renewable energy¶ technologies on the local level. Programs and incentives in this report include:

COMMUNITY INVESTMENT & AWARENESS PROGRAMS

v Renewable Energy Projects

v Education & Assistance

v Green Pricing Programs

v Green Power Purchasing

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

v Rebates, Grants, & Loans

v Tax Incentives

v Green Building Incentives

v Industrial Recruitment

RULES, REGULATIONS & POLICIES

v Solar & Wind Access

v Net Metering

v Construction & Design

v Contractor Licensing

v Equipment Certification

v Public Benefits Funds

v Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards

v Disclosure & Certification

Established in 1995, DSIRE is an ongoing project to summarize incentives, programs, and¶ policies for renewable energy. The project is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy’s¶ Office of Power Technologies and is managed by the North Carolina Solar Center. DSIRE on¶ Line makes the DSIRE database accessible via the web at:¶ http://www.ncsc.ncsu.edu/dsire.htm. The website is updated daily and includes search¶ capabilities for all incentives. In addition to state and local programs, the website features¶ utility programs and a searchable bibliography.

#### VOTE NEGATIVE

#### PREDICTABLE LIMITS—the word incentives in the resolution is modified by financial to make it manageable. Going beyond makes the topic unpredictable.

#### GROUND—financial incentives insure the aff has links to market disads and counterplans which are the only core negative ground across bi-directional energies. Holding the line key

### 1NC DA 1

#### India is poised to become a nuclear exporter due to lack of US competition in the small reactor market --- the plan reverses this

CSIS, 2010 [ “India’s Nuclear Push” <http://csis.org/blog/india%E2%80%99s-nuclear-push>]

**“**In India's statement to the 54th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, Indian Atomic Energy Commission chairman Srikumar Banerjee said that Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL) is ‘ready to offer Indian PHWRs of 220 MWe or 540 MWe for export’”**. ¶** It’s happening– second-tier nuclear suppliers from China, South Korea, and now India are waking up to the opportunities that may emerge from intensified interest in nuclear power. India is entering the nuclear supply business at a time when new nuclear states are looking for alternatives to the huge, expensive reactors sold by the French, Russians, Japanese, Canadians, and Americans. ¶ ¶ Last year, Korea won the plum contract in the Middle East – a $20 billion agreement to build 4 nuclear power reactors in the United Arab Emirates. The UAE plans to construct a total of 10 reactors, using one contractor. China, while busily constructing nuclear power plants at home, will build a few new reactors in Pakistan and reportedly is interested in Turkish and Arab state plans to import. India will be next off the starting block of this export race.¶ ¶ There’s no way to predict how price-competitive India’s export reactors will be. NPCIL is a public enterprise under the control of the government’s Department of Atomic Energy. One of the suggested virtues of the U.S.-India nuclear deal was that the Indian nuclear sector would be forced to clean up its act as foreign competition grew in India.One way for the NPCIL to become more self-sustaining is through exports. ¶ **¶** What will motivate nuclear power newcomers to buy Indian, Korean or Chinese? First, the reactor vendors from the advanced nuclear states are in disarray. AREVA has its much-publicized cost overruns in Olkiluoto; Japanese vendors do not have an export history; and Russian reactors were previously sold only in the Eastern bloc countries or allies. Russia will expand from reactors in India and Iran to potential contracts with Turkey and Vietnam.¶ ¶ China, South Korea and Indiaallhave smaller reactors to offer**.** In the United States, while there is interest in small modular reactors, there aren’t any licensed**.** These smaller reactors are more likely to fit the needs of states that are new to nuclear power. Not only do they lack the billions of dollars it takes to build large 1000MWe-1600MWe reactors, but they also lack the extensive transmission grids to accommodate large, centralized electricity generators.

#### Indian nuclear industry is essential to growth.

World Nuclear News, 2009 [http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/NN-Indian\_joint\_venture\_to\_produce\_forgings-301109.html]

India will have a world-class heavy forging facility for future nuclear power plants after a joint venture by Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL) and Larsen & Toubro (L&T).

NPCIL-LandT¶ The signing of the joint venture agreement in Mumbai¶ The joint venture will construct a new facility at L&T's existing manufacturing site in Hazira, Surat, Gujarat state, which will have a dedicated steel melt shop producing ingots of up to 600 tonnes, as well as a heavy forge shop equipped with a forging press that will be amongst the largest in the world. The facility will supply finished forgings for nuclear reactors, pressurizers and steam generators, and also heavy forgings for critical equipment in the hydrocarbon sector and for thermal power plants. The coastal location of the Hazira plant will also facilitate multi-modal transportation and export of parts produced at the joint venture facility.¶ In a joint statement, the companies said: "The new fully integrated facility ... would significantly augment India's capabilities in manufacturing critical components for the nuclear power industry." They added, "Indigenous manufacture of forgings will close a critical cap in Indian industry's capability to produce equipment for nuclear, thermal power and hydrocarbon plants. It will enable a significant reduction in cycle times."¶ ¶ Anil Kakodkar, secretary of the Department of Atomic Energy and chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, commented: "The establishment of JV between NPCIL and L&T reflects our vision of steady progress for growth of nuclear power in the country in a self reliant manner." He added, "The facility would contribute in closing the gap in the supply chain for nuclear power reactors, a wide spectrum of installations for nuclear fuel cycle and other infrastructure applications, like hydrocarbon and power."¶ ¶ L&T chairman and managing director A M Naik added, "This JV will place India amongst the few countries in the world capable of producing nuclear grade heavy forgings. When combined with the established facilities in Hazira, this venture will form part of a fully integrated high technology manufacturing complex." He noted that L&T has previously provided NPCIL with nuclear power plant systems and equipment and that the new joint venture "will add a new dimension to our long standing relationship."¶ ¶ According to a Bloomberg report, the new plant will start in 2011, while exports are set to begin by 2013.¶ ¶ L&T is India's biggest engineering and construction company and makes reactor pressure vessels for the country's pressurized heavy water reactors (PHWRs), fast breeder reactor and steam generators. It has been involved in supply of equipment, systems and services for nearly all the PHWRs that have been indigenously built, including the manufacture of calandrias, end-shields, steam generators, primary heat transport system and heat exchangers.¶ ¶ The company signed four agreements with foreign nuclear power reactor vendors in early 2009. The first, with Westinghouse, sets up L&T to produce component modules for the Westinghouse AP1000 reactor. The second agreement was with Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd "to develop a competitive cost/scope model for the ACR-1000." In April, L&T signed an agreement with Russia's AtomStroyExport primarily focused on components for the next four VVER reactors at Kudankulam, but extending beyond that to other Russian VVER plants in India and internationally. In May, it signed an agreement with GE-Hitachi to produce major components for ABWRs - the two companies hope to utilize indigenous Indian capabilities for the complete construction of nuclear power plants including the supply of reactor equipment and systems, valves, electrical and instrumentation products for ABWR plants to be built in India.

#### Prevents Indo-Pak war

Kapur 8 [Associate Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval Post-graduate School and a Faculty Affiliate at Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation

(Paul, Ten Years of Instability in a Nuclear South Asia, International Security, Volume 33, Number 2, Fall 2008]

The Indians, for their part, have pursued improved relations with Pakistan for two principal reasons, neither of which stems from nuclear deterrence. First, India's main national priority has become continued economic growth, which Indian leaders believe is essential if the country is to reduce poverty, shed its "third-world" status, and join the first rank of nations.[54](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.2.kapur.html" \l "f54) Greater prosperity, in turn, has led to rising economic aspirations among the Indian electorate. Indians increasingly expect, as Chengappa puts it, "better jobs, the American dream." Therefore the government seeks "to focus on growth and to keep the peace," rather than squander resources on continued Indo-Pakistani conflict.[55](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.library.emory.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.2.kapur.html" \l "f55)

### 1NC DA 2

#### Obama winning with betting markets – best predictors

Thompson 10/24 has been a semi-pro baseball player in France, an editorial cartoonist for Newsday, and a Reporter[Keith Thomson, How Gamblers -- History's Most Accurate Election Forecasters -- Are Betting on 2012, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/keith-thomson/how-gamblers--historys-mo_b_2011534.html?utm_hp_ref=elections-2012>]

I don't like uncertainty. The current presidential polls -- Gallup with Romney leading by three percent, CBS with Obama up by two percent, aggregators split on whose nose is ahead -- are a hotbed of uncertainty. Fortunately there are veritable election oracles I can turn to instead: gamblers.

In 2004, Gallup failed to forecast the winner of the popular vote for president -- for the second straight election. Halfway through Election Day 2004, various exit polls showed Kerry with the lead. Meanwhile 91 percent of bettors on Betfair.com had their money on Bush. The betting markets also were correct on the winner in each of the 50 states.

Before the 2008 election, I spoke to Koleman Strumpf, a University of Kansas economics professor who tracks betting trends. "Relative to the polls, the betting markets have to think hard about what they're saying since they are putting their money at stake," he said. "Also polls tend to reflect what people are thinking at a given moment, versus a forecast of what will happen on election day -- post-convention bounces, for instance."

Added Paulick Report editor Ray Paulick, one of America's top horseracing handicappers and a political prediction markets aficionado, "Gamblers have more experience with cheaters. They take voter fraud into their metrics. Polls don't. Nor do polls take into account intangibles like how each state's secretary of state factors in or systems within a state designed to eliminate voters."

In 2008, 90 percent of gamblers correctly forecast an Obama victory. They were also on the money with 48 of 50 states.

Gamblers' success in this arena is nothing new. In presidential races beginning in 1896, the New York Times, Sun, and World provided daily betting quotes. The papers' sources were bookies who had agents at every stump and whistle-stop to gather intel and quantify popular sentiment. Between 1884 and 1940, the bettors erred on just one of sixteen elections, Wilson's 1916 upset of Hughes.

Ironically, polls sent gamblers to the sideline. "Prior to Gallup's introduction in 1936, newspapers had little to report about the election horse race other than the betting markets," Strumpf explains. "When scientific polls came along, newspapers had something to report other than markets they were oftentimes uncomfortable with."

The same discomfort led to states relegating such gamblers to outlaws. The Internet has given rise to new forums, however. As of this writing, betting at the three biggest prediction markets is as follows: Betfair has Obama with a 64 percent chance to win to Romney's 36 percent; Intrade has the president at 58 percent; and the Iowa Electronic Markets have the president at 59 percent. Oddschecker shows bookmakers to be even more bullish on Obama.

Why are the polls and gamblers so far apart?

"The answer highlights one of the main differences between the polls and markets like Intrade," Intrade's exchange operations manager Carl Wolfenden told me. "The polls ask who you're going to vote for -- a question that requires an emotional response. Intrade asks who you think will win -- a rational question that requires someone to look at the facts and real world events, such as polls, debates, speeches, gaffes, scandals and crises. One of these facts is the Electoral College, which isn't accounted for in polls."

Why the big lead for Obama?

"Our markets recognize that Romney probably needs to win Ohio to beat Obama," Wolfenden says. "And so the price for Obama to be reelected has closely tracked his probability of winning Ohio. So while Romney may lead in the polls, and he may have flipped a number of other key states -- such as Florida, Virginia, Colorado -- to his side of the ledger, our markets appear to believe that without Ohio he can't get it done."

Strumpf adds: "I think the big message in this election cycle is that polls are giving conflicting answers, and unless you are willing to look at several state-level polls, it is hard to make sense of it all. The prediction markets like Intrade cut through all this and give us a single number to focus on."

**The plan is massively unpopular.**

**Mariotte 12** [Michael, Executive Director of Nuclear Information and Resource Service, “Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the polls say” Daily Kos -- June 5 -- http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say]

Conclusion 3: On new reactors, how one asks the question matters.¶ Gallup and the Nuclear Energy Institute ask the same question: “Overall, do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the U.S.?”¶ This question doesn’t really get to the issue of support for new nuclear reactors, although NEI typically tries to spin it that way. Although a question of support for current reactors wasn’t asked in any recent poll we saw, the public traditionally has been more supportive of existing reactors than new ones, and the question above could easily be interpreted as support for existing reactors, or even simple recognition that they exist. The results may also be skewed by the pollsters throwing nuclear in as “one of the ways,” without a context of how large a way.¶ Nonetheless, despite asking the same question, Gallup and NEI can’t agree on the answer. NEI, for example, in November 2011 asserted that 28% of the public strongly favors nuclear power with an additional 35% somewhat in favor. NEI found only 13% strongly opposed and another 21% somewhat opposed. A May 2012 NEI poll did not publicly break down the numbers into strongly vs somewhat, but claimed a similar 64-33% split between support for nuclear power and opposition.¶ Gallup, asking the same question in March 2012, found a narrower split. A smaller number was strongly in favor (23%, a drop of 5%) and a larger number strongly opposed (24%, increase of 3%)—overall an 8-point anti-nuclear swing among those with strong opinions. Those in the middle were 34% somewhat favor vs 16% somewhat opposed. The 2012 numbers were slightly worse for nuclear power than the identical question asked in March 2011, just before Fukushima.¶ But other polls suggest that Gallup and NEI may be asking the wrong question. For example, the LA Times reported on a Yale-George Mason University poll in April 2012 that found that support for new nuclear power had dropped significantly, from 61% in 2008 to 42% today.¶ Even Rasmussen in its May 2012 poll found that only 44% support building new reactors. That was good news for Rasmussen since it found that only 38% oppose them, with a surprising 18% undecided (surprising because no other poll we saw had such a high undecided contingent for any nuclear-related question).¶ Meanwhile the March 2012 ORC International poll found that:¶ “Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. Those who say they are more supportive of nuclear power a year after Fukushima account for well under a third (28 percent) of all Americans, little changed from the 24 percent who shared that view in 2011.”¶ But perhaps the most telling, and easily the most interesting, poll comes from a March 2012 poll from the Yale Project on Climate Change Communications. Participants were asked, “When you think of nuclear power, what is the first word or phrase that comes to your mind?”¶ 29% of those polled said “disaster.” Another 24% said “bad.” Only about 15% said “good” and that was the only measurable group that had anything positive to say. That poll also found that, “…only 47 percent of Americans in May 2011 supported building more nuclear power plants, down 6 points from the prior year (June 2010), while only 33 percent supported building a nuclear power plant in their own local area.”

#### Small changes matter.

Silver 10/20 Elections Guru [nate Silver, Oct. 20: Calm Day in Forecast, but Volatility Ahead, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/20/oct-20-calm-day-in-forecast-but-volatility-ahead/>]

What makes this challenging is that although something like a half-point shift is hard to detect in the polls, it is also potentially meaningful given how late it is in the race and how close the contest is.

The most natural analogy might be to a baseball game. Scoring a run in the first inning is worth something, but it won’t shift the win probabilities all that much: there’s too much that can happen later on in the game.

We’re now in the political equivalent of the eighth inning, however. A run scored in the eight inning is potentially much more important than one in the first.

The reason I say “potentially” is that it makes a tremendous difference depending what the score is. In a blowout, the eighth inning won’t matter at all. A team down 9-1 is almost certainly going to lose; but so will one that gets a solo home run and trails 9-2 instead.

(The political equivalent: Walter Mondale, in 1984, improved to a 17-point deficit from a 20-point deficit in national polls after his first debate with Ronald Reagan. This may have helped him to carry his home state of Minnesota, and lose the Electoral College 525-13 rather than 535-3.)

But if the score is tied, or if it’s a one-run game, a run scored in the eighth will make a huge difference.

That’s where we find ourselves right now in the presidential race. This election is close and is likely to end up that way. There’s about a 50-50 chance that the election will end up within 2.5 percentage points, according to the forecast, against only a 15 percent chance that either candidate will win by five points or more.

For this reason, the percentage estimates in the forecast are likely to be volatile from here on out.

#### That flips the election.

Schnur 12 Dan Schnur, director of the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at the University of Southern California; he served as the national communications director of Senator John McCain’s presidential campaign in 2000, “The President, Gas Prices and the Pipeline,” <http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/09/the-president-gas-prices-and-the-keystone-pipeline/>

Like every president seeking re-election, Barack **Obama walks the fine line** every day **between** the discordant goals of **motivating his party’s** strongest **loyalists and reaching out to swing voters** for their support. A few weeks ago, **that** pathway **took him** to a tiny town in Oklahoma, where, caught **between** **the anti-drilling** demands of the **environmental community and** the thirst for more affordable gasoline from unions, **business owners** and drivers, the president announced his support for building half of an oil pipeline.

The economic impact of rising energy prices in itself is considerable, but the psychological toll on voters is just as significant, as tens of millions of motorists are reminded by large signs on almost every street corner of the financial pain of filling their gas tanks. Obama and his political lieutenants are acutely aware that this growing frustration has the potential to complicate an election year that otherwise seems to be shifting in the incumbent’s favor.

As a result, **Obama has been hitting the energy issue** hard in recent weeks, at least as hard **as a candidate can hit when forced to navigate between two** almost mutually exclusive **political priorities. The result is a president who talks forcefully of** the benefits of **wind and solar** power **while** also **boasting about** the amount of **oil** the nation produces under his leadership.

**There are times when this gets** slightly **uncomfortable**. **Obama recently called for** increased **exploration** along the Atlantic Coast **but stopped short of** calling for expanded **drilling** in that region. **This is the energy policy equivalent of admitting to an experiment with marijuana but not inhaling.**

Where the issue becomes more tangible and therefore trickier for Obama is when the multiple choices become binary. The debate over the proposed XL Keystone Pipeline that would transport Canadian oil through the nation’s heartland to the Gulf of Mexico crystallizes the choices involved and forces a shades-of-gray conversation into starker hues of black and white.

**Obama recognizes that the devoted environmentalists who represent a critical portion of the Democratic party base need some motivation to turn out for him in the fall**. But he also understands that centrist voters who support him on a range of other domestic and foreign policy matters could be lured away by a Republican opponent who either promises relief at the gas pump or who can lay blame at the White House doorstep for those higher prices. Even more complicated is the role of organized labor, which has poured immense amounts of support into Obama’s re-election but also prioritizes the job-creation potential of the pipeline.

**The result of these competing political and policy pressures brought Obama to** Ripley, Okla., **where** **he tried to satisfy** **the needs** **of these various audiences** **without alienating any of them**. First, **the president endorsed the southern portion of** the **Keystone** project in order to relieve the glut of domestically drilled oil that is now unable to make it to refineries near the Gulf of Mexico in a timely manner. This had the effect of irritating his environmental allies but failed to mollify the project’s advocates, who pointed out that the review process that the president called for was already underway.

He **then reiterated** the administration’s **antipathy toward the northern section** of the pipeline, which would allow Canadian-drilled oil to be transported into this country. **This provided** some **comfort to drilling** **opponents**, but infuriated both the pro-oil forces and the Canadian government. The most likely outcome is that Canada will still build a pipeline, but rather one that goes westward to the Pacific Ocean north of the United States border and then ships Canadian oil to China instead of into this country.

#### Romney destroys the economy.

BARR 12 Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution [Michael Barr, JPMorgan mess: Why Mitt Romney’s wrong on Dodd-Frank, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76728.html>]

When financial giant JPMorgan Chase recently revealed that it had lost far more than $2 billion in a credit derivatives trade gone wrong, the news sent a clear message: Opponents of financial reform are wrong. Without the Dodd-Frank Act and the global reforms being led by the United States, the financial sector would go back to its old ways, eventually putting taxpayers and the economy at grave risk of harm.

Yet for the presumed GOP nominee Mitt Romney, the news sent a very different message. He repeated his call to repeal Dodd-Frank, though it made the system stronger, and though JPMorgan’s revelations demonstrated the need for robust rules.

Romney and many Republican lawmakers seem intent on going back to the financial casino that led to the worst economic crisis in 80 years. The financial industry has spent far more than $100 million trying to roll back Wall Street reform. Romney, meanwhile, has been clear about what he wanted to get rid of — a comprehensive financial reform package that passed Congress and was signed by the president. Yet he makes only the vaguest of promises about what he might do instead.

Romney’s reaction is the equivalent of putting out a small fire in your house, then deciding that the lesson is you need to stuff your house with matches, throw out your fire extinguisher and cancel your fire insurance. And doing all this after the house nearly burned to the ground less than four years ago.

The system of rules under which the financial industry operated in the lead-up to the financial crisis was broken. Financial institutions took on too much risk with too little capital. Financial companies could escape meaningful supervision by calling themselves investment banks or insurance conglomerates rather than commercial banks, and all institutions could move assets and liabilities off the balance sheet and out of regulatory purview in the shadow banking system.

Derivatives were traded in the dark; conflicts of interest were rife; securitizations and synthetic products hid real risks; and there was no way to wind down a major firm like Lehman Brothers without causing widespread harm. Consumers and investors lacked adequate protections, which too often meant that the financial industry could take advantage of them.

These flaws blew up the financial system, crushed the economy and cost millions of Americans their jobs. They wiped out families’ savings and put homes at risk. These flaws lined the pockets of Wall Street bankers while making taxpayers the fall guy for their failures. This is what we would get back if we followed Romney’s advice and repealed Dodd-Frank.

The Dodd-Frank Act, once fully implemented, can change all that. It has already increased capital requirements and created the authority to regulate Wall Street firms that pose a threat to financial stability, without regard to their corporate form. It enacted a resolution authority to wind down these major firms in the event of a crisis — without feeding a panic or putting taxpayers on the hook, putting an end to Too Big to Fail; restricted risky activities by firms with taxpayer-insured deposits, including through the “Volcker rule”; imposed a cap on the relative size of the largest firms; and required transparency, central clearing, exchange trading and margin for the derivatives market. It established a new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to look out for the interests of American households.

Key provisions of reform are already working. For example, measures requiring large banks to hold more capital have helped make financial institutions more resilient. And if a big firm got itself into deep trouble today, the government now has the tools to wind it down, with shareholders and creditors taking their losses.

Rules under other parts of the Dodd-Frank Act are still being drafted by regulators and must be completed to protect taxpayers and the economy. We need a strong Volcker rule to prevent banks from making risky bets with taxpayer-insured deposits and strict limits on counter-party exposures among the largest financial firms to limit systemic risk. We need robust rules for derivatives clearing and trading, and adequate funding for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission to enforce them. We need strong consumer and investor protections to keep the market fair and open.

Yet Romney and many Republicans in Congress are determined to forget the lessons of the crisis by repealing rules that could address the weaknesses in our regulatory system that allowed the financial crisis to happen. Romney suggested last week that he wasn’t even concerned by the JPMorgan losses.

But for those of us who remember how Wall Street reacted after the 2008 financial collapse, the losses reminded us why regulators need to finish the job of implementing these and other key provisions as quickly and robustly as possible; why Congress should stop trying to cut necessary budgets and block agency nominees; and why Romney should take a cold hard look at the ways in which his support for Wall Street’s lobbying exposes taxpayers and the economy to enormous risk of another crisis.

**Extinction.**

**Green & Schrage 9** (Michael J. and Steven P., Senior Advisor and Japan Chair @ CSIS and Associate Professor @ Georgetown University AND CSIS School Chair in International Business and Former Senior Official with the US Trade Representative’s Office, *It’s not just the economy*, State Department and Ways & Means Committee, Asia Times, 3/26, <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/asian_economy/kc26dk01.html>)

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe.¶ However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. ¶ In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. ¶ There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face.¶ A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally.¶ Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth).¶ The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard.¶ The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%.¶ Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development".¶ If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too.¶ Dangerous states¶ It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state.¶ The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy.¶ It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system.¶ Challenges to the democratic model¶ The trend in East Asia has been for developing economies to steadily embrace democracy and the rule of law in order to sustain their national success. But to thrive, new democracies also have to deliver basic economic growth. The economic crisis has hit democracies hard, with Japanese Prime Minister Aso Taro's approval collapsing to single digits in the polls and South Korea's Lee Myung-bak and Taiwan's Ma Ying Jeou doing only a little better (and the collapse in Taiwan's exports - particularly to China - is sure to undermine Ma's argument that a more accommodating stance toward Beijing will bring economic benefits to Taiwan). Thailand's new coalition government has an uncertain future after two years of post-coup drift and now economic crisis.¶ The string of old and new democracies in East Asia has helped to anchor US relations with China and to maintain what former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice once called a "balance of power that favors freedom". A reversal of the democratic expansion of the past two decades would not only impact the global balance of power but also increase the potential number of failed states, with all the attendant risk they bring from harboring terrorists to incubating pandemic diseases and trafficking in persons. It would also undermine the demonstration effect of liberal norms we are urging China to embrace at home.

#### Romney reinstates the Gag Rule.

Bassett 10/10 [Laura Bassett, Romney Reiterates: 'I'm A Pro-Life Candidate', http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/10/10/romney-pro-life-abortion\_n\_1955812.html]

After telling a reporter on Tuesday that he would not pursue any legislation to restrict abortion, Republican candidate Mitt Romney waved away suspicions Wednesday that his anti-abortion stance is wavering.

"I think I've said time and again, I'm a pro-life candidate," he told reporters at a campaign stop in Ohio according to a pool report. "I'll be a pro-life president. The actions I'll take immediately are to remove funding for Planned Parenthood. It will not be part of my budget."

The former Massachusetts governor also reiterated his plan to reinstate the "Global Gag Rule," which prevents non-governmental organizations overseas that receive U.S. aid money from counseling patients on or referring them to abortion services. The Hyde amendment already prevents those organizations from using U.S. money to pay for abortions.

Romney, who has called Roe v. Wade "one of the darkest moments in Supreme Court history," was forced to defend his anti-abortion position on Wednesday after he told the Des Moines Register on Tuesday, "There's no legislation with regards to abortion that I'm familiar with that would become part of my agenda." His campaign walked back his statement within two hours, saying that he would "of course" support legislation aimed at restricting access to abortion.

The Obama campaign accused Romney on Wednesday of being dishonest about his anti-abortion position in order to "close the deal" with female voters.

"He didn't soften these positions, he's trying to hide them," Stephanie Cutter, President Barack Obama's campaign manager, told reporters. "If people believe that he's changed his mind, they should go ahead and ask him."

#### Extinction.

Cote 4 (Robin, Author, Lecturer + member of non-profit The Life Center, "Overpopulation Equals Disaster," http://www.truth101.org/vs-overpopulation.html)

By their support of anti-choice laws, such as restrictions on foreign aid, (http://www.pro-truth.net/30-references.html#gag) and by their opposition to certain practices, the anti-abortion promoters deny sex education, birth control, and abortion to millions in third-world countries while the impoverished overpopulation in these countries is busy cutting down what’s left of the rain forests to feed still more unwanted children. The rain forests are not only the homes for most life forms on this planet, these forests are also an **essential requirement for a stable global environment**. In the developed countries, to accommodate the increasing population, people are busy building still more factories and cars which produce even more pollution. Pollution is destroying the ozone layer at a phenomenal rate and has already begun to produce an **irreversible, environmental disaster of as-yet unimaginable proportions**. **Outlawing abortion is like playing a variation of Russian roulette where it's your turn until the gun goes off.**

### 1NC CP 1

#### The Executive Branch of the United States should enter into binding consultation with the legislation branch over a proposal to acquire small modular nuclear reactors on mission critical military installations in the United States.  The Executive Branch should commit to implementing the outcome of the consultation.

#### The counterplan advocates LESS CHANGE than the status quo – if the counterplan solves as well as the aff that means presumption flips negative.

#### Consultation is crucial to bring Congress in as a full partner and avoid interbranch struggles and micromanagement

Linda S. Jamison, Deputy Director of Government Relations at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Spring 1993 (“Executive-Legislative Relations after the Cold War” – The Washington Quarterly) p. lexis

Likewise, the president must show his willingness and sincerity in dealing with Congress. Presidential initiatives are more likely to survive congressional scrutiny and the formal oversight process when the president is willing to treat Congress as a full partner in formulating and creating policy. The consultative process is especially useful when the president considers the use of military force to carry out foreign policy objectives. Congress must be brought in on the decisions to commit U.S. troops to combat. The paper also includes further recommendations for how the executive branch can improve and consolidate its strategy toward Congress. The thoughtful recommendations derived from the Iran-contra debacle serve as a warning that future failures to build consensus will produce similar constitutional struggles, which thus will continue to plague U.S. foreign policy. Among the paper's observations, the most compelling is that the system of shared powers will never work effectively until the executive recognizes Congress as a full and competent partner in the making of policy -- a need that has become even more imperative over the years as the boundaries between foreign policy and domestic policy have become more diffuse and vague.

#### Effective interbranch cooperation is vital to United States leadership – avoiding unilateral presidential actions is essential

Robert A. Pastor, Professor of Political Science at Emory University and Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at Emory’s Carter Center, Autumn 1991 (“Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy: Comparative Advantage or Disadvantage” – The Washington Quarterly) p. lexis

The constitutional relationship between the two branches is not the problem; indeed, the interbranch model provides the best vehicle for U.S. leadership in a complex world. The essence of forging "a new engagement" between Congress and the president is attitudinal -- to recognize that both branches are responsible for conflicts and that they occur as much because of presidential arrogance as of congressional assertiveness. If, for example, President Bush, flush with the success of a military victory, chooses either to ignore the Congress on an important issue or to bash the minority who voted for continuation of sanctions rather than war, he will rapidly transform interbranch comity into partisan conflict. The way to make the United States a more effective global actor is for each branch to modify its approach to take account of the other's perspective. An assertive Congress can be a positive force, and a lever in international negotiations, as Thomas Mann has shown, when the two branches respect and maintain the delicate balance between them. Interbranch politics is often viewed as a liability in foreign policy making, but with sensitivity to the distinct roles of each institution, the president and Congress can transform the process to the comparative advantage of the United States.

### 1NC CP 2

#### Counterplan Text: The Executive Branch of the United States should acquire small modular nuclear reactors near mission critical military installations in the United States. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should waive siting restrictions for Executive Branch small modular nuclear reactors.

#### Solves the case – SMR’s near the base can just as effectively provide power

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

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

Having DoD as the exclusive user is not practical for almost all DoD installations because even small nuclear power plants generate more power than is needed on almost all DoD installations. If a nuclear plant doesn’t operate near capacity the cost of the power it supplies increases, making the business case unattractive. Having a DoD installation, or a group of DoD installations, as a priority user would allow an SMR plant to better contribute to energy assurance for those installations served by the plant. The installations could continue to be connected to the commercial power grid. When operation of the SMR plant was interrupted for some reason, like maintenance or refueling, the commercial grid could supply the installation power. When the SMR plant is operational it could supply power, even when power from the commercial grid is not available. The principal advantages of an arrangement where DoD is among the commercial users supplied by the nuclear power plant is that it would be easier to reliably operate the plant at full capacity. If contract arrangements could give DoD installations priority access to power when there is an interruption in power supplied by the commercial grid, then DoD electrical power assurance would still be significantly improved. And the nuclear plant would have sufficient capacity to supply many other users in the vicinity of the installations as well. With a long-term power purchase agreement, this could provide reliable power at a stable cost. This kind of arrangement would almost certainly require additional distribution infrastructure and more advanced electrical network control. Producing power for the commercial grid that sells to customers that include DoD would allow the plant to reliably operate at full capacity. Having a small nuclear power plant located on, or near, a DoD installation could make the power supply in that area more reliable than if the area depends on more distant power plants. Additional distribution infrastructure and electrical network controls would also contribute to electrical power assurance.

#### Putting an SMR ON a base disrupts training

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

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

For many years, DoD installations have been under pressure and scrutiny aimed at divesting land that isn't needed for conducting military missions including training. Consequently, it will not be easy to find appropriate sites for nuclear power plants on military installations where there will be little or no impact on military operations or training. However, if a nuclear power plant is deemed to make significant contributions to military missions, then it could be worthwhile to displace, or interfere with, other activities in order to make room for the nuclear power plant.

#### Training is key to military readiness – effects risk of conflict in the Middle East and Asia

Bianca Falcone – The Heritage Foundation – 10/5/12, Defending Readiness: Keep Military Training Strong, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/10/05/defending-readiness-keep-military-training-strong/

Cutting the budget for training will have a direct effect on America’s servicemen and women. Troops who are not adequately trained can be faced with dire consequences when in combat. Chairman Howard “Buck” McKeon (R-CA)of the House Armed Services Committee warned, “When you say that we will be cutting back on training, that can cost lives and that to me is over the top. We’ve gone way too far.” In addition, training cuts will erode military readiness and have a formidable impact on the ability of the United States to adequately respond to future contingencies and conflicts. We do not know when or where our Armed Forces will be engaged next. However, we do know that “recent history tells us to expect the unexpected. The last four U.S. presidents…have each sent America’s military into harm’s way for wars that were not anticipated.” Right now, the United States is facing a destabilized Middle East, China’s growing military forces, and an Iran on the brink of gaining nuclear weapons—all while our service members are still engaged in Afghanistan. Now is not the time to reduce flight hours for our Air Force pilots, steaming days for our sailors, or training for any of our service members—it is dangerous and irresponsible. As General Joseph F. Dunford, U.S. Marine Corps, stated at the HASC hearing, “We have a readiness challenge today. It’ll be exacerbated.” Providing the correct amount of training to successfully complete a mission is imperative to troop safety and morale, as well as military readiness as a whole. It is the government’s job to make sure our troops are prepared and able to get the job done. Congress must work to stop sequestration before it goes into effect on January 2. As Comptroller Hale stated, “If you’re driving into a brick wall at 60 miles an hour, let’s find a way to avoid the wall, not figure out a way to pick up the pieces after we hit it.”

#### Training is key to readiness which is key to global deterrence – decline causes lashout and war

Spencer, Senior Research Fellow at Heritage, 2000

(The Facts About Military Readiness, www.heritage.org/research/reports/2000/09/bg1394-the-facts-about-military-readiness

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace. Readiness Defined. Readiness measures the ability of a military unit, such as an Army division or a carrier battle group, to accomplish its assigned mission. Logistics, available spare parts, training, equipment, and morale all contribute to readiness. The military recognizes four grades of readiness.7 At the highest level, a unit is prepared to move into position and accomplish its mission. At the lowest level, a unit requires further manpower, training, equipment, and/or logistics to accomplish its mission. There is evidence of a widespread lack of readiness within the U.S. armed forces. Recently leaked Army documents report that 12 of the 20 schools training soldiers in skills such as field artillery, infantry, and aviation have received the lowest readiness rating. They also disclose that over half of the Army's combat and support training centers are rated at the lowest readiness grade.8 As recently as last November, two of the Army's 10 active divisions were rated at the lowest readiness level, and none were rated at the highest.9 Every division required additional manpower, equipment, or training before it would be prepared for combat, due largely to the units' commitments to operations in the Balkans.10 And 23 percent of the Army's Chinook cargo helicopters, 19 percent of its Blackhawk helicopters, and 16 percent of its Apaches are not "mission-capable."11 In other words, they are not ready. The Facts about Military Readiness The reduction in forces of the U.S. armed forces began in the early 1990s. After the end of the Cold War, the Bush Administration began to reduce the size of the military so that it would be consistent with post-Cold War threats.12 Under the Clinton Administration, however, that reduction in forces escalated too rapidly at the same time that U.S. forces were deployed too often with too little funding. The result was decreased readiness as personnel, equipment, training, and location suffered. Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, the U.S. military has been deployed on over 50 peacekeeping and peace-enforcement operations.13 Yet the resources available to fund these missions have steadily decreased: The number of total active personnel has decreased nearly 30 percent, and funding for the armed services has decreased 16 percent. The strain on the armed forces shows clearly now as the reduced forces deploy for too long with insufficient and antiquated equipment. The result is indisputable: Readiness is in decline. Because the security of the United States is at stake, it is imperative to present the facts about military readiness: FACT #1. The size of the U.S. military has been cut drastically in the past decade. Between 1992 and 2000, the Clinton Administration cut national defense by more than half a million personnel and $50 billion in inflation-adjusted dollars.14 (See Table 1.) The Army alone has lost four active divisions and two Reserve divisions. Because of such cuts, the Army has lost more than 205,000 soldiers, or 30 percent of its staff, although its missions have increased significantly throughout the 1990s. In 1992, the U.S. Air Force consisted of 57 tactical squadrons and 270 bombers. Today the Air Force has 52 squadrons and 178 bombers. The total number of active personnel has decreased by nearly 30 percent. In the Navy, the total number of ships has decreased significantly as well. In 1992, there were around 393 ships in the fleet, while today there are only 316, a decrease of 20 percent. The number of Navy personnel has fallen by over 30 percent. In 1992, the Marine Corps consisted of three divisions. The Corps still has three divisions, but since 1992, it has lost 22,000 active duty personnel, or 11 percent of its total. The Clinton Administration also cut the Marine Corps to 39,000 reserve personnel from 42,300 in 1992. Effect on Readiness. In spite of these drastic force reductions, missions and operations tempo have increased, resulting in decreased military readiness. Because every mission affects far greater numbers of servicemen than those directly involved, most operations other than warfare, such as peacekeeping, have a significant negative impact on readiness. For each serviceman who participates in a military operation, two others are involved in the mission: one who is preparing to take the participant's place, and another who is recovering from having participated and retraining. Therefore, if 10,000 troops are on peace operations in the Balkans, 30,000 troops are actually being taken away from preparing for combat. Ten thousand are actively participating, while 10,000 are recovering, and 10,000 are preparing to go. Coupled with declining personnel, increased tempo has a devastating effect on readiness. Morale problems stemming from prolonged deployments, equipment that wears out too quickly, and decreased combat training levels heighten when troops are committed to non-combat operations. Further exacerbating the military's declining readiness is the tendency to take troops with special skills from non-deployed units. Thus, a mission may affect non-deployed units as well because they will not be able to train properly. The soldiers integral to the non-deployed mission are not present, and there is no one to take their place. A mission's spillover effects are clearly illustrated by a July 2000 report by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) on the U.S. commitments in the Balkans: In January 2000 ... four active divisions and one Guard division were affected by these operations [in the Balkans]. Among the active divisions, the 1st Cavalry Division was recovering from a 1-year deployment in Bosnia, the 10th Mountain Division was deployed there, and elements of the Guard's 49th Armored Division were preparing to deploy there. At the same time, the European-based 1st Infantry Division was deployed to Kosovo, and the 1st Armored Division was preparing to deploy there. Although none of these divisions deployed in its entirety, deployment of key components--especially headquarters--makes these divisions unavailable for deployment elsewhere in case of a major war.15 Simultaneously, the military's budget has continuously decreased over the past eight years; and, thus, the services are being forced to choose between funding quality of life improvements, procurement, training, and other essential spending. Consequently, none is adequately funded. For example, the Army is short by thousands of night vision goggles, binoculars, global positioning systems and hundreds of generator sets, battery chargers, and chemical agent monitors. (See Table 2.) According to the Office of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, these shortages are due to "recent increases in requirements," "slowed procurement funding," and "use of operations and maintenance funds for higher priorities."16 Furthermore, when smaller forces deploy for more missions, the result is increased wear-and-tear on equipment and longer deployments for servicemen. Coupled with too little money, the result is a military weakened by aging equipment, low morale, and poor training. FACT #2. Military deployments have increased dramatically throughout the 1990s. The pace of deployments has increased 16-fold since the end of the Cold War.17 According to Representative Curt Weldon (R-PA), the Clinton Administration has deployed U.S. forces 34 times in less than eight years. During the entire 40-year period of the Cold War, the military was committed to comparable deployments just 10 times.18 Between 1960 and 1991, the Army conducted 10 operations outside of normal training and alliance commitments, but between 1992 and 1998, the Army conducted 26 such operations. Similarly, the Marines conducted 15 contingency operations between 1982 and 1989, and 62 since 1989.19 During the 1990s, U.S. forces of 20,000 or more troops were engaged in non-warfighting missions in Somalia (1993), Haiti (1994), Bosnia (1996), and Iraq and Kuwait (1998).20 In 1998, before U.S. interventions in Kosovo and East Timor, General Henry Shelton, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned, "In the past four years we've conducted some four dozen major operations. And today, in support of our national strategy, we have more than 50,000 troops deployed in 12 major operations--and, I might add, many smaller ones--in dozens of countries around the world." Today the Army has 144,716 soldiers in 126 countries.21 Throughout the 1990s, U.S. taxpayers spent an average of $3 billion per year on peace operations.22 In 1990, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) spent around $200 million on peace operations. Today that amount has ballooned to $3.6 billion.23 The 78-day Kosovo campaign in 1999 cost around $5 billion, not including the ongoing peace mission.24 Operations Southern and North Watch in Iraq cost $1.1 billion per year; the Haiti operation cost a total of $2.4 billion; and to date, the Balkans have cost over $15 billion.25 (See Table 3.) Effect on Readiness. This dramatic increase in the use of America's armed forces has had a detrimental effect on overall combat readiness. According to General Shelton, "our experience in the Balkans underscores the reality that multiple, persistent commitments place a significant strain on our people and can erode warfighting readiness."26 Both people and equipment wear out faster under frequent use. For example, units deployed in Somalia took 10 months to restore their equipment to predeployment readiness levels.27 According to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) survey of Army leaders who participated in peace missions, almost two-thirds said that their units' training readiness had declined.28 Training is a key component of readiness, and frequent missions cause the armed forces to reduce training schedules. For example, Operation Allied Force caused 22 joint exercises to be cancelled in 1999. Joint training exercises were reduced from 277 in fiscal year (FY) 1996 to 189 in FY 2000.

### 1NC—Hege Advantage

#### The system is robust—they have learned from past experiences.

Cauley 11—President and Chief Executive Officer North American Electric Reliability Corporation [Gerry Cauley, “HEADLINE: ELECTRIC GRID AND INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY,” Committee on House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, CQ Congressional Testimony, May 31, 2011 Tuesday]

The electricity being used in this room right now is generated and transmitted in real time over a complex series of lines and stations from as far away as Ontario or Tennessee. As complex as it is, few machines are as robust as the bulk power system. Decades of experience with hurricanes, ice storms and other natural disasters, as well as mechanical breakdowns, vandalism and sabotage, have taught the electric industry how to build strong and reliable networks that generally withstand all but the worst natural and physical disasters while supporting affordable electric service. The knowledge that disturbances on the grid can impact operations thousands of miles away has influenced the electric industry culture of reliability, affecting how it plans, operates and protects the bulk power system.

#### No impact to sabotage

Newitz 10 [ANNALEE NEWITZ, The US electrical grid is too crappy to be vulnerable to terrorist attack, say physicists,” IO9, October 13, 2010 8:30 AM, pg. http://io9.com/5662593/the-us-electrical-grid-is-too-crappy-to-be-vulnerable-to-terrorist-attack-say-physicists]

Last year, network theorists published some papers suggesting that terrorists could take down the entire US electrical grid by attacking a small, remote power station. But new research shows that network theory models, which great for analyzing many complex systems, don't work for patchwork systems like the US electrical grid. Basically, the grid was set up so haphazardly that you'd have to take out a major node before you'd affect the entire thing. (Want to see a map of the US electrical grid? Check out this one on NPR.)

Science Daily sums up:

[The] electric grid is probably more secure that many people realize — because it is so unpredictable. This, of course, makes it hard to improve its reliability (in another line of research, [study co-author Paul] Hines has explored why the rate of blackouts in the United States hasn't improved in decades), but the up-side of this fact is that it would be hard for a terrorist to bring large parts of the grid down by attacking just one small part.

The researchers based their conclusions on real-world data from the power grid in the eastern U.S.

#### Reactors are still in the research stage—they are decades away from being deployable.

Anderson 10—Senior Engineer in the Integrated Applications Office @ National Renewable Energy Laboratory [Kate Anderson “SMALL NUCLEAR REACTORS,” White Paper, February 1, 2010]

Despite these benefits, small reactors have many challenges to overcome. A few designs are in the engineering phase and could be commercialized within a decade, but most designs are still in the research stage, and will require extensive engineering and demonstration before they are ready to be commercialized. The unique design features that make small reactors appealing, like passive safety systems and integral designs, require non-traditional components that will need to be fully developed, tested, and demonstrated. Additional developments in instrumentation and control will be needed for most small reactor designs. Designs that depart from the traditional light water reactortechnology may required significant material and fuel qualification as well, which could take 10-12 years or more.9 pg. 3-4

### 1NC—Cyber

#### No cyber terrorism—tech complexity, image factor, and accident issue.

Conway 11 — Maura Conway, Lecturer in International Security in the School of Law and Government at Dublin City University, 2011 (“Against Cyberterrorism: Why cyber-based terrorist attacks are unlikely to occur,” *Communications of the ACM*, Volume 54, Number 2, February, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ACM Online)

Three Arguments Against Cyberterrorism

In my opinion, the three most compelling arguments against cyberterrorism are:

The argument of **Technological Complexity**;

The argument regarding **9/11 and the Image Factor**; and

The argument regarding **9/11 and the Accident Issue**.

The first argument is treated in the academic literature; the second and third arguments are not, but ought to be. None of these are angles to which journalists appear to have devoted a lot of thought or given adequate consideration.

In the speech mentioned earlier, FBI Director Mueller observed "Terrorists have shown a clear interest in pursuing hacking skills. And they will either train their own recruits or hire outsiders, with an eye toward combining physical attacks with cyber attacks." That may very well be true, but the argument from Technological Complexity underlines that 'wanting' to do something is quite different from having the ability to do the same. Here's why:

Violent jihadis' IT knowledge is not superior. For example, in research carried out in 2007, it was found that of a random sampling of 404 members of violent Islamist groups, 196 (48.5%) had a higher education, with information about subject areas available for 178 individuals. Of these 178, some 8 (4.5%) had trained in computing, which means that out of the entire sample, less than 2% of the jihadis came from a computing background.3 And not even these few could be assumed to have mastery of the complex systems necessary to carry out a successful cyberterrorist attack.

Real-world attacks are difficult enough. What are often viewed as relatively unsophisticated real-world attacks undertaken by highly educated individuals are routinely unsuccessful. One only has to consider the failed car bomb attacks planned and carried out by medical doctors in central London and at Glasgow airport in June 2007.

Hiring hackers would compromise operational security. The only remaining option is to retain "outsiders" to undertake such an attack. This is very operationally risky. It would force the terrorists to operate outside their own circles and thus leave them ripe for infiltration. Even if they successfully got in contact with "real" hackers, they would be in no position to gauge their competency accurately; they would simply have to trust in same. This would be very risky.

So on the basis of technical know-how alone cyberterror attack is not imminent, but this is not the only factor one must take into account. The events of Sept. 11, 2001 underscore that for a true terrorist event spectacular moving images are crucial. The attacks on the World Trade Center were a fantastic piece of performance violence; look back on any recent roundup of the decade and mention of 9/11 will not just be prominent, but pictures will always be provided.

The problem with respect to cyber-terrorism is that many of the attack scenarios put forward, from shutting down the electric power grid to contaminating a major water supply, fail on this account: they are unlikely to have easily captured, spectacular (live, moving) images associated with them, something we—as an audience—have been primed for by the attack on the World Trade Center on 9/11.

The only cyberterrorism scenario that would fall into this category is interfering with air traffic control systems to crash planes, but haven't we seen that planes can much more easily be employed in spectacular "real-world" terrorism? And besides, aren't all the infrastructures just mentioned much easier and more spectacular to simply blow up? It doesn't end there, however. For me, the third argument against cyberterrorism is perhaps the most compelling; yet it is very rarely mentioned.

In 2004, Howard Schmidt, former White House Cybersecurity Coordinator, remarked to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary regarding Nimda and Code Red that "we to this day don't know the source of that. It could have very easily been a terrorist."4 This observation betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature and purposes of terrorism, particularly its attention-getting and communicative functions.

A terrorist attack with the potential to be hidden, portrayed as an accident, or otherwise remain unknown is unlikely to be viewed positively by any terrorist group. In fact, one of the most important aspects of the 9/11 attacks in New York from the perpetrators viewpoint was surely the fact that while the first plane to crash into the World Trade Center could have been accidental, the appearance of the second plane confirmed the incident as a terrorist attack in real time. Moreover, the crash of the first plane ensured a large audience for the second plane as it hit the second tower.

Alternatively, think about the massive electric failure that took place in the northeastern U.S. in August 2003: if it was a terrorist attack—and I'm not suggesting that it was—but if it was, it would have been a spectacular failure.

Conclusion

Given the high cost—not just in terms of money, but also time, commitment, and effort—and the high possibility of failure on the basis of manpower issues, timing, and complexity of a potential cyberterrorist attack, the costs appear to me to still very largely outweigh the potential publicity benefits. The publicity aspect is crucial for potential perpetrators of terrorism and so the possibility that an attack may be apprehended or portrayed as an accident, which would be highly likely with regard to cyberterrorism, is detrimental. Add the lack of spectacular moving images and it is my belief that cyberterrorism, regardless of what you may read in newspapers, see on television, or obtain via other media sources, is not in our near future.

So why then the persistent treatment of cyberterrorism on the part of journalists? Well, in this instance, science fiction-type fears appear to **trump rational calculation** almost every time. And I haven't even begun to discuss how the media discourse has clearly influenced the pronouncements of policymakers.

#### No impact to a cyber-attack on the grid. Prefer our ev—their authors have an economic incentive to hype the threat.

Hallinan 12—Conn Hallinan is a Foreign Policy In Focus columnist [January 11, 2012, “Cyber War: Reality or Hype?” Foreign Policy in Focus, http://www.fpif.org/articles/cyber\_war\_reality\_or\_hype]

But consider the sources for all this scare talk: Clarke is the chair of a firm that consults on cyber security, and McConnell is the executive vice-president of defense contractor Booz Allen Hamilton. Both are currently doing business with the Pentagon.

Arms giants like Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Northrop Grumman, Boeing, and other munitions manufactures are moving heavily into the cyber security market. In 2010, Boeing snapped up Argon ST and Narus, two cyber security firms with an estimated value of $2.4 billion. Raytheon bought Applied Signal Technology, General Dynamics absorbed Network Connectivity Solutions, and Britain’s major arms firm, BAE, purchased Norkom and ETI.

“There is a feeding frenzy right now to provide products and services to meet the demands of governments, law enforcement, and the military,” says Ron Deibert, director of the Canada Center for Global Security Studies.

There are big bucks at stake. Between the Defense Department and Homeland Security, the United States will spend some $10.5 billion for cyber security by 2015. The Pentagon’s new Cyber Command is slated to have a staff of 10,000, and according to Northrop executive Kent Schneider, the market for cyber arms and security in the United States is $100 billion.

But is cyber war everything it’s cracked up to be, and is the United States really so behind the curve in the scramble to develop cyber weapons?

According to investigative journalist Seymour Hersh, the potential for cyber mayhem has “been exaggerated,” and the Defense Department and cyber security firms have blurred the line between cyber espionage and cyber war. The former is the kind of thing that goes on, day in and day out, among governments and industry, except its medium is the Internet. The latter is an attack on another country’s ability to wage war, defend itself, or run its basic infrastructure.

Most experts say the end-of-the-world scenarios drawn up by people like Clarke are largely fiction. How could an enemy shut down the U.S. national power grid when there is no such thing? A cyber attack would have to disrupt more than 100 separate power systems throughout the nation to crash the U.S. grid.

Most financial institutions are also protected. The one example of a successful cyber attack in that area was an apparent North Korean cyber assault this past March on the South Korean bank Nonghyup that crashed the institution’s computers. But an investigation found that the bank had been extremely remiss in changing passwords and controlling access to its computers. According to Peter Sommer, author of the OECD report Reducing Systemic Cybersecurity Risk, the cyber threat to banks “is a bit of nonsense.”

However, given that many Americans rely on computers, cell phones, smart devices, and the like, any hint that an “enemy” could disrupt access to those devices is likely to get attention. Throw in some scary scenarios and a cunning enemy—China—and it’s pretty easy to make people nervous.

But contrary to McConnell’s statement, the United States is more advanced in computers than other countries in the world, and the charge that the country is behind the curve sounds suspiciously like the “bomber gap” with the Russians in the 1950s and the “missile gap” in the 1960s. Both were illusions that had more to do with U.S. presidential elections and arms industry lobbying than anything in the real world.

### 1NC—Drones

#### Drones suck – undermine credibility & boost recruitment

CAVALLARO et al 12 professor of law & founding director of Stanford Law School's International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic [James Cavallaro, http://livingunderdrones.org/report-strategy/]

Strategic Considerations

The central justification for US drone strikes is that they are necessary to make the US safer by disrupting militant activity. Proponents argue that they are an effective, accurate, and precise tool to that end. However, serious questions have been raised about the accuracy and efficacy of strikes, and the publicly available evidence that they have made the US safer overall is ambiguous at best. Considerable costs also have been documented. The under-accounted-for harm to civilians–injuries, killings, and broad impacts on daily life, education, and mental health–was analyzed in detail above, and must be factored as a severe cost of the US program.[1] In addition, it is clear that US strikes in Pakistan foster anti-American sentiment and undermine US credibility not only in Pakistan but throughout the region. There is strong evidence to suggest that US drone strikes have facilitated recruitment to violent non-state armed groups, and motivate attacks against both US military and civilian targets. Further, current US targeted killing and drone strike practices may set dangerous global legal precedents, erode the rule of law, and facilitate recourse to lethal force.

A significant rethinking of current policies, in light of all available evidence, the concerns of various stakeholders, and short and long-term costs and benefits, is long overdue.

#### Strikes undermine US credibility abroad – undermine other efforts

CAVALLARO et al 12 professor of law & founding director of Stanford Law School's International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic [James Cavallaro, http://livingunderdrones.org/report-strategy/]

Drones Undermine US Credibility in Pakistan and Throughout the Region¶ Despite the vast foreign aid the US has invested in Pakistan, a 2012 poll by the Pew Research Center’s Global Attitude project found that 74% of Pakistanis consider the US an enemy, up from 64% three years ago.[71] Only 45% of Pakistanis felt it important to improve relations with the US, down from 60% the previous year, and fewer support cooperation or even receiving aid from the US.[72]¶ The growing unpopularity of the US in Pakistan weakens the countries’ bilateral relationship, makes it more difficult for Pakistani political leaders to work collaboratively with the US, and risks undermining Pakistani democracy and development. The deterioration of the Pakistani-US bilateral relationship may also place US security at risk.¶ Dennis Blair, former Director of National Intelligence, described how unilateral American drone attacks in Pakistan are eroding US “influence and damaging our ability to work with Pakistan to achieve other important security objectives like eliminating Taliban sanctuaries, encouraging Indian-Pakistani dialogue, and making Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal more secure.”[73] Cameron Munter, who announced his early resignation as US Ambassador to Pakistan in May 2012,[74] reportedly revealed to colleagues that he “didn’t realize his main job was to kill people.”[75] In previous interviews, he criticized the US use of drones, arguing that the attacks need to be more “judicious.”[76] Although Secretary of State Hilary Clinton strongly supports drone strikes, she reportedly also has “complained to colleagues about the drones-only approach at Situation Room meetings.”[77] The New York Times reported in May 2012, “some officials felt the urgency of counterterrorism strikes was crowding out consideration of a broader strategy against radicalization.”[78]¶ The focus on drones also risks undermining Pakistan’s development by incentivizing undemocratic decision-making and fostering instability. In 2009, Anne Patterson, US Ambassador to Pakistan, discussed the risks of the US drone strategy in a cable sent to the Department of State. She noted, “Increased unilateral operations in these areas risk destabilizing the Pakistani state, alienating both the civilian government and military leadership, and provoking a broader governance crisis within Pakistan without finally achieving the goal [of eliminating the Al Qaeda and Taliban leadership].”[79] Pakistan High Commissioner to the United Kingdom Wajid Shamsul Hasan told The Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ):¶ What has been the whole outcome of these drone attacks is, that you have rather directly or indirectly contributed to destabilizing or undermining the democratic government. Because people really make fun of the democratic government–when you pass a resolution against drone attacks in the parliament, and nothing happens. The Americans don’t listen to you, and they continue to violate your territory.[80]¶ The US strikes have also contributed to the delegitimization of NGOs that are perceived as Western, or that receive US aid, including those providing much-needed services, such as access to water and education, and those administering the polio vaccine; this perception has been exploited by Taliban forces.[81]¶ The significant global opposition to drone strikes also erodes US credibility in the international community. In 17 of the 20 countries polled by the Pew Global Attitudes Project, the majority of those surveyed disapproved of US drone attacks in countries like Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen.[82] Widespread opposition spans the globe, from traditional European allies such as France (63% disapproval) and Germany (59% disapproval) to key Middle East states such as Egypt (89% disapproval) and Turkey (81% disapproval).[83] As with other unpopular American foreign policy engagements, including the invasion of Iraq and the practice of torture at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere, drone strikes weaken the standing of the US in the world, straining its relationships with allies, and making it more difficult for it to build multilateral alliances to tackle pressing global challenges.

### 1NC—Water

#### Alt cause—export regulations

Platts, 10/1/2012. “Export reform needed to increase US nuclear market share: NEI,” http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6666149.

Export controls on technology related to nuclear power should be reformed to allow US companies to capture a larger share of growing international markets, the Nuclear Energy Institute said Monday. The US Department of Commerce estimates the world market for nuclear power technology, fuel and related services and equipment at "upwards of" $750 billion over the next 10 years, Richard Myers, vice president for policy development, planning and supplier programs at NEI, said at a press conference Monday in Washington to release a report the US nuclear power industry commissioned on the topic. "It is a myth that the US nuclear supply chain has disappeared," Myers said. Most manufacturing of large "heavy metal" components for nuclear power plants, such as reactor vessels, is now done in Asia, but many US firms manufacture "precision components" for the nuclear industry and would stand to benefit from increased ability to compete with other countries, Myers said. US licensing and regulatory reviews of nuclear exports, however, are "unduly burdensome," have confusing "layers of jurisdiction" shared by at least four federal agencies, and typically take at least a year to complete, "months longer" than reviews in other exporter countries, he said. As a result, the US export control regime is "far more complex and more difficult to navigate ... than comparable regimes in other nations," Myers said. The report prepared by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman for NEI said that "US agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger executive branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that US exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly 'level the playing field' for US exporters in the near term." Many such reforms can be accomplished "administratively," without the need for legislation, James Glasgow, a partner at Pillsbury who specializes in nuclear export law, said during the press conference. The US Department of Energy is currently amending some of its export regulations, known as the Part 810 rule, and reforming that rule could provide significant opportunities to US exporters, Glasgow said. Unfortunately, some of DOE's proposed revisions to the rule go in the wrong direction, adding regulatory requirements and hurdles, Myers said. Some potential customers for US nuclear exports see DOE's Part 810 review as "the choke point" for an order, and "sometimes that's an evaluation criterion" for deciding whether to buy from a US firm, Glasgow said. In such situations, delay in the review can be "the functional equivalence of denial" of permission for the export because the buyer looks elsewhere, he said.

\*\*\*Burdensome U.S. export regulations are the critical obstacle to nuclear leadership—the U.S. actually still has the supply chain, but massive delays in processing push countries away from the U.S.

#### No water wars AND no impact to water scarcity

Allouche 11—Jeremy Allouche, research Fellow, water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, former professor – MIT, PhD in International Relations from the Graduate Institute of International Studies [“The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” *Food Policy*, Volume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Pages S3–S8, Science Direct]

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable.

Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations

In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.

In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action.

The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.

None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).

As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 ( [FAO, 1978] and [FAO, 1984]).

The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example [Allouche, 2005], [Allouche, 2007] and [Rouyer, 2000]). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians ( [Dinar and Dinar, 2005] and [Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006]).

In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.

The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict ( [Brauch, 2002] and [Pervis and Busby, 2004]). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and [Kevane and Gray, 2008]).

## \*\*\* 2NC

### 2NC Solvency Block

#### Their Andres and Breetz evidence says that the DOD serving as a customer for SMR’s is sufficient to solve

Andres and Breetz 11

(Richard B. Andres, Professor of national Security Strategy at the national War College and doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications,” National Defense University Strategic Forum, http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/strforum/sf-262.pdf)

Unfortunately, the technology for these reactors is, for the most part, caught between the drawing board and production. Claims regarding the field utility and safety of various reactors are plausible, but authoritative evaluation will require substantial investment and technology demonstration. In the U.S. market, DOD could play an important role in this area. In the event that the U.S. small reactor industry succeeds without DOD support, the types of designs that emerge might not be useful for the department since some of the larger, more efficient designs that have greater appeal to private industry would not fit the department’s needs. Thus, there is significant incentive for DOD to intervene to provide a market, both to help the industry survive and to shape its direction.

#### Purchasing is key to solvency not location of the SMR’s

Rosner and Goldberg, Professor of Physics at U Chicago and Assistant to the Director at the Argonne National Laboratory, 11

(Small Modular Reactors – Key to Future Nuclear Power Generation in the U.S., https://epic.sites.uchicago.edu/sites/epic.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/EPICSMRWhitePaperFinalcopy.pdf)

Similar to other important energy technologies, such as energy storage and renewables, “market pull” activities coupled with the traditional “technology push” activities would significantly increase the likelihood of timely and successful commercialization. Market transformation incentives serve two important objectives. They facilitate demand for the off-take of SMR plants, thus reducing market risk and helping to attract private investment without high risk premiums. In addition, if such market transformation opportunities could be targeted to higher price electricity markets or higher value electricity applications, they would significantly reduce the cost of any companion production incentives. There are three special market opportunities that may provide the additional market pull needed to successfully commercialize SMRs: the federal government, international applications, and the need for replacement of existing coal generation plants. 6.2.1 Purchase Power Agreements with Federal Agency Facilities Federal facilities could be the initial customer for the output of the LEAD or FOAK SMR plants. The federal government is the largest single consumer of electricity in the U.S., but its use of electricity is widely dispersed geographically and highly fragmented institutionally (i.e., many suppliers and customers). Current federal electricity procurement policies do not encourage aggregation of demand, nor do they allow for agencies to enter into long-term contracts that are “bankable” by suppliers. President Obama has sought to place federal agencies in the vanguard of efforts to adopt clean energy technologies and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Executive Order 13514, issued on October 5, 2009, calls for reductions in greenhouse gases by all federal agencies, with DOE establishing a target of a 28% reduction by 2020, including greenhouse gases associated with purchased electricity. SMRs provide one potential option to meet the President’s Executive Order. One or more federal agency facilities that can be cost effectively connected to an SMR plant could agree to contract to purchase the bulk of the power output from a privately developed and financed LEAD plant. A LEAD plant, even without the benefits of learning, could offer electricity to federal facilities at prices competitive with the unsubsidized significant cost of other clean energy technologies. Table 4 shows that the LCOE estimates for the LEAD and FOAK-1plants are in the range of the unsubsidized national LCOE estimates for other clean electricity generation technologies (based on the current state of maturity of the other technologies). All of these technologies should experience additional learning improvements over time. However, as presented earlier in the learning model analysis, the study team anticipates significantly greater learning improvements in SMR technology that would improve the competitive position of SMRs over time. Additional competitive market opportunities can be identified on a region-specific, technology-specific basis. For example, the Southeast U.S. has limited wind resources. While the region has abundant biomass resources, the estimated unsubsidized cost of biomass electricity is in the range of $90-130 per MWh (9-13¢/kWh), making LEAD and FOAK plants very competitive (prior to consideration of subsidies). Competitive pricing is an important, but not the sole, element to successful SMR deployment. A bankable contractual arrangement also is required, and this provides an important opportunity for federal facilities to enter into the necessary purchase power arrangements. However, to provide a “bankable” arrangement to enable the SMR project sponsor to obtain private sector financing, the federal agency purchase agreement may need to provide a guaranteed payment for aggregate output, regardless of actual generation output. Another challenge is to establish a mechanism to aggregate demand among federal electricity consumers if no single federal facility customer has a large enough demand for the output of an SMR module. The study team believes that high level federal leadership, such as that exemplified in E.O. 13514, can surmount these challenges and provide critical initial markets for SMR plants.

#### Prefer the counterplans ability to solve – every extra increment of government involvement decreases the likelihood of successful commercialization

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

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

### AT: Can’t Solve Islanding

#### Islanding is not confined to the physical limits of the base

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

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

Electricity control capabilities, such as self-healing6 and optimization of assets to increase operational efficiency, could improve overall power availability; however, they are not necessary for the integration of small nuclear power plants. Key components for improving electricity control include advanced electricity meters and electricity meter data management. These tools are needed in order to establish islanding, a condition in which a portion of the utility system, which contains both load and generation, is isolated from the remainder of the utility system and continues to operate. Since the power generation capacities of small nuclear power plants are larger than required for most DoD bases, islanding could extend to adjacent communities if sufficient technical upgrades were performed to systems outside of the installation. This contributes to DoD missions because civilians and service members working on the installation often live with their families in adjacent communities. The power would ensure that critical services such as emergency response, waste water treatment, and hospitals could be maintained.

#### Their on bases argument proves – not about forward basing – just need them at large staging areas.

Galloway 10 Brigadier General Gerald E, Former Dean of the Academic Board, US Military Academy and Dean of the Faculty and Academic Programs, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, "On the Need for Creative Energy Solutions", Summer, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/WEB%2007%2027%2010%20MAB%20Powering%20America%27s%20Economy.pdf

Based on the progress made in technology, and on the findings of a study he chaired for the National Academies, General Galloway believes it may be time for the Army to revisit the initiative and consider paradigm shifting technologies like small, modular nuclear reactors. “In 1999, our report on logistics for the future Army recommended looking once again into small nuclear plants. It found that now there are additional benefits, like producing hydrogen for fuel cells. Today, small nuclear reactors are being marketed in the U.S. It’s probably time to think more about this,” General Galloway says. “No one’s envisioned bringing them out in combat zones, but they could provide energy in theater at large staging areas.”

General Galloway sees a special role for DOD in demonstrating these reactors in the United States. “The challenge at many military facilities is that they’re tied to the grid. We’ve seen the grid go down. At the same time, energy demands are rising. Putting a small reactor on a military installation not only provides a reliable and sustainable power source and a test bed to define its longterm utility, but also places the plant in a secure location. Within the United States, it’s hard to find a more physically secure place than a military installation,” says General Galloway. “If the tests go well on bases in the United States, these small reactors could be used to support overseas military operations or disaster recovery activities.”

#### Location flexibility allows it to be NEAR bases

SCHWARTZEL 3 – 30 – 12 [Pitt Post-Gazette Staff [Erich Schwartzel, Minireactor in works at Westinghouse, http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/news/science/minireactor-in-works-at-westinghouse-298739/?print=1]

Minisize nuclear reactors that power individual neighborhoods -- and can be situated near them -- could be designed by Westinghouse and licensed within 10 years if legislation introduced by two Pennsylvania congressmen Friday becomes part of an upcoming national energy bill.

Reps. Jason Altmire, D-McCandless, and Tim Murphy, R-Upper St. Clair, joined Westinghouse executives in the company's Cranberry headquarters for the announcement. It's part of the politicians' first move in making Western Pennsylvania a major player in whatever energy legislation moves through Congress later this year.

The lawmakers see an opportunity for companies in Pittsburgh -- the "energy capital of the world," according to Mr. Murphy.

The Nuclear Power 2021 Act calls for the construction of two small nuclear reactors by 2021, both of which will be funded partially by the Department of Energy. While the legislation presents itself as a possible solution to record-high gasoline prices, the proposal will inevitably be met by anxious constituents still reeling from the recent nuclear meltdown in Japan.

Westinghouse has been working on small nuclear reactors.

The company designed a Small Modular Reactor that shrinks nuclear operations to one capsule that stands about 90 feet tall and doesn't need to be located near a large body of water for its cooling needs.

The 7-month-old project is still in the "nursery" stages of research and development, said Westinghouse CEO Aris Candris, but the company envisions the plants to be something like a new windmill: just part of the scenery.

"You can put it anywhere," said Mr. Altmire.

They can sit within miles of the industrial plant, military base or neighborhood they power. The Small Modular Reactor couldn't power all of Pittsburgh, but it's "more than enough for Cranberry," said Kate Jackson, chief technology officer at Westinghouse.

The location flexibility of the plants is one selling point for the congressmen's reluctant colleagues, still well aware of the earthquake and tsunami in Japan that crippled the country's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant, causing the world's biggest nuclear disaster since the Chernobyl accident in 1986.

### AT: Exclusively Providing to DOD Key

#### 2) Nuclear power plants on military bases do not exclusively provide power to the military

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

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

Sensitivity results for the capacity factor are shown in figure 14. So long as the power plant can be operated at near capacity, small changes in the capacity factor won't affect feasibility very much. Existing large nuclear reactors now operate with capacity factors over 90 percent, and small reactors are expected to perform at least as well. However, if the customer base for a plant only includes DoD users, then there are very few locations where even a small nuclear plant can be operated at near capacity. For most DoD installations, business case considerations require that a DoD sponsored nuclear plant also provide power to non-DoD users.

### AT: to Safety

#### 2) No advantage to putting it on the base – military personnel don’t have the training for safety management

Christine Parthemore and Will Rogers – Center for New American Security – 5/20/10, Parthemore & Rogers: Nuclear Reactors on Military Bases May Be Risky, Roll Call, http://www.cnas.org/node/4502

Proponents of boosting this carbon-free energy source on military bases argue that these installations have unique capacities that would ease concerns over its use, namely more gates and more armed guards already on base 24/7. Likewise, the U.S. military services have unique energy security needs. Consistent energy supplies are a critical component of America’s ability to train at home and to operate globally. Energy is so important that some analysts are even exploring “islanding” the energy systems on some military installations to reduce vulnerabilities related to their reliance on often brittle domestic electric grids. Consideration of nuclear energy as part of these islanding concepts is on the rise. On the other hand, opponents contend that sufficient numbers of military base personnel may not have the requisite training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials to attend to reactors in the round-the-clock manner necessary. In most cases, additional qualified personnel and improved physical security and safety requirements would be needed. As with all nuclear power generation, materials proliferation, water usage, radioactive waste management and public opinion will also be major concerns.

#### 3) Putting reactors on the base make accidents more likely

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

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

DoD must also consider the potential effect of military training on reactor operations. Reactors must be designed to the criteria that no accidents at nearby military facilities may threaten nuclear plant safety. NRC regulations note that accidents at nearby military facilities such as munitions storage areas and ordinance test ranges may threaten safety. Flight training is another area of concern. The NRC stipulates that nuclear plant developers should identify airports within 16 km, and the risks of potential incidents must be taken into consideration [48]. Hybrid concepts that include industrial facilities associated with nuclear reactors raise additional safety concerns.

#### Their 1ac advocate says safety & utility aren’t proven yet either way.

Andres and Breetz 11 Richard B, Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and a Senior Fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University and Hanna L, doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, February, "Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications", [www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf](http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/StrForum/SF-262.pdf)

Unfortunately, the technology for these reactors is, for the most part, caught between the drawing board and production. Claims regarding the field utility and safety of various reactors are plausible, but authoritative evaluation will require substantial investment and technology demonstration. In the U.S. market, DOD could play an important role in this area. In the event that the U.S. small reactor industry succeeds without DOD support, the types of designs that emerge might not be useful for the department since some of the larger, more efficient designs that have greater appeal to private industry would not fit the department’s needs. Thus, there is significant incentive for DOD to intervene to provide a market, both to help the industry survive and to shape its direction.

### SMR’s Disrupt Training/Operations

#### Limits activity that can occur on the base because there are strict restrictions on how land and airspace near a nuclear plant can be used

King, Associate Director of Research and Associate Research Professor of International Affairs at George Washington, 11 (March, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations, <http://www.cna.org/research/2011/feasibility-nuclear-power-us-military>)

There are liabilities to having a nuclear power plant located on a military installation. First, the military installation must find and give up all other use of a small area where the site is to be built. The site would need to be “not too near” to certain types of facilities. For example, not too near a hospital and not too near a facility that stores and handles explosives. Finding a specific site on an installation that is appropriate and suitable may be difficult. In addition, having a nuclear power plant on a military installation would almost certainly impose some restrictions on how land and airspace in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear plant could be used thereafter.

#### Land leased on military bases trades off with military operations – putting it near military bases solves

GAO 2012

(April, RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT FINANCING

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

In addition to the benefits and drawbacks of the financing approaches, not all financing approaches are suitable in all circumstances. For example, an enhanced-use lease requires that a military department have land that is not needed for the time for public use, but is not excess to DOD’s needs. In our previous report on enhanced-use leasing, we found cases where the military was leasing back property that had been included in an enhanced-use lease and cases where there appeared to be reasonable potential that the property included in a lease might be needed for military purposes over the lease’s term, particularly in cases where the leased property was located in the interior, rather than at the perimeter, of the installation. Additionally, although the military services could potentially use existing authorities to convey a renewable energy system to an electric utility company16 or sell renewable energy to a utility,17 the installation must have a renewable energy generation facility on the installation to use those authorities. According to military service headquarters officials, there are several issues with using these authorities for renewable energy projects; for example, officials said that the use of these authorities is complicated. Additionally, the military services may not have such facilities on the installations. Furthermore, some installations have not been able to use certain approaches because of constraints that are outside of the installation’s control. For example, officials at three installations said that they are not able to use Utility Energy Service Contracts at their installations because the area electric utility company does not participate in the program. Additionally, officials at two installations said that they are limited in the alternative-financing approaches that they can use for renewable energy projects since the installations are serviced by regulated utilities. For example, officials at one of the installations said that they believe that they cannot implement any project in which they pay a contractor directly for the energy generated by the kilowatt hour—which is how contracts for projects financed through a power purchase agreement are typically paid—since the local utility is the only entity allowed to sell energy in the area.

### AT: SMR’s Too Small to Effect Training

#### 2) SMR’s aren’t actually all that small – about the size of a shopping mall

Szondy 12

(David, freelance writer he has contributed to Charged and iQ magazine, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” February 16, 2012, http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

One way of getting around many of these problems is through the development of small modular reactors (SMR). These are reactors capable of generating about 300 megawatts of power or less, which is enough to run 45,000 US homes. Though small, SMRs are proper reactors. They are quite different from the radio-thermal generators (RTG) used in spacecraft and remote lighthouses in Siberia. Nuclear reactors such as SMRs use controlled nuclear fission to generate power while RTGs use natural radioactive decay to power a relatively simple thermoelectric generator that can only produce, at most, about two kilowatts. In terms of power, RTGs are the equivalent of batteries while small nuclear reactors are only "small" when compared to conventional reactors. They are hardly the sort that you would keep in the garage. In reality, SMR power plants would cover the area of a small shopping mall. Still, such an installation is not very large as power plants go and a reactor that only produces 300 megawatts may not seem worth the investment, but the US Department of Energy is offering US$452 million in matching grants to develop SMRs and private investors like the Bill Gates Foundation and the company of Babcock and Wilcox are putting up money for their own modular reactor projects.

### 2NC—No Water Wars

#### Water wars are a myth—overwhelming empirical evidence

Weinthal and Vengosh 11—\*Erika Weinthal is Associate Professor of Environmental Policy at the Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke University and \*\*Avner Vengosh is a Professor of Geochemistry and Water Quality and chair of the Water and Air Resources program at the Nicholas School of Environment in Duke University [ed. Richard Parker, Marni Sommer, “Water and Conflict,” ch. 26, *Routledge Handbook of Global Public Health*, Taylor & Francis, Feb 1, 2011]

By the end of the twentieth century, it was thus widely assumed that water scarcity would be a driver of conflict between nation states, especially in the arid regions of MENA. World leaders such as former UN secretary-general, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, famously warned, ‘the next war in the Middle East will he fought over water, not politics' (Vesilind 1993: 53). The Economist, furthermore, predicted in 1999 that '[w]ith 3.5 billion people affected by water shortages by 2050, conditions are ripe for a century of water conflicts.’ The empirical evidence, however, has yet to support such prophecies. Rather, when it comes to water resources at the interstate level, cooperation is much more ubiquitous. The historical record shows that states rarely if ever go to war over water; in parsing more than 1,800 state-to-state water interactions in trans-boundary basins between 1946 and 1999, Wolf et al. (2003) demonstrated that none have led to formal war. Yet such encouraging findings should not obscure the fact that the ‘[MENA] region has a striking absence of inclusive and comprehensive international water agreements on its most significant trans-boundary water courses’ (World Bank 2007: 80). The Nile River Basin, which is shared by ten countries and inhabited by approximately 150 million people, for example, has a long history of tension (e.g. Egypt-Sudan conflicts in the l950s). In spite of current progress with the Nile Basin Initiative (World Bank 2007: 83), Egypt - the dominant downstream riparian (i.e. water user along the river) - continues to appropriate more than 90 per cent of the Nile River.

With the maturation of the field of water conflict and cooperation, the notion of impending water wars has come to be better understood as a ‘myth’ rather than a ‘reality’ (Bencala and Dabelko 2008). This is not to say that tensions do not exist among states regarding their shared and limited water resources, but rather there is a growing realisation that the source of conflict is emanating from disagreements within a country due to a lethal combination of population growth, unsustainable water withdrawals, lack of adequate water management, weak institutions, and pressure for economic development (e.g. see Wolf 2007). The Pacific Institute's Water Conflict Chronology indicates that between 2000 and 2009, most occurrences of water conflict were at the sub-national level, of which nearly half were development disputes. Examples in 2009 include hundreds of Mumbai residents in India protesting water cuts that resulted in one person being killed and dozens injured, and violent clashes in Ethiopia over access to water in the Somali border region.

#### Aff can’t solve—Indian dams makes war and collapse inevitable—aff doesn’t solve because desal doesn’t solve territory issues and no salt water to desalinate

Daly 12—John C.K. Daly is the chief analyst at the energy news site Oilprice.com. Dr. Daly received his Ph.D. in 1986 from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London [April 13, 2012, “Troubled Waters: Has The India-Pakistan Water Conflict Reached A Boiling Point?” http://www.economywatch.com/economy-business-and-finance-news/has-the-india-pakistan-water-conflict-reached-a-boiling-point.13-04.html]

In an editorial entitled “War With India Inevitable” published in Lahore's ‘The Nation’ on Sunday, the newspaper's Editor-in-Chief and Nazaria-i-Pakistan Trust Chairman, Majid Nizami, asked his fellow citizens to prepare for a war with India over water issues.

Nizami also told those attending the "Pakistan-India relations: Our rulers’ new wishes" session at Aiwan-e-Karkunan Tehrik-e-Pakistan, that, "Indian hostilities and conspiracies against the country will never end until she is taught a lesson."

While The Nation – a conservative daily that is part of the Nawa-i-Waqt publishing group – may have a circulation of just 20,000 readers, its close ties to Pakistan's highest military circles mean that Nizami's comments should hardly be rejected out of hand.

Tellingly, Nizami's audience at the session also included some high ranking Pakistani officials, including Nazaria-i-Pakistan Vice Chairman Dr Rafique Ahmed; Pakistan Movement Workers-Trust Chairman, retired Colonel Jamshed Ahmed Tareen; former Foreign Secretary Shamshad Ahmed Khan; Jamiat Ulema-e-Pakistan Secretary General Qari Zawar Bahadur; retired Air Marshall Khurished Anwar Mirza; retired Brigadier Hamid Saeed Akhtar and Jamaat-e-Islami Lahore Chief Ameer-ul-Azeem, among others.

At the heart of the issue are Pakistan's concerns over India's ongoing construction of two hydroelectric dams on the upper reaches of the Indus River. The Indus, which begins in Indian-controlled Kashmir and flows through both India and Pakistan, is Pakistan's primary freshwater source, on which 90 percent of its agriculture depends.

The 45-megawatt, 190-feet tall Nimoo-Bazgo concrete dam and the 44-megawatt Chutak hydroelectric power project, Islamabad believes, will reduce the Indus River's flow towards Pakistan, and are capable of storing up to 4.23 billion cubic feet of water, which will violate the terms of the bilateral 1960 Indus Water Treaty.

“Already the Indus is experiencing water flows that are down 30 percent from its normal levels. According to a number of Pakistani agriculture and water experts, the nation is heading towards a massive water shortage in the next couple of years due to insufficient water management practices and storage capacity, which will be exacerbated by the twin Indian hydroelectric projects.”

So, if push comes to shove, who's got Pakistan's back? China.

During the Boao Forum for Asia held in China's southern Hainan Island on 1 April, Pakistan and China agreed to support each other "in all circumstances" and vowed to uphold their sovereignty and territorial integrity at all costs.

Pakistani Prime Minister Syed Yousuf Raza Gilani told Chinese Executive Vice Premier Li Keqiang: "China's friend is our friend, and China's enemy is ours," adding that Pakistan considers China's security as its own security and supports China's position on Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang.

Li replied that China would support Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity in every situation, telling Gilani: "No matter what changes take place at international level, we will uphold Pakistan's sovereignty and territorial integrity."

It might be noted here that in October 1962, coinciding with the Cuban missile crisis, India and China fought a brief but bitter war along their disputed Himalayan border. Fifty years later, China and India have yet to resolve their border issues over Kashmir; and China continues to claim most of India's Arunachal Pradesh territory to the base of the Himalayas in the absence of any definitive treaty delineating the border.

Kashmir today also remains the site of the world's largest and most militarized territorial dispute with portions under the de facto administration of China (Aksai Chin), India (Jammu and Kashmir), and Pakistan (Azad Kashmir and Northern Areas).

No guesses therefore as to whom Beijing might back should Pakistani-Indian tensions continue to rise.

Accordingly, the only way to keep the peace may be, as to paraphrase Ronald Reagan in Berlin: "Prime Minister Singh, tear down those dams!" Just don't bet on it.

#### No risk of Middle East war

**Maloney and Takeyh, 07** - \*senior fellow for Middle East Policy at the Saban Center for Middle East Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*senior fellow for Middle East Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Susan and Ray, International Herald Tribune, 6/28, “Why the Iraq War Won't Engulf the Mideast”,

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2007/0628iraq\_maloney.aspx)

Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, the region has also developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.

### Drones bad—Destabilize Pakistan

#### Strikes destabilize pakistan

CAVALLARO et al 12 professor of law & founding director of Stanford Law School's International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic [James Cavallaro, http://livingunderdrones.org/report-strategy/]

The focus on drones also risks undermining Pakistan’s development by incentivizing undemocratic decision-making and fostering instability. In 2009, Anne Patterson, US Ambassador to Pakistan, discussed the risks of the US drone strategy in a cable sent to the Department of State. She noted, “Increased unilateral operations in these areas risk destabilizing the Pakistani state, alienating both the civilian government and military leadership, and provoking a broader governance crisis within Pakistan without finally achieving the goal [of eliminating the Al Qaeda and Taliban leadership].”[79] Pakistan High Commissioner to the United Kingdom Wajid Shamsul Hasan told The Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ):

What has been the whole outcome of these drone attacks is, that you have rather directly or indirectly contributed to destabilizing or undermining the democratic government. Because people really make fun of the democratic government–when you pass a resolution against drone attacks in the parliament, and nothing happens. The Americans don’t listen to you, and they continue to violate your territory.[80]

The US strikes have also contributed to the delegitimization of NGOs that are perceived as Western, or that receive US aid, including those providing much-needed services, such as access to water and education, and those administering the polio vaccine; this perception has been exploited by Taliban forces.[81]

## \*\*\* 1NR

### 1NR—Overview

**Overpopulation outweighs --- Cote says repeal of the Gag rule exacerbates environmental stressors in a way that other concerns do not --- kills everyone.**

Otten 1 Professor of Emergency Medicine and Pediatrics at the University of Cincinnati [Edward Otten, 2000-2001, http://www.ecology.org/biod/population/human\_pop1.html]

The exponential growth of the human population, making humans the dominant species on the planet, is having a grave impact on biodiversity. This destruction of species by humans will eventually lead to a destruction of the human species through natural selection. While human beings have had an effect for the last 50,000 years, it has only been since the industrial revolution that the impact has been global rather than regional. This global impact is taking place through five primary processes: over harvesting, alien species introduction, pollution, habitat fragmentation, and outright habit destruction.

#### Small changes matter.

POWELL 10 – 6 – 12 Harvard Gazette – Quoting the Head of the Laboratory of Populations at Columbia [Alvin Powell, A close eye on population growth, Harvard Staff Writer, <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2012/10/a-close-eye-on-population-growth/>]

Projections that global population growth will level out in coming decades are not assured, an expert said Wednesday, adding that just a one-child difference in global fertility would mean an extra 10 billion people by century’s end.

“It matters enormously what we do right now,” said Joel Cohen, a professor at Rockefeller University and head of the Laboratory of Populations at Rockefeller and Columbia universities. “The world is not fixed. Demography is not destiny. We can influence the world of our children and grandchildren by what we do right now.”

At today’s rate, population would skyrocket by 2100, to 27 billion from today’s 7 billion, Cohen said. But growth has been slowing steadily in recent decades. Projections see the pace continuing to slow as it approaches the replacement growth rate of about 2.1 children per family, putting the world population between 9 billion and 10 billion by 2100.

But relatively small differences in fertility could dramatically change the outcome, Cohen said. A half-child reduction in the fertility rate would see global population peak and then fall back to 6 billion by 2100. A half-child increase in the rate would mean population would continue to climb, reaching some 16 billion by the end of the century.

Reproductive freedom independently causes extinction.

Sanger 4 [Alexander, The Chair of the International Planned Parenthood Council, Beyond Choice, Reproductive Freedom in the 21st Century, p. 72]

**Reproductive freedom is** not only important, it is **necessary for human existence**. To create and nurture life, humanity must have the right to get pregnant or not and give birth or not, when people choose to do so. These choices are the essence of human reproduction. The right to reproduce as one thinks best is what reproductive freedom is supposed to protect. While the movement to establish this freedom has been a major component of the women’s movement, it is not just a woman’s issue. Reproductive freedom concerns the entire human race. It impacts human health and survival and the improvement of the human condition. By exerting control over our biological destiny, we are insuring that destiny. The future of the human race has not been and can not be left to chance. **We have survived because we have taken control of our reproduction and our biological destiny**. **Reproductive rights are vital because they help insure the survival of humanity.**

**Romney collapses Russian relations.**

Bandow 12—Senior Fellow at CATO [Doug Bandow, 4/23/12, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836]

Mitt Romney has become the inevitable Republican presidential candidate. He’s hoping to paint Barack Obama as weak, but his attempt at a flanking maneuver on the right may complicate America’s relationship with Eastern Europe and beyond. Romney recently charged Russia with being America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As Jacob Heilbrunn of National Interest pointed out, this claim embodies a monumental self-contradiction, attempting to claim “credit for the collapse of the Soviet Union, on the one hand [while] predicting dire threats from Russia on the other.” Thankfully, the U.S.S.R. really is gone, and neither all the king’s men nor Vladimir Putin can put it back together. It is important to separate behavior which is grating, even offensive, and that which is threatening. Putin is no friend of liberty, but his unwillingness to march lock-step with Washington does not mean that he wants conflict with America. Gordon Hahn of CSIS observes: Yet despite NATO expansion, U.S. missile defense, Jackson-Vanik and much else, Moscow has refused to become a U.S. foe, cooperating with the West on a host of issues from North Korea to the war against jihadism. Most recently, Moscow agreed to the establishment of a NATO base in Ulyanovsk. These are hardly the actions of America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s charge is both silly and foolish. This doesn’t mean the U.S. should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Moreover, treating Moscow like a foe will make Russia more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union—and especially Washington’s determination to continue expanding NATO. After all, if another country ostentatiously called the U.S. its chief geopolitical threat, ringed America with bases, and established military relationships with areas that had broken away from the U.S., Washington would not react well. It might react, well, a lot like Moscow has been reacting. Although it has established better relations with the West, Russia still might not get along with some of its neighbors, most notably Georgia, with its irresponsibly confrontational president. However, Washington should not give Moscow additional reasons to indulge its paranoia.

Nuclear war --- turns hegemony.

Krieger & Starr 12—President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation & Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility [David Krieger & Steven Starr, “A Nuclear Nightmare in the Making: NATO, Missile Defense and Russian Insecurity,” Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, January 03, 2012 http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/db\_article.php?article\_id=321]

This is a dangerous scenario, no matter which NATO we are talking about, the real one or the hypothetical one.  Continued US indifference to Russian security concerns could have dire consequences: a breakdown in US-Russian relations; regression to a new nuclear-armed standoff in Europe; Russian withdrawal from New START; a new nuclear arms race between the two countries; a breakdown of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty leading to new nuclear weapon states; and a higher probability of nuclear weapons use by accident or design.  This is a scenario for nuclear disaster, and it is being provoked by US hubris in pursuing missile defenses, a technology that is unlikely ever to be effective, but which Russian leaders must view in terms of a worst-case scenario.

In the event of increased US-Russian tensions, the worst-case scenario from the Russian perspective would be a US first-strike nuclear attack on Russia, taking out most of the Russian nuclear retaliatory capability.  The Russians believe the US would be emboldened to make a first-strike attack by having the US-NATO missile defense installations located near the Russian border, which the US could believe capable of shooting down any Russian missiles that survived its first-strike attack.

The path to a US-Russian nuclear war could also begin with a conventional military confrontation via NATO. The expansion of NATO to the borders of Russia has created the potential for a local military conflict with Russia to quickly escalate into a nuclear war.  It is now Russian policy to respond with tactical nuclear weapons if faced with overwhelmingly superior conventional forces, such as those of NATO.   In the event of war, the “nuclear umbrella” of NATO guarantees that NATO members will be protected by US nuclear weapons that are already forward-based in Europe.

### 1NR—UQ

#### Ahead --- swing states

Silver 10/27 Oct. 26: State Poll Averages Usually Call Election Right, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/27/oct-26-state-poll-averages-usually-call-election-right/>

The FiveThirtyEight forecast model has found the past several days of battleground state polling to be reasonably strong for Barack Obama, with his chances of winning the Electoral College increasing as a result. The intuition behind this ought to be very simple: Mr. Obama is maintaining leads in the polls in Ohio and other states that are sufficient for him to win 270 electoral votes.

Friday featured a large volume of swing state polling, including three polls of Ohio, each of which showed Mr. Obama ahead by margins ranging from two to four percentage points.

#### Obama’s winning despite the economy

Cook 9/3 Cook Report, Elections Guru Specialist [Charlie Cook, Why Romney is Falling Behind, <http://cookpolitical.com/story/4754>]

It is becoming clear that if President Obama is reelected, it will be despite the economy and because of his campaign; if Mitt Romney wins, it will be because of the economy and despite his campaign.

The U.S. economy—and, by extension, the public’s judgment of Obama’s stewardship over the economy—is a millstone that no president would want around his neck. Polls and focus groups are quite clear: While Americans don’t blame Obama for the economic downturn, they are disappointed with how he has handled it since taking office. They had hoped that he would be more effective. Just a third of Americans in last month’s NBC News/Wall Street Journal polling felt that the country was headed in the right direction, and 54 percent disapproved of the president’s handling of the economy.

What’s worse, it’s not getting better. A just-released Blue Chip Economic Indicators survey of 56 top economists shows a consensus forecast of the U.S. economy growing by just 1.7 percent in the current, third quarter and 1.9 percent in the fourth quarter, with unemployment remaining around 8.2 percent for the last six months of 2012. Traditionally this would not be considered reelection territory.

But for all of that, Obama went into the conventions either tied or with an ever-so-slight lead in the national polls, and he comes out of the Democratic convention with a lead. The exact size of that advantage will be clear by the end of this week, when we will see a pile of new, post-convention polling. Gallup’s seven-day moving-average tracking poll through last Sunday gives Obama a 4-point lead, 49 percent to 45 percent. Going into the GOP convention, the battleground-state picture looked better for Obama than the national numbers: Obama was up in nine of 11 battlegrounds, with Michigan and Pennsylvania looking not so much like battleground states. Romney leads only in North Carolina.

While there are talented and hardworking staffers and consultants working on the Romney campaign, this column since July has been highly critical of Romney advertising and messaging. The decision to defer any biographical ads until August—ads that would have sought to define Romney on a personal level beyond being just rich, as someone worthy of trust, and as someone whom swing voters might be comfortable having in the White House—is inexplicable. The Obama campaign and allies ripped Romney apart in swing-state advertising, and with no Teflon coating to protect their candidate, it stuck like Velcro. While Romney allies say that such positive ads did not “move numbers” when dial-tested, my view is that these kinds of ads are essential to making their candidate acceptable. No matter how unhappy voters are, if they are uncomfortable with the alternative, the incumbent survives.

Only in the last few days has the Romney campaign begun buying any time in swing states on local cable systems, something the Obama team has been doing for months. While one campaign has been looking for every nook and cranny to reach voters and has been doing so for some time, the other didn’t bother until after the conventions. Go figure.

The Romney campaign made the extraordinary decision to not try seriously to connect their candidate with voters on a personal level until their convention. As dubious as that decision was, they were rewarded by having a convention shortened by a day due to a hurricane, then compounded the error of waiting until the convention by putting much of what was most needed to be seen in the 8 and 9 p.m. hours, when the only viewers would be C-SPAN fans. Wow! The biographical film and the testimonials of people whose lives had been touched by Romney were powerful, necessary, and largely unseen. Instead, the Romney campaign treated them to the Clint Eastwood debacle and a serviceable speech by Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida that should have been made earlier, not chewing up precious broadcast airtime. At the 10-11 p.m. hour, abbreviated personal testimonies and the film introducing Romney’s own speech—which was quite good—would have made for an extraordinary hour of television and very likely have done him a lot of good with voters.

As a result of all of this, while voters are quite open to firing Obama, they remain quite reticent about Romney. Debates can and have been critical, but they work better for candidates who need to demonstrate that they are smart and knowledgeable, tests Romney met and passed long ago; debates are tougher venues for demonstrating empathy and developing trust.

This is a very close race and one that still could go either way. But the odds of Romney capitalizing on this economy, and the opportunity it affords, seem lower than they were before the conventions. If Republicans and Romney supporters are growing nervous, they should be.

#### Momentum.

WITT 10 – 25 – 12 Examiner Election Coverage Staff [Ryan Witt, Updated Obama versus Romney polls in the 10 key swing states, <http://www.examiner.com/article/updated-obama-versus-romney-polls-the-10-key-swing-states>]

The most recent polls, including many released over the last 24 hours, show that Obama appears to have regained the momentum in the presidential race against Mitt Romney. This week's update shows that Obama has either maintained or widened his lead in most of the ten swing states. Romney is still winning Florida and North Carolina, but Obama is winning Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nevada. Colorado and Virginia could best be described as a tie at this point. Many of these polls may not include any bump Obama may have received from his debate victory on Monday.

Below are the updates for each state, including the most recent poll, a Real Clear Politics (RCP) average of polls, an average of polls from the last weeks, and Nate Silver’s probabilities for who will win the state. Last Thursday's update showed President Obama leading in six of the states, tied in two of the states, and losing Florida and North Carolina.

### 2NC—Link UQ

#### Obama is backing off nuclear.

Skutnik 10/22 Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering at Tennessee[Steve Skutnik, “Does nuclear lack a natural constituency?,” 10/22, <http://theenergycollective.com/skutnik/133191/does-nuclear-lack-natural-constituency>]

Or, more importantly, if support for nuclear was more than token for both candidates, why is it exactly than in Romney's 21-page energy plan, the proposals for nuclear come down to a single bullet point: "Revitalize nuclear power by equipping the NRC to approve new designs and to license approved reactor designs on approved sites within two years." (How this will be accomplished is left as an exercise for the reader). Note the striking absence of any mention of small modular reactors and their potential to revitalize export-driven manufacturing in the U.S., or even such basic measures as reforming antiquated laws restricting vitally-needed foreign investment in new domestic nuclear capacity - nuclear, it would seem, is an afterthought. Nor is it any better with Obama, where his campaign's "issues" site for energy lists oil exploration and (inexplicably) clean coal (one gets the feeling we're actually back in the Bush years), but fails to even mention nuclear. The very fact that the Romney campaign would speak effusively of renewables as an improbable part of a vague, "all-of-the-above" energy strategy while Obama bafflingly promotes both fossil exploration and dubious "clean coal" technology (see also, vaporware) point to an effort to reach voters not on the rational basis of carefully-considered energy policy, but rather, in a word, pandering. (Yes, quel surprise indeed coming from a political campaign). So why is this? Because again, by and large for the public, I am largely convinced that support for particular energy sources comes not from their practical value but from what these represent. It is immaterial as to whether availability and diffusivity inherently limit the ability of renewables to produce electricity at the large, consistent scales required to power modern civilization - because these sources, at their core, represent aspirational goods which somehow magically disconnect environmental consequences from energy. Fossil resources represent abundance - an energy abundance which can be found here at home, supporting an economic fantasy of "energy independence" powered by domestic, low-cost energy sources (to which environmental concerns are ancillary). What brings this charade crashing down is the dissonance with how each of these sides deals with the issue of nuclear. If the latter camp truly cared about abundance, nuclear would plausibly be of co-equal priority - uranium resources are relatively abundant in the U.S., and most of the uranium it imports are from friendly countries like our neighbors to the north. Further, nuclear is relatively cheap - particularly once plants are built - and those plants can supply energy for entire generations at tiny marginal costs. Thus, if it was simply about energy abundance, one would expect more than simple tepid support - one should see more folks like Lamar Alexander exhorting the country to double our current fleet by building a hundred new nuclear reactors. But they don't. Instead we are given platitudes extolling the virtues of abundant natural gas and coal - not uranium. Meanwhile, as to the former crowd that values minimizing environmental impacts, it is immaterial as to what backs up intermittent sources (i.e., it's the same resources in which they claim they are attempting to displace). If the plausible goal were to eliminate CO2 and air pollution as much as possible, one would think that nuclear, given its high capacity and availability, would be at the vanguard of the movement. And yet it is shockingly absent - instead, once again, natural gas and ephemeral promises of "clean coal" (which, in fairness, is probably more about a cynical electoral sop to coal-producing states than it is a serious policy proposal) take the fore. Constantly we hear from these same people theoretically devoted to the cause of creating a clean energy future about the virtue and necessity of natural gas as a "bridge" fuel - as if carbon-free nuclear energy simply did not exist. (Or as if natural gas did not pose a far more substantial risk in terms of deaths per unit energy produced). What nuclear seems to lack here is the existence of a natural constituency Again, look at what a rational examination of the expressed interests of our two major constituencies above should theoretically produce - nuclear, by all accounts, should be a hands-down consensus winner. Yet instead it is relegated to scarcely a mention in high-profile debates. Again, it is far better for nuclear not to exist solely in the thrall of one ideological pole, given the ease at which it can be marginalized on a partisan basis. But perhaps the bigger issue now is that nuclear, enjoying a broad but shallow public consensus, finds itself politically homeless.

#### Specifically true of SMR’s.

Somsel 10/13 Nuclear Engineer – American Thinker Contributor[Joseph Somsel, “Obama's War on Nuclear Power,” <http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/10/obamas_war_on_nuclear_power.html#ixzz2ANPdx7qn>]

One bright spot was to be the DoE's continued support for the development of what are called "small modular reactors." These are to be much smaller than current reactors and passively safe. Supposedly, these features will allow easier, quicker construction and an opening into markets too small for traditional designs. Some think government interest is focused on independent power supply for military bases, for which these reactors would be well-suited. However, the applications for developmental cost-sharing are languishing, awaiting DoE's overdue approval. Cynical observers would predict that no announcement will occur until after the election. The Obama administration has more to lose politically from approval from its environmentalist base than it could possibly gain from nuclear supporters.

The U.S. government's response to the nuclear problems at Fukushima, if well-meaning, have not been particularly cogent or stellar.  First, the U.S. industry has been substantially better-prepared than its Japanese counterpart, so some of the rather obvious problems at Fukushima have already been addressed here.  After the 9/11 terrorist attacks flying large aircraft into buildings, the U.S. industry embarked on an internal program to prepare for such extreme plant damage.  Still, there was a clearly political rush to get something done by the first anniversary of the event last March.

One of the three orders issued by the NRC to U.S. industry last March was for additional spent fuel pool monitoring instruments.  One can sense that this was required to save face for the aforementioned Chairman Jaczko, who infamously acted like a chicken with its head cut off during the Fukushima event, publicly worrying about their spent fuel racks being uncovered and the spent fuel "burning" in free air.  The smell of leadership panic was in the air.  Fifty years of professional consideration and practice have previously shown no basis for these additional instruments.  At least they will be cheap and not get in the way -- we hope.

Other orders from the NRC remain "quick fixes" without a comprehensive technical acknowledgement yet of the complexity of the situation and the eventual required integration of the technical solutions required.  In other words, I'll bet we have to eventually go back and backfit the backfits.

While it remains an essentially political decision as to the allocation of resources for public safety, as an engineer and a citizen, one could hope for a more efficient process.  Few of us want to waste resourcesm, but if the public wants to spend money on making nuclear power plants safer yet, so be it.  Perhaps this is not a complaint one can squarely lay on the doorstep of President Obama, but a more professional and sober appointee to the chairmanship of the NRC could have made the process of responding to the Fukushima event more rational and productive.

From one end of the nuclear power process (uranium mining) to the other (waste disposal), and throughout the sensitive stages in between (financing, licensing, and upgrading), the Obama administration has made decisions that retard the production of nuclear power, hurt our balance of payments, and increase the cost of electricity.  Like the administration's war on coal and their opposition to fracking, their disdain for cheap, plentiful energy for the American economy ultimately hurts the American people.

#### Rhetoric proves.

Levine 9/7 (Gregg; Contributing Editor and Former Managing Editor – Firedoglake and Contributing Writer for Truthout, “Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech,” <http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/>)

President Obama no longer promises to “safely harness nuclear power”–that likely would have sounded like a cruel joke in a world now contaminated by the ongoing Fukushima disaster–but beyond that, he does not promise anything about nuclear power at all. There was no platitude, no carefully crafted signal to the industry that has subsidized much of Obama’s political career, no mention of nuclear power whatsoever.

That is not to say that the entire 2012 Democratic National Convention was a nuclear-free zone. A few hours before the president took the stage at the Time Warner Cable Arena, James Rogers, co-chair of the Charlotte host committee, and oh, by the way, CEO of Duke Energy, stepped to the lectern and endorsed Obama’s “all of the above” energy “strategy” (they keep using that word; I do not think it means what they think it means):

We need to work even harder toward a future of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy. That means we need to invest heavily in new zero-emission power sources, like new nuclear, wind and solar projects, as well as new technologies, like electric vehicles.

Well, if you are looking for a future of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy, you need look no further than nu–wait, what? If you are looking for those three features in an energy future, it is hard to imagine a worse option than the unsustainably expensive, chronically unreliable and dangerously dirty nuclear power plant. And, as has been discussed here many times, nuclear is not a zero-emission source, either. The massive carbon footprint of the nuclear fuel lifecycle rivals coal, and that doesn’t even consider the radioactive isotopes that facilities emit, even when they are not encountering one of their many “unusual events.”

But the CEO of the Charlotte-based energy giant probably has his eyes on a different prize. Rogers, who has been dogged by questions about a power grab after Duke’s merger with Progress Energy and his lackluster performance as fundraiser-in-chief for the DNC, sits atop a company that operates seven US nuclear power plants, and is partners in a plan to build two new AP1000 reactors in Cherokee County, South Carolina.

That last project, which is under active review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, awaiting a combined construction and operating license, is one of a small handful of proposed new nuclear facilities currently scrambling for financing. The South Carolina plant, along with a pair of reactors in Georgia, two slated for a different site in South Carolina, and possibly one more in Tennessee, represent what industry lobbyists like to call the “nuclear renaissance.”

But completion of any of the above is nowhere close to guaranteed, and even if some of these reactors are eventually built, none will be able to generate even one kilowatt of commercial power until years after President Obama completes his sought-after second term.

Which, if you really care about America’s energy future, is, of course, all for the better. As even James Rogers noted in his speech (and he gets props for this):

[W]e cannot lose sight of energy efficiency. Because the cleanest, most efficient power plant is the one we never have to build.

That Duke’s CEO thought to highlight efficiency is interesting. That President Obama, with his well-documented ties to the nuclear industry, chose not to even mention nuclear power is important.

### 1NR—Link Wall

**Anti-nuclear environmentalist groups take every advantage to protest nuke power --- the plan sets them off.**

**Gamble 11**. [Jack, nuclear industry engineer, “Antinuclear Activists Will Try to Equate Hiroshima with Fukushima” Nuclear Fissionary -- July 25 -- http://nuclearfissionary.com/2011/07/25/antinuclear-activists-will-try-to-equate-hiroshima-with-**fukushima/?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+NuclearFissionary+%28Nuclear+Fissionary%29]**

But that won’t stop the antinuclear fear mongers from writing editorials and planning protests of nuclear power on the 66th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing on August 6, 2011.¶ What better way to manipulate the headlines than to put their fear mongering spin on a historical anniversary? This is exactly what they’ve done with Hurricane Katrina, the BP Oil Spill, wildfires, floods, 9/11, and any other major events for the last few decades. When you have no shame and sell fear for a living, I suppose there is little standing in your way.

**Public perception is what’s key --- the short-term nature of the link outweighs their long-term link turns.**

**Duffy 12**. [Bobby, MD of Ipsos MORI Social Research Institue, “After Fukushima Public Opinion is Still Unclear on Nuclear Power” Huffington Post -- November 3 -- http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/bobby-duffy/fukushima-public-opinion-nuclear\_b\_1335016.html]

As with all aspects of opinions and policy on energy, the drivers are as varied as the social, political and economic contexts of different countries. It is also partly because people themselves are balancing competing concerns.¶ Five factors come out consistently as the key issues on energy for the public: ahead of everything is cost, then four concerns - CO2 emissions, security of supply or dependence on other countries, the threat of nuclear disasters and the need for investment in renewables - all vie for the next most important.¶ But even here the challenge for policy-makers is that it's not actual dependency, reliability of renewable sources or real risks of nuclear disaster that drives public opinion, it is perceptions of them. Just to take the example of dependency on other countries, you might expect that high dependency countries would support nuclear more, as dependency is something people would generally like to avoid and nuclear power supply is at least within national control.

**Link alone turns the case – public opposition undermines investment.**

**C**ivil **S**ociety **I**nstitute, 3/7/**2012** (Survey: Americans Not Warming Up to Nuclear Power One Year After Fukushima, p. <http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm>)

Peter Bradford, former member of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, former chair of the New York and Maine utility regulatory commissions, and currently adjunct professor at Vermont Law School on "Nuclear Power and Public Policy, said: "This survey is another piece of bad news for new nuclear construction in the U.S. For an industry completely dependent on political support in order to gain access to the taxpayers' wallets (through loan guarantees and other federal subsidies) and the consumers' wallets (through rate guarantees to cover even canceled plants and cost overruns), public skepticism of this magnitude is a near fatal flaw. The nuclear industry has spent millions on polls telling the public how much the public longs for nuclear power. Such polls never ask real world questions linking new reactors to rate increases or to accident risk. Fukushima has made the links to risk much clearer in the public mind. This poll makes the consequences of that linkage clear."

**And it prevents deployment of SMR’s.**

**I**nternational **T**rade **A**dministration, February **2011** (The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors, Department of Commerce, p. 7)

One additional obstacle is beyond the scope of this report but could play a significant role in whether SMRs are commercially deployed: public opinion. To the extent that the smaller profile of SMRs results in their deployment closer to population centers, public opposition to their deployment might rise. Deployment at existing sites, or in industrial applications away from residential areas, however, might minimize the impact of public opinion. Education about the safety features of SMRs and nuclear reactors in general could also ameliorate this concern.

### AT: Sandy

#### 2. Sandy freezes uniqueness – post the storm will be huge.

WASHINGTON POST 10 – 29 – 12 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/10/29/hurricane-sandy-freezes-2012-race-in-place/>

Hurricane Sandy freezes 2012 race in place

Hurricanes dominating the news is nothing new, but the timing of Sandy — it will make landfall just eight days before a presidential election — presents a unique set of challenges for both President Obama and former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney.

Theories abound as to how Sandy could impact this contest. Some argue it could aid Obama as he will be front and center over the next few days fulfilling his duties as president rather than looking like a candidate. Others note that Democrats rely on early voting far more than do Republicans, and widespread power outages and damage left in the wake of the storm could keep some voters at home in the runup to the election — a possibility that top Obama advisor David Axelrod expressed concern about Sunday.

Speculation aside, there’s one thing that Hurricane Sandy has already done — and will continue to do for at least the early part of this week: freeze the race in place.

There will be nothing — repeat: nothing — on cable television over the next several days other than images of Sandy churning it’s way up the East Coast. (Yes, residents of everywhere not in the path of the storm, we know that it’s not a big story for you. But the storm is headed toward Washington and New York City, two of the country’s biggest media centers. It’s just a fact.)

What that wall-to-wall coverage of the storm will bump off the air, of course, is the wall-to-wall coverage of the campaign that would have been there if not for Sandy. (All of the reporters who were being added for the final week of the election will now be diverted to cover the path of Sandy.) And it will force the two candidates and their campaigns to be far less aggressive in their scheduling and messaging than they normally would be in the race’s last days. Can you imagine if you are seeing footage of homes destroyed and then commercials air that savage either Obama or Romney? Not exactly what you want to see at that moment.

The cumulative effect will be to preserve the race as it was towards the end of last week — a dead heat nationally with President Obama clinging to a swing state edge. What remains to be seen is when/if things return to normal before Nov. 6, and if they do, what the two campaigns do in what will be a very short window before voters’ vote.

#### 3. only impacts states that are locked Obama regardless

REUTERS 10 – 26 – 12, “UPDATE 1-Hurricane Sandy rains on U.S. presidential campaign”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/26/usa-campaign-weather-idUSL1E8LQF8G20121026

Election officials said they would do everything possible to ensure that voting goes on, even if problems from the storm persisted until Nov. 6.¶ "I have heard from some states like Virginia and Maryland that they are definitely working on contingency plans for problems that may arise as a result of the storm," said Kay Stimson, communications director for the National Association of Secretaries of State.¶ "They are always preparing for any kinds of problems, any thing that could arise that could potentially pose problems for elections," she said.¶ The rules for rescheduling voting in case of bad weather vary from state to state.¶ Virginia election officials said they were monitoring the situation and encouraging in-person absentee voting - the form of early voting allowed in the state - to continue as long as conditions remained safe.¶ In heavily Democratic Maryland, which Obama is expected to carry easily, the state of emergency declared by Governor Martin O'Malley would allow for changes, if necessary, including the postponement of the election in all or part of the state.

### AT: Wont Do

#### He says he will.

ROMNEY 11 Next President of the U.S. in the world of the Aff [Mitt Romney, My Pro-Life Pledge, <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/269984/my-pro-life-pledge-mitt-romney>]

I am pro-life and believe that abortion should be limited to only instances of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

I support the reversal of Roe v. Wade, because it is bad law and bad medicine. Roe was a misguided ruling that was a result of a small group of activist federal judges legislating from the bench.

I support the Hyde Amendment, which broadly bars the use of federal funds for abortions. And as president, I will support efforts to prohibit federal funding for any organization like Planned Parenthood, which primarily performs abortions or offers abortion-related services.

I will reinstate the Mexico City Policy to ensure that nongovernmental organizations that receive funding from America refrain from performing or promoting abortion services, as a method of family planning, in other countries. This includes ending American funding for any United Nations or other foreign assistance program that promotes or performs abortions on women around the world.

#### It was a Reagan and Bush policy so he will.

Roylance 12 [Deseret News Staff, Susan Roylance, Families Around the World: Romney commits to defund United Nations Population Fund, Planned Parenthood, http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705399188/Romney-commits-to-defund-United-Nations-Population-Fund-Planned-Parenthood.html?pg=2]

In a speech before CPAC Friday, Mitt Romney announced steps he would take against abortion, inluding cutting off federal funds to Planned Parenthood, if elected president.

“Mine will be a pro-life presidency,” he said. “On day one, I will reinstate the Mexico City policy. I will cut off funding for the United Nations Population Fund, which supports China’s barbaric One Child Policy.”

The Mexico City policy prohibits funding organizations that promote abortion in other countries.

UNFPA spokesman Omar Gharzeddine denied Romney's accusation that UNFPA promotes China's coercive family planning.

Gharzeddine said the UN Population Fund “promotes voluntary family planning and human rights in more than 150 countries, including China. It does not support coercion in family planning, coercive abortions or forced sterilizations anywhere in the world.”

He also said UNFPA “highly appreciates the political and financial support of the United States.”

But Jeanne Head, National Right to Life vice president for International Affairs, responded to KSL in support of Romney's claim: “There is no doubt that the United Nations Population Fund participates in the management of China's one-child population control policy which has resulted in countless forced abortions throughout the country. Sadly, right this very minute, the United States government is providing funding to the UNFPA.”

Congressman Chris Smith, R-New Jersey, also said he believes the UN Population Fund supports China's one child policy. He recently traveled to China to investigate and reported his findings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in October.

China's “one child per couple policy is the most egregious systematic attack on mothers ever," he said before the House committee."Yet the UNPFA incorporates and defers to that policy in its programs.”

The Mexico City policy, also known as the "Global Gag Rule," was originally enacted by President Ronald Reagan, has been through a series of rescissions and adoptions in the past three decades — depending on the current US president's party affiliation. President Bill Clinton rescinded the policy; President George W. Bush adopted it again, but President Barack Obama, during his first week in office, rescinded it yet again.