## 1NC

### 1NC---1

#### Power in the federal government is divided into three branches—the affirmative does not specify

Rotunda 1 (18 Const. Commentary 319, “THE COMMERCE CLAUSE, THE POLITCAL QUESTION DOCTRINE, AND MORRISON,” lexis)

The Framers of our Constitution anticipated that a self-interested "federal majority" would consistently seek to impose more federal control over the people and the states. n10 Hence, they created a federal structure designed to protect freedom by dispersing and limiting federal power. They instituted federalism [\*321] chiefly to protect individuals, that is, the people, not the "states qua states." n11 The Framers sought to protect liberty by creating a central government of enumerated powers. They divided power between the state and federal governments, and they further divided power within the federal government by splitting it among the three branches of government, and they further divided the legislative power (the power that the Framers most feared) by splitting it between two Houses of Congress.

#### Voting Issue

#### Negative ground—specification is key to generate enough specific uniqueness and link magnitude so that generic exploration now doesn’t non-unique our disadvantages. Gives us textual competition for agent counterplans—key to specific disadvantages and high tech solvency arguments

#### 2AC clarifications are too late—the 1AC plan is used to generate counterplan competition—2AC or CX justifies affirmative conditionality and kills any negative predictability

### 1NC---2

#### The 1AC’s rationalist attempt to anticipate the effects of foreign policy will fail. Emptying oneself of being is a prerequisite to true understanding.

Pettman 5—Ralph Pettman, Professor in the School of History, Philosophy, Political Science and International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington, 2005 (“Taoism And The Concept Of Global Security,” *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Volume 5, Number 1, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Oxford Journals Online, p. 72-75)

How does moving onto Taoist ground, and immersing ourselves in Taoist experience, play out in practice? Our section on mapping the concept of global security began by highlighting the making of modernity. If we start with this general project, and cast it in the light of the general Taoist knack for sacral spontaneity, we see at once how little this knack has to do with the rationalist way of thinking or being. Where the modernist/rationalist talks of empirical logic and scientific representation, the sacralist/Taoist talks (in Graham’s terms, at least) of the rejection of empirical logic, and an ‘infinite regress, testing by tests which in the end are themselves untested’ (Graham, [end page 72] 1981, pp. 10, 11). Where the rationalist talks of the hypothetico-​deductive method, the Taoist talks (again in Graham’s terms) of an understanding of the ‘mysterious order which runs through all things’, and the universal motion of chi energy (Graham, 1981, pp. 12, 19–20). Where the rationalist talks of a detached and individuated intellectual vantage-​point, separate from society, where reason can be given free reign to cogitate and communicate, the Taoist talks (in Hansen’s terms this time) of ‘heart-​minds’ (Hansen, 1992, pp. 53, 85–86).

Taoists respond to the situation they are in by unfocusing, that is, by allowing themselves to act with the ‘immediacy of an echo’, rather than the self-​consciousness of someone who applies general principles. (Graham, 1981, pp. 6, 12, 14). They invite, in other words, the kind of recognition the ‘heart’ gives ‘when the mind is silent’ (Krishnamurti, 1972, p. 34). This is metaphorical language, but we are not, after all, trying to ascertain what is scientifically true. We are trying to locate scientific truth-​finding within its sacral context. 8

Faced with global security planning, Taoists highlight the way rationalist attempts to anticipate a particular foreign policy can only reach so far. Taoists highlight how those who really know what they are doing tend to eschew conscious thought to attend instead to the ‘total situation’. This ‘knack’, like a feel for the way a bacterium works, or for how to play a musical instrument, is not one that can be ultimately explained (Graham, 1983, p. 7). Taoists also compare the way they face the future with the way it is faced by those who promote the national interest, for example, or the relevant capitalist/corporate, politico-​social, bourgeois, or masculinist interest. The rationalist entertains options A, B, and C, and plays out each one in advance, in a bid to anticipate what will turn out the best. Except that it is not possible to anticipate what will turn out the best. In choosing one policy option, the others cease to exist. Once, for example, option B is chosen, options A and C have no chance of happening. Option A might have been better, or might have been worse. Likewise option C. With the B policy chosen, these alternatives are no longer alternatives. Which is why contemplating such alternatives was futile in the first place, and making decisions on the basis of such contemplations makes no sense at all. It is not possible, that is, to know rationally what is in the national interest. To rely on rationalism is, therefore, to overplay rationalism, which is to underplay Taoism in turn, and to underplay sacral spontaneity (Graham, 1981, p. 14). [end page 73]

Modernist proponents of global security demur. Enough people in the world live as if modernist conceptions of global security ought to prevail, they note, for most of these conceptions to prevail in practice. Enough people behave as if world order is made up of sovereign states, for example, for this way of ordering world affairs to be a tangible, global reality. The same applies to liberal marketeering, global modes of making civil identity, the global formation of capitalist classes, the global advent of social movements, and the global advent of gender-​specific practices. There is a self-​fulfilling quality to the modernist project, and we must deal with its global consequences, they argue, whether the Taoist critique of the rationalist cause is valid or not.

This is not to say that the people of the world live in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps there is a preferred alternative, though perhaps (and this is the Taoist thought) there is no ‘preferred alternative’ either, at least of a rationally accessible sort. Perhaps it is a matter of standing back to look at this cosmos that we are all in, then standing close to listen, then feeling as best we can for how it moves, before standing back to look once more. Perhaps we might even learn something in taking ourselves through such a process, something we might need to know if we are to understand global security.

#### No one knows what is good and bad. Reject the aff’s judgments, even if we lose all life on earth

Kirkland 98 [Russell Kirkland, Associate Professor of Religion (and Asian Studies), “"Responsible Non-Action" In a Natural World: Perspectives from the Nei-Yeh, Chuang-Tzu, and Tao-Te Ching,” 1998, University of Georgia, http://kirkland.myweb.uga.edu/rk/pdf/pubs/ECO.pdf]

Why It Is Wrong to Resent Unexpected Changes In Chuang-tzu 18, we find two famous stories in which a man experiences a sudden and deeply personal transformation, a transformation that strikes others around him as deeply troubling.5 In one, the philosopher Hui-tzu goes to offer his sympathies to Chuang-tzu upon the event of the death of Chuang's wife. In the next story, a willow suddenly sprouts from the elbow of a fictional character. In each story, a sympathetic friend is shocked and dismayed to find that the first character in each story is not shocked and dismayed by the unexpected turn of events. In each story, the first character patiently and rationally explains the nature of life, and counsels his companion to accept the course of events that life brings to us, without imposing judgment as to the value of those events. In each case, the reader learns that it is foolish and inappropriate to feel emotional distress at such events, for a proper understanding of the real nature of life leads us to accept all events with the same equanimity, even those events that might have once sticken us as deeply distressing. In the Taoist classic Huai-nan-tzu, one finds a famous story of a man who suddenly finds himself the unexpected owner of a new horse. His neighbors congratulate him on his good fortune, until his son falls from the horse and breaks his leg. The man's neighbors then act to console him on his bad fortune, until army conscriptors arrive and carry off all the able-bodied young men, leaving the injured young man behind as worthless. The lesson of the story is that when an event occurs, we are quick to judge it as fortunate or unfortunate, but our judgments are often mistaken, as later events often prove.6 And one of the most heavily stressed lessons of the Chuang-tzu is that humans quickly judge events on the basis of what we accept on the basis of simplistic assumptions — e.g., that life is inherently better than death — and that the wise person learns to question and discard such assumptions, and forego such judgments regarding events. When Chuang-tzu's wife died, Chuang-tzu does not argue that the world is a better place for her absence, or that his life is improved by his sudden new freedom. In fact, there is no issue in the passage of whether the world is better off with Chuang-tzu's wife alive or dead. The only issue in the passage is that people are born and that people later die, and to ignore that basic fact would display culpable stupidity. The very same lesson is impressed upon the reader of the previous passage, regarding the sudden transformation of a character's elbow. What we are taught in that passage is that life is a process of ineluctable change and transformation, and that humans would be profoundly wrong and clearly silly to object to such change. Another element of the lesson is that the nature of human life is not separate from, or other than, the nature of nonhuman life. When one says that "life is ineluctable change, and we must accept such change with serenity," one is speaking about "life" in such a way that it clearly involves the lives of individual humans just as fully as it involves the events that occur in the broader world, and vice versa. Imagine the story of the death of Chuang-tzu's wife involving, instead, the death of the species we call whooping cranes: Chuang-tzu would, in that case, patiently point out to his deeply caring but deeply shallow friend that he had indeed felt grief to see such beautiful birds come to their end, but had gone on to engage in appropriate rational reflection upon the nature of life, and had come to accept the transitory nature of all such creatures, just as in the present story Chuang-tzu had come to accept the transitory nature of his own spouse. If one must learn to accept with serenity the death of someone we love, someone without whose life our own life would have never been what it is, wouldn't the author urge us to accept that the death of some birds, birds that have never played a role in our lives the way that one's deceased spouse had done, is an event that we should accept with equanimity? If change catches up with us, even to the extent that the planet that we live on should become permanently devoid of all forms of life, the response of the author of these passages would logically be that **such is the nature of things**, and that crying over such a sudden turn of events would be very silly indeed, like a child crying over a spilt glass of milk, or the death of some easily replaceable goldfish. The only reason that a child cries over the death of a goldfish is that he or she has become irrationally attached to that creature as it exists in its present form, and has formed an immature sentimental bond to it. As adults, we appreciate the color and motion of fish in our aquaria, but seldom cry over the death of one of its inmates: we know very well that to cry over the death of such a fish would be silly and a sign of juvenile behavior. As our children grow, we teach them, likewise, never to follow their raw emotional responses, but rather to govern their emotions, and to learn to behave in a responsible manner, according to principles that are morally correct, whether or not they are emotionally satisfying. If, for instance, one were to see a driver accidentally run over one's child or beloved, one's first instinct might be to attack the driver with a righteous fury, falsely equating emotional intensity and violent action with the responsible exercise of moral judgment. In general, we work to teach ourselves and each other not to respond in that way, to take a course of self-restraint, curbing emotion, lest it propel us into actions that will later, upon calm reflection, be revealed to have been emotionally satisfying but morally wrong. If I saw my child run down by a car, it might give me great emotional satisfaction to drag the driver from her car and beat her to death. But it might well turn out that she had in fact done nothing wrong, and had been driving legally and quite responsibly when a careless child suddenly ran into her path, giving her no time to stop or to evade the child. Because we have all learned that the truth of events is often not apparent to the parties that are experiencing them, we generally work to learn some degree of self-control, so that our immediate emotional reaction to events does not mislead us into a foolish course of action. Now if we take these facts and transfer them into our consideration of Chuang-tzu and Mencius on the riverbank, that episode should, logically, be read as follows. If Mencius feels an emotional urge to jump into the river to save the baby, his emotional response to the baby's presence there must be seen as immature and irresponsible. After all, one might muse, one never knows, any more than the man with the horse, when an event that seems fortunate is actually unfortunate, or vice versa. What if the baby in the water had been the ancient Chinese equivalent of Adolf Hitler, and the saving of young Adolf — though occasioned by the deepest feelings of compassion, and a deep-felt veneration for "life" — led to the systematic extermination of millions of innocent men, women, and children? If one knew, in retrospect, that Hitler's atrocities could have been totally prevented by the simple moral act of refraining from leaping to save an endangered child, would one not conclude, by sound moral reasoning, that letting that particular baby drown would have represented a supremely moral act? How, Chuang-tzu constantly challenges us, **how can we possibly know what course of action is truly justified?** What if, just for the sake of argument, a dreadful plague soon wipes out millions of innocent people, and the pathogen involved is soon traced back to an organism that had once dwelt harmlessly in the system of a certain species of bird, such as, for instance, the whooping crane? In retrospect, one can imagine, the afflicted people of the next century — bereft of their wives or husbands, parents or children — might curse the day when simple-minded do-gooders of the twentieth-century had brazenly intervened with the natural course of events and preserved the cursed specied of crane, thereby damning millions of innocents to suffering and death. We assume that such could never happen, that all living things are somehow inherently good to have on the planet, that saving the earthly existence of any life-form is somehow inherently a virtuous action. But our motivations in such cases are clearly, from a Taoist point of view, so shallow and foolish as to warrant no respect. If Mencius, or a sentimental modern lover of "life," were to leap into the river and save a floating baby, he or she would doubtless exult in his or her selfless act of moral heroism, deriving a sense of satisfaction from having done a good deed, and having prevented a terrible tragedy. But who can really know when a given event is truly a tragedy, or perhaps, like the horse that breaks a boy's leg, really a blessing in disguise. Since human wisdom, Chuang-tzu suggests, is inherently incapable of successfully comprehending the true meaning of events as they are happening, when can we ever truly know that our emotional urge to save babies, pretty birds, and entertaining sea-mammals is really an urge that is morally sound. The Taoist answer seems to be that we can never be sure, and **even if the extinction** of Chuangtzu's wife or of the whooping crane really **brought no actual blessing to the world, such events are natural and proper in the way of life itself, and to bemoan such events is to show that one is no more insightful about life than a child who sentimentally cries over the loss of a toy**, a glass of milk, a beloved pet, or even her mommy, run over by a drunken driver. The Taoist lesson seems, in this regard, to be the same in each case: things happen, and some things cause us distress because we attach ourselves sentimentally to certain people, objects, and patterns of life; when those people, objects, or patterns of life take a sudden or drastic turn into a very different direction, a mature and responsible person calms his or her irrational emotions, and takes the morally responsible course of simply **accepting the new state of things**.

### 1NC---3

#### Energy Production is the production of electricity

NASA 11 [NASA Scientific and Technical Information. Scope and Subject Category Guide, http://www.scribd.com/doc/80662465/sscg]

Energy Production—The production of electricity, combustible fuels, nuclear and thermonuclear fuels, and heating and cooling by renewable resources.

#### For is exclusive—meaning the incentive must EXLUSIVELY be for the production of electricity.

Clegg 95—J.D., 1981 Yale Law School; the author is vice president and general counsel of the National Legal Center for the Public Interest. (Roger, “Reclaiming The Text of The Takings Clause,” 46 S.C. L. Rev. 531, Summer, lexis)

Even if it made no sense to limit the clause to takings "for public use"--and, as discussed below, it might make very good sense--that is the way the clause reads. It is not at all ambiguous. The prepositional phrase simply cannot be read as broadening rather than narrowing the clause's scope. Indeed, a prepositional phrase beginning with "for" appears twice more in the Fifth Amendment, and in both cases there is no doubt that the phrase is narrowing the scope of the Amendment. n20

#### VIOLATION—the affirmative incentives research & development—NOT of energy production

#### VOTE NEG—

#### 1. LIMITS—allowing research & development of random energy sources expands the topic to a theoretical number of energy sources—impossible to predict.

#### 2. GROUND—the only unified neg ground is energy production—futuristic sources guarantee the aff AT WORSE a massive delay before they link to the only ground on the topic.

### 1NC---4

#### Text—The fifty state governments and all relevant territories of the United States should expand loan guarantees for Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors in the United States.

#### States solve financial incentives

Clean Energy Group, No Date [“Clean Energy Federalism,” http://www.cleanegroup.org/what-we-do/clean-energy-federalism/, States Lead, Washington Follows]

Over the past decade, states have provided critical financial support to spur thousands of new, clean energy projects using a range of financial support tools, from rebates to competitive grants to loans. Complementing these tools is a set of aggressive public policies at the state level — from tax incentives, net metering, and interconnection rules to renewable portfolio standards. States also are implementing various economic development programs, including industry cluster support, incubators, workforce training and other investments.

Demonstrating Results

The most recent data show that between 1998 and 2009, states, through their own funds, have supported over 72,000 new, clean energy projects across the United States. To bring these projects to market over this eleven year period, states have invested $2.7 billion of their own public funds, almost a half a billion dollars in state funds in 2009 alone. This is separate and apart from any federal stimulus funds, a remarkable demonstration of the states’ commitment to clean energy as part of their future economic development strategies.

Why States are in the Lead

It makes sense that states have been on the cutting edge of clean energy technology deployment. In addition to financial support for clean energy, through their utility regulators, states decide what kind of power plants — coal, oil, solar, or wind — are financed and built in the U.S. While the federal government can influence state energy investment decisions through research and development funding and tax incentives, federal agencies ultimately have little control over those electric power generation decisions.

#### The federal government will model the counterplan

Hills 1 [Daniel Halberstam and Roderick M Hills, Jr. Assistant professor law at the University of Michigan Law School specializing in U.S. constitutional law and Professor of law at the University of Michigan Law School, specializing in U.S. constitutional law, local government law, the law of federalism and intergovernmental relations, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, “State Autonomy in Germany and the United States,” 03-2001, L/N]

The states may exploit this power to initiate programs as a practical means to counteract Congress's constitutional authority to federalize policy areas. For example, before Congress generates enough political will to legislate in any given area, states may step into the field with their own policy proposals. One result is that state policy initiatives may be quite influential in the federal lawmaking process by providing the initial impetus and sometimes even blueprint for federal action (Elliot, Ackerman, and Millian 1985).

### 1NC---5

#### Obama will win but its close.

**Trippi 10/4** (Joe, Political Strategist, Ted Kennedy staffer, Will Romney take advantage of his second chance?, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/10/04/will-romney-take-advantage-his-second-chance/)

Today, Obama has formidable leads in national and swing state polls. My own estimate puts Obama just 5 Electoral College votes short of 270 and another four years in the White House.

So much for that referendum election, right?

Wrong.

Obama’s strength creates an ironic problem. As the media consumes poll after poll and begin to trumpet a perceived Obama victory, voters will be forced to confront the fact of his re-election. They will have to ask themselves one more time if this is what they want. At that point, this might no longer be a choice election, it would instead be **a referendum on the president** -- the race Romney has always wanted.

Should that moment happen, it would be the Romney campaign’s best shot at being able to turn the election around. If Romney's recent high profile speeches are any gauge, he might just have the message to make that happen.

Romney’s most powerful line of the entire campaign came during his speech at the Republican Convention when he said, "President Obama promised to begin to slow the rise of the oceans and to heal the planet. My promise is to help you and your family." That’s the type of message that can break through to voters but we hardly hear it.

In Wednesday night's debate, Romney not only delivered that type of message, he did so with the fire and confidence that could give voters confidence in his ability to bring about the change many claim to want. It was the type of performance that will give many voters pause when considering why this guy is down in so many polls.

Obama still has major advantages. The electoral map gives him many pathways to victory and runaway leads with women and Hispanics could serve as a firewall.

But with November 6 just over thirty days away, **this election is still up for grabs**. It might be too little too late for Romney or it could be the beginning of a comeback for the history books if he can start to connect the dots he laid out in the RNC speech and Wednesday night's debate. Either way, Romney will have been given a chance to argue this election on his terms. Whether he has what it takes to make the most of it the second time around is yet to be seen.

#### Nuclear alienates key constituent groups.

**Mick 6/19** (Jason Daily Tech, Obama Fights For Nuclear, Environmentalists Label Him a Shill http://www.dailytech.com/Obama+Fights+For+Nuclear+Environmentalists+Label+Him+a+Shill/article18781.htm)

Despite these small victories, President Obama's nuclear vision faces many impending obstacles.  Despite the fact that you could tear down one of the nation's old reactors, replace it with a dozen modern clean reactor designs and still have less net waste, some environmentalist groups remain adamantly opposed to new plant construction.  They have vowed to bury the bid for clean nuclear power under a flood of lawsuits.  If the suits succeed, they will raise the cost of nuclear so high, that it can't even compete with the most expensive forms of nuclear energy, like solar power.

And perhaps the biggest obstacle to Obama's nuclear vision will come in 2012.  That is the year when he will face reelection.  That may prove challenging given that one of his former key constituent groups—the environmental lobby—has become one of his staunchest critics.  Regardless, the U.S. is making its first true nuclear progress in 30 years, and that is among the many factors that will already make President Obama's presidency noteworthy.

#### Obama’s margin for error is small --- it costs him the election.

**TNF 12** (The New Fuelist, Obama’s tall environmental task in 2012 http://www.newfuelist.com/blog/obama-coal-regulations-keystone-pipeline)

In case you can’t see it, that’s a treacherous tightrope Barack Obama is walking on these days whenever he steps into the circus-like national energy and environmental policy debate. And his margin for political error on environmental issues will shrink even more during this election year. To avoid alienating environmentalists who supported him in 2008, he must not forget to occasionally—and substantially—lean to the left. But if he wants to hold on to coveted independent voters who are more worried about the slumping economy than they are about pollution, he must also periodically shift back to the middle and right.

The proposed Keystone XL pipeline embodies the President’s conundrum. From the right, calls for increased “energy security” and for the creation of (a disputed number) of pipeline-related jobs make it hard for him to say no. On the left, a large and organized anti-pipeline contingent has taken pains to turn the decision on the pipeline—which will carry crude made from Canadian oil sands, the extraction and production of which makes the fuel much more greenhouse gas-intense than conventional oil—into a political make-or-break for Obama on climate change.

The administration spent 2011 establishing what it must view as a politically necessary middle ground on the environment. It engineered a drastic ratcheting up of fuel efficiency standards for automakers, and sold it as a way to both reduce greenhouse gas emissions and the burden on the consumer. It also introduced landmark regulations on air pollution from power plants, while placating utilities—and outraging many supporters—by delaying the EPA’s proposed tightening of the nation’s standards for smog. And it earned at least temporary relief from pressure to decide on the Keystone XL by punting the issue past the election, to 2013.

But it’s going to be tougher to maintain balance on the tightrope this year. Congressional Republicans, by demanding a much-earlier Obama decision on the Keystone XL in exchange for their support of the recent payroll tax extension, have hinted at their party’s desire to force the President’s hand on environmental issues. The GOP’s presidential nominee will undoubtedly attempt to paint Obama as an over-regulator and irrational environmentalist—an attack line which will warrant a defense. And therein lies Obama’s tall task: to defend his administration’s substantial forays into environmental regulation in terms that resonate with independents whose main concern is the economy—all while simultaneously ensuring that his frustrated environmentalist supporters don’t completely lose their patience.

#### Romney foreign policy causes extinction.

**Bandow 12** Senior fellow at the Cato Institute and former special assistant to President Ronald Reagan [Doug Bandow, 5-15-12, “Mitt Romney: The Foreign Policy of Know-Nothingism” http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/mitt-romney-foreign-policy-knownothingism]

Romney’s overall theme is American exceptionalism and greatness, slogans that win public applause but offer no guidance for a bankrupt superpower that has squandered its international credibility. “This century must be an American century,” Romney proclaimed. “In an American century, America leads the free world and the free world leads the entire world.” He has chosen a mix of advisers, including the usual neocons and uber-hawks — Robert Kagan, Eliot Cohen, Jim Talent, Walid Phares, Kim Holmes, and Daniel Senor, for instance — that gives little reason for comfort. Their involvement suggests Romney’s general commitment to an imperial foreign policy and force structure. Romney is no fool, but he has never demonstrated much interest in international affairs. He brings to mind George W. Bush, who appeared to be largely ignorant of the nations he was invading. Romney may be temperamentally less likely to combine recklessness with hubris, but he would have just as strong an incentive to use foreign aggression to win conservative acquiescence to domestic compromise. This tactic worked well for Bush, whose spendthrift policies received surprisingly little criticism on the right from activists busy defending his war-happy foreign policy. The former Massachusetts governor has criticized President Obama for “a naked political calculation or simply sheer ineptitude” in following George W. Bush’s withdrawal timetable in Iraq and for not overriding the decision of a government whose independence Washington claims to respect. But why would any American policymaker want to keep troops in a nation that is becoming ever more authoritarian, corrupt, and sectarian? It is precisely the sort of place U.S. forces should not be tied down. In contrast, Romney has effectively taken no position on Afghanistan. At times he appears to support the Obama timetable for reducing troop levels, but he has also proclaimed that “Withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan under a Romney administration will be based on conditions on the ground as assessed by our military commanders.” Indeed, he insisted: “To defeat the insurgency in Afghanistan, the United States will need the cooperation of both the Afghan and Pakistani governments — we will only persuade Afghanistan and Pakistan to be resolute if they are convinced that the United States will itself be resolute,” and added, “We should not negotiate with the Taliban. We should defeat the Taliban.” Yet it’s the job of the president, not the military, to decide the basic policy question: why is the U.S. spending blood and treasure trying to create a Western-style nation state in Central Asia a decade after 9/11? And how long is he prepared to stay — forever? On my two trips to Afghanistan I found little support among Afghans for their own government, which is characterized by gross incompetence and corruption. Even if the Western allies succeed in creating a large local security force, will it fight for the thieves in Kabul? Pakistan is already resolute — in opposing U.S. policy on the ground. Afghans forthrightly view Islamabad as an enemy. Unfortunately, continuing the war probably is the most effective way to **destabilize nuclear-armed Pakistan**. What will Romney do if the U.S. military tells him that American combat forces must remain in Afghanistan for another decade or two in order to “win”? The ongoing AfPak conflict is not enough; Romney appears to desire **war with Iran** as well. No one wants a nuclear Iran, but Persian nuclear ambitiions began under America’s ally the Shah, and there is no reason to believe that the U.S. (and Israel) cannot deter Tehran. True, Richard Grenell, who briefly served as Romney’s foreign-policy spokesman, once made the astonishing claim that the Iranians “will surely use” nuclear weapons. Alas, he never shared his apparently secret intelligence about the leadership in Tehran’s suicidal tendencies. The Iranian government’s behavior has been rational even if brutal, and officials busy maneuvering for power and wealth do not seem eager to enter the great beyond. Washington uneasily but effectively deterred Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong, the two most prolific mass murderers in history. Iran is no substitute for them. Romney has engaged in almost infantile ridicule of the Obama administration’s attempt to engage Tehran. Yet the U.S. had diplomatic relations with Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia. Washington came to regret not having similar contact with Mao’s China. Even the Bush administration eventually decided that ignoring Kim Jong-Il’s North Korea only encouraged it to build more nuclear weapons faster. Regarding Iran, Romney asserted, “a military option to deal with their nuclear program remains on the table.” Building up U.S. military forces “will send an unequivocal signal to Iran that the United States, acting in concert with allies, will never permit Iran to obtain nuclear weapons... Only when the ayatollahs no longer have doubts about America’s resolve will they abandon their nuclear ambitions.” Indeed, “if all else fails... then of course you take military action,” even though, American and Iranian military analysts warn, such strikes might only delay development of nuclear weapons. “Elect me as the next president,” he declared, and Iran “will not have a nuclear weapon.” Actually, if Tehran becomes convinced that an attack and attempted regime change are likely, it will have **no choice** but to develop nuclear weapons. How else to defend itself? The misguided war in Libya, which Romney supported, sent a clear signal to both North Korea and Iran never to trust the West. Iran’s fears likely are exacerbated by Romney’s promise to subcontract Middle East policy to Israel. The ties between the U.S. and Israel are many, but their interests often diverge. The current Israeli government wants Washington to attack Iran irrespective of the cost to America. Moreover, successive Israeli governments have decided to effectively colonize the West Bank, turning injustice into state policy and making a separate Palestinian state practically **impossible.** Perceived American support for this creates **enormous hostility** toward the U.S. across the Arab and Muslim worlds. Yet Romney promises that his first foreign trip would be to Israel “to show the world that we care about that country and that region” — as if anyone anywhere, least of all Israel’s neighbors, doesn’t realize that. He asserted that “you don’t allow an inch of space to exist between you and your friends and allies,” notably Israel. The U.S. should “let the entire world know that we will stay with them and that we will support them and defend them.” Indeed, Romney has known Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for nearly four decades and has said that he would request Netanyahu’s approval for U.S. policies: “I’d get on the phone to my friend Bibi Netanyahu and say, ‘Would it help if I say this? What would you like me to do?’” Americans would be better served by a president committed to making policy in the interests of the U.S. instead. Romney’s myopic vision is just as evident when he looks elsewhere. For instance, he offered the singular judgment that Russia is “our number one geopolitical foe.” Romney complained that “across the board, it has been a thorn in our side on questions vital to America’s national security.” The Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Apparently Romney is locked in a time warp. Moscow manifestly does not threaten vital U.S. interests. Romney claimed that Vladimir “Putin dreams of ‘rebuilding the Russian empire’.” Even if Putin has such dreams, they don’t animate Russian foreign policy. No longer an ideologically aggressive power active around the world, Moscow has retreated to the status of a pre-1914 great power, concerned about border security and international respect. Russia has no interest in conflict with America and is not even much involved in most regions where the U.S. is active: Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. Moscow has been helpful in Afghanistan, refused to provide advanced air defense weapons to Iran, supported some sanctions against Tehran, used its limited influence in North Korea to encourage nuclear disarmament, and opposes jihadist terrorism. This is curious behavior for America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s website explains that he will “implement a strategy that will seek to discourage aggressive or expansionist behavior on the part of Russia,” but other than Georgia where is it so acting? And even if Georgia fell into a Russian trap, Tbilisi started the shooting in 2008. In any event, absent an American security guarantee, which would be madness, the U.S. cannot stop Moscow from acting to protect what it sees as vital interests in a region of historic influence. Where else is Russia threatening America? Moscow does oppose NATO expansion, which actually is foolish from a U.S. standpoint as well, adding strategic liabilities rather than military strengths. Russia strongly opposes missile defense bases in Central and Eastern Europe, but why should Washington subsidize the security of others? Moscow opposes an attack on Iran, and so should Americans. Russia backs the Assad regime in Syria, but the U.S. government once declared the same government to be “reformist.” Violent misadventures in Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya demonstrate that America has little to gain and much to lose from another attempt at social engineering through war. If anything, the Putin government has done Washington a favor keeping the U.S. out of Syria. This doesn’t mean America should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But **treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one**. Doing so especially will make Moscow more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union. Naturally, Romney wants to “encourage democratic political and economic reform” in Russia — a fine idea in theory, but meddling in another country’s politics rarely works in practice. Just look at the Arab Spring. Not content with attempting to start a mini-Cold War, Mitt Romney dropped his nominal free-market stance to demonize Chinese currency practices. He complained about currency manipulation and forced technology transfers: “China seeks advantage through systematic exploitation of other economies.” On day one as president he promises to designate “China as the currency manipulator it is.” Moreover, he added, he would “take a holistic approach to addressing all of China’s abuses. That includes unilateral actions such as increased enforcement of U.S. trade laws, punitive measures targeting products and industries that rely on misappropriations of our intellectual property, reciprocity in government procurement, and countervailing duties against currency manipulation. It also includes multilateral actions to block technology transfers into China and to create a trading bloc open only for nations genuinely committed to free trade.” Romney’s apparent belief that Washington is “genuinely committed to free trade” is charming nonsense. The U.S. has practiced a weak dollar policy to increase exports. Washington long has subsidized American exports: the Export-Import Bank is known as “Boeing’s Bank” and U.S. agricultural export subsidies helped torpedo the Doha round of trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization. Of course, Beijing still does much to offend Washington. However, the U.S. must accommodate the rising power across the Pacific. Trying to keep China out of a new Asia-Pacific trade pact isn’t likely to work. America’s Asian allies want us to protect them — no surprise! — but are not interested in offending their nearby neighbor with a long memory. The best hope for moderating Chinese behavior is to tie it into a web of international institutions that provide substantial economic, political, and security benefits. Beijing already has good reason to be paranoid of the superpower which patrols bordering waters, engages in a policy that looks like containment, and talks of the possibility of war. Trying to isolate China economically would be taken as **a direct challenge**. Romney would prove Henry Kissinger’s dictum that **even paranoids have enemies**. Naturally, Romney also wants to “maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors.” However, 67 years after the end of World War II, it is time for Beijing’s neighbors to arm themselves and cooperate with each other. Japan long had the second largest economy on earth. India is another rising power with reason to constrain China. South Korea has become a major power. Australia has initiated a significant military build-up. Many Southeast Asian nations are constructing submarines to help deter Chinese adventurism. Even Russia has much to fear from China, given the paucity of population in its vast eastern territory. But America’s foreign-defense dole discourages independence and self-help. The U.S. should step back as an off-shore balancer, encouraging its friends to do more and work together. It is not America’s job to risk Los Angeles for Tokyo, Seoul, or Taipei. Romney similarly insists on keeping the U.S. on the front lines against North Korea, even though all of its neighbors have far more at stake in a peaceful peninsula and are able to contain that impoverished wreck of a country. The Romney campaign proclaims: “Mitt Romney will commit to eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons and its nuclear-weapons infrastructure.” Alas, everything he proposes has been tried before, from tougher sanctions to tighter interdiction and pressure on China to isolate the North. What does he plan on doing when Pyongyang continues to develop nuclear weapons as it has done for the last 20 years? The American military should come home from Korea. Romney complained that the North’s nuclear capability “poses a direct threat to U.S. forces on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere in East Asia.” Then withdraw them. Manpower-rich South Korea doesn’t need U.S. conventional support, and ground units do nothing to contain North Korea’s nuclear ambitions. Pull out American troops and eliminate North Korea’s primary threat to the U.S. Then support continuing non-proliferation efforts led by those nations with the most to fear from the North. That strategy, more than lobbying by Washington, is likely to bring China around. Romney confuses dreams with reality when criticizing President Obama over the administration’s response to the Arab Spring. “We’re facing an Arab Spring which is out of control in some respects,” he said, “because the president was not as strong as he needed to be in encouraging our friends to move toward representative forms of government.” Romney asked: “How can we try and improve the odds so what happens in Libya and what happens in Egypt and what happens in other places where the Arab Spring is in full bloom so that the developments are toward democracy, modernity and more representative forms of government? This we simply don’t know.” True, the president doesn’t know. But neither does Mitt Romney. The latter suffers from the delusion that bright Washington policymakers can remake the world. Invade another country, turn it into a Western-style democracy allied with America, and everyone will live happily every after. But George W. Bush, a member of Mitt Romney’s own party, failed miserably trying to do that in both Afghanistan and Iraq. The Arab Spring did not happen because of Washington policy but in spite of Washington policy. And Arabs demanding political freedom — which, unfortunately, is not the same as a liberal society — have not the slightest interest in what Barack Obama or Mitt Romney thinks. Yet the latter wants “convene a summit that brings together world leaders, donor organizations, and young leaders of groups that espouse” all the wonderful things that Americans do. Alas, does he really believe that such a gathering will stop, say, jihadist radicals from slaughtering Coptic Christians? Iraq’s large Christian community was destroyed even as the U.S. military occupied that country. His summit isn’t likely to be any more effective. Not everything in the world is about Washington. Which is why Romney’s demand to do something in Syria is so foolish. Until recently he wanted to work with the UN, call on the Syrian military to be nice, impose more sanctions, and “increase the possibility that the ruling minority Alawites will be able to reconcile with the majority Sunni population in a post-Assad Syria.” Snapping his fingers would be no less effective. Most recently he advocated arming the rebels. But he should be more cautious before advocating American intervention in another conflict in another land. Such efforts rarely have desirable results. Iraq was a catastrophe. Afghanistan looks to be a disaster once American troops come home. After more than a decade Bosnia and Kosovo are failures, still under allied supervision. Libya is looking bad. Even without U.S. “help,” a full-blown civil war already threatens in Syria. We only look through the glass darkly, observed the Apostle Paul. It might be best for Washington not to intervene in another Muslim land with so many others aflame. Despite his support for restoring America’s economic health, Romney wants to increase dramatically Washington’s already outsize military spending. Rather than make a case on what the U.S. needs, he has taken the typical liberal approach of setting an arbitrary number: 4 percent of GDP. It’s a dumb idea, since America already accounts for roughly half the globe’s military spending — far more if you include Washington’s wealthy allies — and spends more in real terms than at any time during the Cold War, Korean War, or Vietnam War, and real outlays have nearly doubled since 2000. By any normal measure, the U.S. possesses far more military resources than it needs to confront genuine threats. What Romney clearly wants is a military to fight multiple wars and garrison endless occupations, irrespective of cost. My Cato colleague Chris Preble figured that Romney's 4 percent gimmick would result in taxpayers spending more than twice as much on the Pentagon as in 2000 (111 percent higher, to be precise) and 45 percent more than in 1985, the height of the Reagan buildup. Over the next ten years, Romney's annual spending (in constant dollars) for the Pentagon would average 64 percent higher than annual post-Cold War budgets (1990-2012), and 42 percent more than the average during the Reagan era (1981-1989). If Mitt Romney really believes that the world today is so much more dangerous than during the Cold War, he should spell out the threat. He calls Islamic fundamentalism, the Arab Spring, the impact of failed states, the anti-American regimes of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela, rising China, and resurgent Russia “powerful forces.” It’s actually a pitiful list — Islamic terrorists have been weakened and don’t pose an existential threat, the Arab Spring threatens instability with little impact on America, it is easier to strike terrorists in failed states than in nominal allies like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, one nuclear-armed submarine could vaporize all four hostile states, and Russia’s modest “resurgence” may threaten Georgia but not Europe or America. Only China deserves to be called “powerful,” but it remains a developing country surrounded by potential enemies with a military far behind that of the U.S. In fact, the **greatest danger** to America is the **blowback** that results from promiscuous intervention in conflicts not our own. Romney imagines a massive bootstrap operation: he wants a big military to engage in social engineering abroad which would require an even larger military to handle the violence and chaos that would result from his failed attempts at social engineering. Better not to start this vicious cycle. America faces international challenges but nevertheless enjoys unparalleled dominance. U.S. power is buttressed by the fact that Washington is allied with every industrialized nation except China and Russia. America shares significant interests with India, the second major emerging power; is seen as a counterweight by a gaggle of Asian states worried about Chinese expansion; remains the dominant player in Latin America; and is closely linked to most of the Middle East’s most important countries, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq. If Mitt Romney really believes that America is at greater risk today than during the Cold War, he is not qualified to be president. In this world the U.S. need not confront every threat, subsidize every ally, rebuild every failed state, and resolve every problem. Being a superpower means having many interests but few vital ones warranting war. Being a bankrupt superpower means exhibiting judgment and exercising discretion. President Barack Obama has been a disappointment, amounting in foreign policy to George W. Bush-lite. But Mitt Romney **sounds even worse.** His rhetoric suggests a return to the worst of the Bush administration. The 2012 election likely will be decided on economics, but foreign policy will prove to be equally important in the long-term. America can ill afford another know-nothing president.
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#### 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#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#f55)

#### India is key to thorium.

Economywatch, 8/23 [http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Is-India-About-to-Alter-the-Worlds-Energy-Future.html]

Since 1951, the Indian government has somehow managed to fail in every single attempt to reach its annual target of increasing the nation’s electricity production capacity. But while the nation continues to struggle with crippling blackouts and power shortages till today, an energy plan, conceived during the 1950s, may fundamentally alter the nation’s, and quite possibly the world’s, energy future.¶ Thorium, like its Norse god and Marvel superhero namesake, is expected to change the world.¶ Late last month, India suffered two consecutive power grid failures, which crippled the nation’s social and economic infrastructure: On July 30th, nearly 300 million Indians were affected by a massive blackout; and on the very next day, more than half of the population had no access to electricity after three of the nation's five power grids failed at lunchtime. As engineers struggled to fix the world’s worst blackout in history, many analysts questioned whether the Indian government could meet the nation's increasing appetite for energy. “The turmoil caused by the back-to-back grid failures is almost at the scale of a national emergency,” wrote [Times of India](http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/crosslines/entry/sushil-kumar-shinde-sneaks-out-of-a-dark-power-ministry) journalist Ranjan Roy in an op-ed piece. “A power crisis has been staring us at the face . . . and successive governments have failed to prevent a disaster,” he later noted.¶ According to a report by [Bloomberg](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-21/india-considers-35-billion-debt-revamp-after-biggest-blackout.html), India has missed every annual target to add electricity production capacity since 1951. India also faced a deficit of 8.5 percent on its base electricity load from 2010-2011; and many Indians now feel that government’s general inaction has compounded the nation’s energy problems.¶ “This is a telling commentary on the situation of the power sector in the country,” told Chandrajit Banerjee, Director General of the Confederation of Indian Industry, to [Arab News](http://www.menafn.com/menafn/1093547225/Blackouts-challenge-Indias-growing-economic-clout). “Losses to businesses have been in hundreds of millions of US dollars, which pales into insignificance when compared to the difficulty that the people of the country have had to face." "As one of the emerging economies of the world, which is home to almost a sixth of the world population, it is imperative that our basic infrastructure requirements are in keeping with India's aspirations," Banerjee added.¶ But, the Indian government insists that they are doing their best. In a report by the Economic Times, the Indian government blamed three states – namely, Punjab, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh – for the blackouts – as they had drawn power in excess of their allotted quota all through June and July. Then-Minister of Power Sushil Kumar Shinde, who has since been replaced by Veerappa Moily, also initially boasted about how quickly India managed to recover its power – comparing it to the 2008 power grid failure in the United States, which took four days to restore.¶ Still, interestingly enough, on August 22nd, the Indian government announced that they would restructure $35 billion of loans held by its utilities in order to boost their ability to supply electricity and avert another blackout. And the biggest news for India’s energy future actually came earlier this year – before the blackouts even occurred – when the Indian parliament declared, in collaboration with its Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), that the nation would commence on the construction of its first-ever 300 MW (megawatt) thorium reactor by 2016-17.¶ Thorium-Fuelled Dreams Thorium is a naturally occurring radioactive chemical element that is named after the Norse god of thunder, Thor. Discovered in 1828 by Swedish chemist Jons Jakob Berzelius, the 90th element on the periodic table has been described by [Forbes](http://www.forbes.com/sites/williampentland/2011/09/11/is-thorium-the-biggest-energy-breakthrough-since-fire-possibly/) as possibly “the biggest energy breakthrough since fire.” According to [Greentech Media](http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/Can-Thorium-Generate-Safer-Nuclear-Power/), Thorium has the potential to replace uranium as a ultra-cheap and ultra-safe nuclear energy source. Not only is the metal approximately three times as abundant as uranium in the earth’s crust, but it also contains up to 200 times the energy density.¶ “So why on earth are we using uranium?” asked Marin Katusa of [Forbes](http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2012/02/16/the-thing-about-thorium-why-the-better-nuclear-fuel-may-not-get-a-chance/). “As you may recall, research into the mechanization of nuclear reactions was initially driven not by the desire to make energy, but by the desire to make bombs.” “The $2 billion Manhattan Project that produced the atomic bomb sparked a worldwide surge in nuclear research, most of it funded by governments embroiled in the Cold War. And here we come to it: Thorium reactors do not produce plutonium, which is what you need to make a nuke.”¶ After decades of relative obscurity however, Thorium is finally attracting increasing interest as an energy source from around the world. Apart from India, China has also announced its intentions to develop a thorium nuclear reactor, while Canada, Germany, Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States have all experimented with using thorium as a substitute nuclear fuel in existing nuclear reactors. India’s thorium plans though are possibly the most well known and most promising of them all.

### 1NC---S

#### Discount their thorium evidence --- it’s from thorium blogs and industry insiders.

#### Nuclear will remain uncompetitive for decades—our evidence cites industry leaders.

Hiltzik 11—Michael Hiltzik is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and author who has covered business, technology, and public policy for the Los Angeles Times for twenty years, master of science degree in journalism from the Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia University [March 23, 2011, “A nuclear renaissance in U.S. was unlikely even before Japan disaster,” *LA Times*, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/23/business/la-fi-hiltzik-20110323]

To all those who may be concerned that the catastrophic events at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant will derail the heralded renaissance of nuclear power in the U.S., you can relax.

The reason is simple: There is no renaissance.

Not even Exelon Corp., the nation's biggest nuclear generation company, has been holding its breath for a surge in orders or appreciable increase in new generating capacity.

The reason has little to do with an unreasoning public's fear of nuclear meltdowns and radiation poisoning, and almost everything to do with pure economics. As John Rowe, Exelon's chairman and chief executive, told an audience at a Washington think tank two weeks ago, you can build a new natural gas plant for 40% less than a new nuclear plant, and the price of its fuel is at rock bottom.

"Natural gas is queen," he says. (To be fair, Exelon also makes a lot of money from gas.)

In recent years, nuclear energy has been promoted as a "green," or at least greenish, alternative to coal power and other fossil-fueled generation. That's been a potent selling point as concern has mounted over the latter's effect on climate change by the production of greenhouse gases. Nuclear power is burdened by its own environmental issues, including the dangers of radioactive release into the atmosphere, but the production of carbon dioxide isn't among them.

Yet the technology's potential as a weapon against global warming has been as oversold, just as its virtues as safe, clean and "too cheap to meter" were during its infancy in the 1950s. To realistically make a dent in climate change, nuclear plant construction would have to take off at such a rate that it would "pose serious concerns" for the availability of construction materials, properly trained builders and operating technicians, and safety and security oversight, as a report by the Council on Foreign Relations observed in 2007.

"For at least a couple of decades to come, nuclear will be very uncompetitive," the report's author, Charles D. Ferguson, told me this week. Ferguson is president of the Federation of American Scientists.

The ongoing disaster in Japan will exacerbate social concerns about nuclear waste disposal — the on-site storage of spent fuel, which is common at U.S. plants, has complicated the situation at Fukushima — as well as concerns about the safety and security of existing plants. But those concerns have existed for years, so the spectacle of the Japanese grappling with the consequences, graphic as it is, may not in itself affect public attitudes.

Talk of nuclear renaissance in the U.S. had been spurred by two developments. One was the dramatic improvement in the operating record of U.S. plants. In recent years the domestic nuclear industry had been operating at close to 90% of capacity, compared with the lousy 65% record it turned in during the 1970s. The change was the product partially of the industry's consolidation into a small number of specialty operators with nuclear expertise, and it tended to reduce the apparent cost of nuclear power to levels competitive with other sources.

But that also means that "people who advocate nuclear power have rose-colored glasses about its economics," says John E. Parsons of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the co-author of a 2009 update to a 2003 MIT report on the future of nuclear power.

Further encouragement came from the streamlining of U.S. licensing rules. The new procedure consolidates what formerly were separate construction and operating permits into one, removing the uncertainty that a utility might build an entire facility only to be denied permission to run it.

But no new plant has yet been approved under the new system, so plenty of uncertainty still exists. "An investor has to ask, 'Am I looking at a technology that works only when all the cards fall my way?'" Parsons says.

Despite expressions of support for nuclear power coming from political leaders, including President Obama, who is offering loan guarantees for new reactors, nuclear energy can't develop in a policy vacuum. One of the dismal ironies of the American energy program is that many of the same politicians standing foursquare behind nuclear power are also sworn opponents of policies such as a carbon tax, which would make nukes more competitive by raising the price of fossil-based alternatives.

For example, here's Mitt Romney. In "No Apology," the book he published last year presumably as a manifesto for his 2012 presidential campaign, Romney says he doesn't understand why nuclear power is such a "boogeyman," because America's existing plants are "trouble-free." Romney contends that nuclear plants are economically unfeasible in the U.S. only because of our "interminable permitting, regulatory and legal delays."

Romney should listen more to fellow businessmen like Exelon's Rowe, who would tell him that the real reason is that gas generation is cheaper, thanks to pricing that ignores such external costs of gas as pollution and climate change. Yet in his book Romney condemns policies such as the carbon tax because it would "fatten government, harm employers and employees, and hurt consumers." You can't have it both ways, Mitt.

Romney defends the economics of nuclear power by observing that countries with major nuclear construction programs, such as China, seem to have solved the economic conundrum without much trouble. Yet even pro-nuclear experts here acknowledge that nuclear economics don't easily cross national borders. China, which has 13 operating nuclear plants and 30 under construction, has endowed its state-owned nuclear industry with heavy subsidies.

According to a report by the Federation of American Scientists, China's burgeoning demand for electrical power can't effectively be satisfied from its current main source, coal, which will face a depletion crisis around the end of this decade. That makes ramping up nuclear an urgent issue for China. But in the U.S., says Andrew Kadak, the former CEO of Yankee Atomic Power Co., a New England nuclear plant operator, "we don't have that urgency because natural gas is too cheap an alternative."

With the construction of plants still hampered by economics, nuclear utilities are devoting more attention to improving efficiencies and increasing the output of their existing plants, a process known as "uprating." But that amounts to treading water until the social and economic difficulties of nuclear power can be addressed. And they'll have to be addressed: "It's going to be very hard to reduce carbon dioxide if nuclear is out of the picture," MIT's Parsons says. But the first step is injecting realism into the discussion. Nuclear power may be necessary to our energy future, but it won't be our savior.

#### Thorium reactors are economically worse—add extra steps to the fuel cycle.

Lovins 9—Amory B. Lovins is a physicist and Cofounder, Chairman, and Chief Scientist of Rocky Mountain Institute and Cofounder and Chairman Emeritus of Fiberforge, Inc. Published in 29 books and hundreds of papers. He has consulted for more than three decades for major firms and governments (including the U.S. DoE and DOD) on advanced energy and resource efficiency in ~50 countries. [March 21, 2009, ““New” nuclear reactors, same old story,” Rocky Mountain Institute, http://www.rmi.org/Knowledge-Center/Library/2009-07\_NuclearSameOldStory]

Thorium reactors

Some enthusiasts prefer fueling reactors with thorium—an element 3x as abundant as uranium but even more uneconomic to use. India has for decades failed to commercialize breeder reactors to exploit its thorium deposits. But thorium can’t fuel a reactor by itself: rather, a uranium- or plutonium-fueled reactor can convert thorium-232 into fissionable (and plutonium-like, highly bomb-usable) uranium-233. Thorium’s proliferation, waste, safety, and cost problems differ only in detail from uranium’s: e.g., thorium ore makes less mill waste, but highly radioactive U-232 makes fabricating or reprocessing U-233 fuel hard and costly. And with uranium-based nuclear power continuing its decades-long economic collapse, it’s awfully late to be thinking of developing a whole new fuel cycle whose problems differ only in detail from current versions.

#### Changes in regulation or financial incentives won’t solve—our ev cites industry officials.

Taylor 8—Jerry Taylor is senior fellow at the Cato Institute. Taylor is a frequent contributor to the *Wall Street Journal* and *National Review* and appears regularly on CNBC, NPR, Bloomberg Radio, the BBC, and Fox News. His op-eds on public policy have appeared in the pages of *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times* and most other major dailies. His extended essays on energy policy have appeared in *The Georgetown Journal of Law & Public Policy*, *The Columbia Journal of International Affairs*, Limes: *The Italian Journal of Geopolitics*, *The Milken Institute Review*, and *Regulation* magazine. Taylor has served on several congressional advisory bodies and has testified frequently on Capitol Hill regarding various energy and environmental policy matters. Taylor is a member of the International Association for Energy Economics. He is also an adjunct scholar at the Institute for Energy Research. [October 22, 2008, “Nuclear Energy: Risky Business,” Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/nuclear-energy-risky-business]

Nuclear supporters often counter that construction costs would be a lot lower if regulators didn't impose insanely demanding safety standards, byzantine and time-consuming permitting processes, or endless public hearings, any one of which could result in the plant being stopped in its tracks. Investors would also be more likely to invest, we're told, if there were a high-level waste repository in place or more political support for nuclear power.

I would love to tell that story. I do, after all, work at the Cato Institute, and blaming government for economic problems is what keeps me in business. But what stops me is the fact that those complaints are not echoed by the nuclear power industry itself.

On the contrary, the industry in the early 1990s asked for-and got-exactly the sort of safety regulations, permit review process, and public comment regime now in place. Both public and political support for nuclear power is running so high than even a majority of Democrats in Congress are happy to not just tolerate nuclear power, but lavish even more subsidies upon it. And while Yucca Mountain may not be open now or ever, everyone seems reasonably content with the current on-site waste storage regime.

Indeed, if government were the reason why investors were saying "no" to their loan applications, I would expect that industry officials would be the first to say so. But they do not.

#### 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.

#### These restrictions outweigh all other barriers.

NEI, Winter 2012. Nuclear Energy Institute. “U.S. Nuclear Export Rules Hurt Global Competitiveness,” <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/publicationsandmedia/insight/insightwinter2012/us-nuclear-export-rules-hurt-global-competitiveness/>.

Today, U.S. dominance of the global nuclear power market has eroded as suppliers from other countries compete aggressively against American exporters. U.S. suppliers confront competitors that benefit from various forms of state promotion and also must contend with a U.S. government that has not adapted to new commercial realities. The potential is tremendous—$500 billion to $740 billion in international orders over the next decade, representing tens of thousands of potential American jobs, according to the [U.S. Department of Commerce](http://www.commerce.gov/). With America suffering a large trade deficit, nuclear goods and services represent a market worth aggressive action. However, antiquated U.S. government approaches to nuclear exports are challenging U.S. competitiveness in the nuclear energy market. New federal support is needed if the United States wants to reclaim dominance in commercial nuclear goods and services—and create the jobs that go with them. “The U.S. used to be a monopoly supplier of nuclear materials and technology back in the ’50s and ’60s,” said Fred McGoldrick, former director of the Office of Nonproliferation and Export Policy at the [State Department](http://www.state.gov/). “That position has eroded to the point where we’re a minor player compared to other countries.” America continues to lead the world in technology innovation and know-how. So what are the issues? And where is the trade? Effective coordination among the many government agencies involved in nuclear exports would provide a boost to U.S. suppliers. “Multiple U.S. agencies are engaged with countries abroad that are developing nuclear power, from early assistance to export controls to trade finance and more,” said Ted Jones, director for supplier international relations at NEI. The challenge is to create a framework that allows commercial nuclear trade to grow while ensuring against the proliferation of nuclear materials. “To compete in such a situation, an ongoing dialogue between U.S. suppliers and government needs to be conducted and U.S. trade promotion must be coordinated at the highest levels,” Jones said. Licensing U.S. Exports Jurisdiction for commercial nuclear export controls is divided among the Departments of [Energy](http://energy.gov/) and Commerce and the [Nuclear Regulatory Commission](http://www.nrc.gov/) and has not been comprehensively updated to coordinate among the agencies or to reflect economic and technological changes over the decades. The State Department also is involved in international nuclear commerce. It negotiates and implements so-called “[123 agreements](http://export.gov/civilnuclear/eg_main_022093.asp)” that allow for nuclear goods and services to be traded with a foreign country. The federal agencies often have different, conflicting priorities, leading to a lack of clarity for exporters and longer processing times for export licenses. “The U.S. nuclear export regime is the most complex and restrictive in the world and the least efficient,” said Jones. “Furthermore, it is poorly focused on items and technologies that pose little or no proliferation concern. By trying to protect too much, we risk diminishing the focus on sensitive technologies and handicapping U.S. exports.” A case in point is the Energy Department’s [Part 810 regulations](http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&rgn=div5&view=text&node=10:4.0.2.5.23&idno=10). While 123 agreements open trade between the United States and other countries, Part 810 regulates what the United States can trade with another country. For certain countries, it can take more than a year to obtain “specific authorizations” to export nuclear items. Because other supplier countries authorize exports to the same countries with fewer requirements and delays, the Part 810 rules translate into a significant competitive disadvantage for U.S. suppliers. Today, 76 countries require a specific authorization, but DOE has proposed almost doubling that number—to include for the first time countries that have never demonstrated a special proliferation concern, that are already part of the global nuclear supply chain, and that plan new nuclear infrastructure. The proposed Part 810 rule would do nothing to reduce lengthy license processing times, said Jones. Other nuclear supplier countries impose strict guidelines on their licensing agencies for timely processing of applications. Equivalent licenses must be processed in fewer than nine months in France, fewer than 90 days in Japan and 15 days in South Korea. One possible solution, said McGoldrick, would be to set similar deadlines for issuance of licenses. U.S. agencies “could have deadlines set forth in the new [Part 810] regulations, which would give the relevant government agencies specified times in which to act on a license. Time could be exceeded only under certain circumstances,” said McGoldrick.

### 1NC---Adv 1

#### The 1AC 65 reactors are being developed by China now --- plan does not offset those --- means the fuel cycle is open.

#### US can’t lead—state run nuclear power will always win

**Domenici and Miller 12** [Pete, Former U.S. Senator and Bipartisan Policy Center Senior Fellow, and Dr Warren F, Former Department of energy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear energy, “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” September, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Nuclear%20Report.PDF]

However, domestic exporters of U.S. nuclear technology, fuels, and services face a truly global and highly competitive market. Commercial nuclear technology is now available from a variety of suppliers, and there are many more companies, several of which have the direct backing of their country’s government, competing with U.S. firms. Industry and other stakeholders believe that U.S. nuclear technology companies are at a competitive disadvantage in international markets due to complex and overlapping federal regulations. Several presenters at the BPC Nuclear Initiative event noted that multiple federal agencies, including the Department of Commerce, DOe, and the Department of State have jurisdiction over commercial nuclear trade, global safety and security, and nonproliferation.

#### Small arsenals solve.

Seng 98 (Jordan, PhD Candidate in Pol. Sci.—U. Chicago, Dissertation, “STRATEGY FOR PANDORA'S CHILDREN: STABLE NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AMONG MINOR STATES,” p. 203-206)

However, this "state of affairs" is not as dangerous as it might seem. The nuclear arsenals of limited nuclear proliferators will be small and, consequently, the command and control organizations that manage chose arsenals will be small as well. The small arsenals of limited nuclear proliferators will mitigate against many of the dangers of the highly delegative, 'non-centralized' launch procedures Third World states are likely to use. This will happen in two main ways. First, only a small number of people need be involved in Third World command and control. The superpowers had tens of thousands of nuclear warheads and thousands of nuclear weapons personnel in a variety of deployments organized around numerous nuclear delivery platforms. A state that has, say, fifty nuclear weapons needs at most fifty launch operators and only a handful of group commanders. This has both quantitative and qualitative repercussions. Quantitatively, the very small number of people 'in the loop' greatly diminishes the statistical probability that accidents or human error will result in inappropriate nuclear launches. All else being equal, the chances of finding some guard asleep at some post increases with the number of guards and posts one has to cover. Qualitatively, small numbers makes it possible to centrally train operators, to screen and choose them with exceeding care, 7 and to keep each of them in direct contact with central authorities in times of crises. With very small control communities, there is no need for intermediary commanders. Important information and instructions can get out quickly and directly. Quality control of launch operators and operations is easier. In some part, at least, Third World states can compensate for their lack of sophisticated use-control technology with a more controlled selection of, and more extensive communication with, human operators. Secondly, and relatedly, Third World proliferators will not need to rely on cumbersome standard operating procedures to manage and launch their nuclear weapons. This is because the number of weapons will be so small, and also because the arsenals will be very simple in composition. Third World stares simply will not have that many weapons to keep track of. Third World states will not have the great variety of delivery platforms that the superpowers had (various ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, long range bombers, fighter bombers, missile submarines, nuclear armed ships, nuclear mortars, etc., etc.), or the great number and variety of basing options, and they will not employ the complicated strategies of international basing that the superpowers used. The small and simple arsenals of Third World proliferators will not require highly complex systems to coordinate nuclear activities. This creates two specific organizational advantages. One, small organizations, even if they do rely to some extent of standard operating procedures, can be flexible in times of crisis. As we have discussed, the essential problem of standard operating procedures in nuclear launch processes is that the full range if possible strategic developments cannot be predicted and specified before the fact, and thus responses to them cannot be standardized fully. An unexpected event can lead to 'mismatched' and inappropriate organizational reactions. In complex and extensive command and control organizations, standard operating procedures coordinate great numbers of people at numerous levels of command structure in a great multiplicity of places. If an unexpected event triggers operating procedures leading to what would be an inappropriate nuclear launch, it would be very difficult for central commanders to “get the word out' to everyone involved. The coordination needed to stop launch activity would be at least as complicated as the coordination needed to initiate it, and, depending on the speed of launch processes, there may be less time to accomplish it. However, the small numbers of people involved in nuclear launches and the simplicity of arsenals will make it far easier for Third World leaders to 'get the word out' and reverse launch procedures if necessary. Again, so few will be the numbers of weapons that all launch operators could be contacted directly by central leaders. The programmed triggers of standard operating procedures can be passed over in favor of unscripted, flexible responses based on a limited number of human-to-human communications and confirmations. Two, the smallness and simplicity of Third World command and control organizations will make it easier for leaders to keep track of everything that is going on at any given moment. One of the great dangers of complex organizational procedures is that once one organizational event is triggered—once an alarm is sounded and a programmed response is made—other branches of the organization are likely to be affected as well. This is what Charles Perrow refers to as interactive complexity, 8 and it has been a mainstay in organizational critiques of nuclear command and control s ystems.9 The more complex the organization is, the more likely these secondary effects are, and the less likely they are to be foreseen, noticed, and well-managed. So, for instance, an American commander that gives the order to scramble nuclear bombers over the U.S. as a defensive measure may find that he has unwittingly given the order to scramble bombers in Europe as well. A recall order to the American bombers may overlook the European theater, and nuclear misuse could result. However, when numbers of nuclear weapons can be measured in the dozens rather than the hundreds or thousands, and when deployment of those weapons does not involve multiple theaters and forward based delivery vehicles of numerous types, tight coupling is unlikely to cause unforeseen and unnoticeable organizational events. Other things being equal, it is just a lot easier to know all of what is going on. In short, while Third World states may nor have the electronic use-control devices that help ensure that peripheral commanders do nor 'get out of control,' they have other advantages that make the challenge of centralized control easier than it was for the superpowers. The small numbers of personnel and organizational simplicity of launch bureaucracies means that even if a few more people have their fingers on the button than in the case of the superpowers, there will be less of a chance that weapons will be launched without a definite, informed and unambiguous decision to press that button.

#### Prolif will be slow.

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, former Deputy Managing Ed. Foreig Affairs and Assistant Managing Ed. Newsweek, Newsweek, “Why Obama should Learn to Love the Bomb,” 44:154, 9-7, L/N)

The risk of an arms race--with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one--is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors--Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say--might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

#### No chain reactions.

Alagappa 8 (Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow—East-West Center, in “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia,” Ed. Muthiah Alagappa, p. 521-522)

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India's and Pakistan's nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran's quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country's security concerns about the United States and Tehran's regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S. Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country's decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

**No terrorism.**

**Mueller 06** – Chair of National Security Studies @ Ohio State University [John Mueller. “Is There Still a Terrorist Threat?,” Foreign Affairs. New York: Sep/Oct 200Vol. 85, Iss. 5; pg. 2//Metapress]

In addition to massive eavesdropping and detention programs, every year some 30,000 "national security letters" are issued without judicial review, forcing businesses and other institutions to disclose confidential information about their customers without telling anyone they have done so. That process has generated thousands of leads that, when pursued, have led nowhere. Some 80,000 Arab and Muslim immigrants have been subjected to fingerprinting and registration, another 8,000 have been called in for interviews with the FBI, and over 5,000 foreign nationals have been imprisoned in initiatives designed to prevent terrorism. This activity, notes the Georgetown University law professor David Cole, has not resulted in a single conviction for a terrorist crime. In fact, only a small number of people picked up on terrorism charges -- always to great official fanfare -- have been convicted at all, and almost all of these convictions have been for other infractions, particularly immigration violations. Some of those convicted have clearly been mental cases or simply flaunting jihadist bravado -- rattling on about taking down the Brooklyn Bridge with a blowtorch, blowing up the Sears Tower if only they could get to Chicago, beheading the prime minister of Canada, or flooding lower Manhattan by somehow doing something terrible to one of those tunnels.

### 1NC---Adv 2

#### Wohlforth is wrong.

Monteiro 11—Professor of Political Science at Yale University [Nuno P. Monteiro, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” International Security, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Winter 2011/12), pp. 9–40]

This article has laid out a theory of unipolarity that accounts for how a unipolar structure of the international system provides significant incentives for conflict. In doing so, my argument corrects an important problem with extant research on unipolarity—the absence of scholarship questioning William Wohlforth’s view that a unipolar world is peaceful. In this respect, Wohlforth’s words ring as true of extant scholarship today as they did in 1999: “When balance-of-power theorists argue that the post–Cold War world is headed toward conflict, they are not claiming that unipolarity causes conflict. Rather, they are claiming that unipolarity leads quickly to bi- or multipolarity. It is not unipolarity’s peace but its durability that is in dispute.”112 Not anymore. It is not that the core of Wohlforth’s widely shared argument is wrong, however: great power conflict is impossible in a unipolar world. Rather, his claim that unipolarity is peaceful has two important limitations. First, it focuses on great powers. But because unipolarity prevents the aggregation of conflicts involving major and minor powers into conflict between great powers, scholars must look beyond great power interactions when analyzing the structural incentives for war. Second, Wohlforth assumes that the unipole’s only reasonable strategic option is defensive dominance. But given that unipolarity provides the unipole with ample room for defining its foreign policy, offensive dominance and disengagement are equally plausible strategies. This requires a look at how these two additional strategies facilitate conflict. Pg. 37

#### The only comprehensive study proves no transition impact.

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

In this article, we question the logic and evidence of the retrenchment pessimists. To date there has been neither a comprehensive study of great power retrenchment nor a study that lays out the case for retrenchment as a practical or probable policy. This article fills these gaps by systematically examining the relationship between acute relative decline and the responses of great powers. We examine eighteen cases of acute relative decline since 1870 and advance three main arguments.

First, we challenge the retrenchment pessimists’ claim that domestic or international constraints inhibit the ability of declining great powers to retrench. In fact, when states fall in the hierarchy of great powers, peaceful retrenchment is the most common response, even over short time spans. Based on the empirical record, we find that great powers retrenched in no less than eleven and no more than fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61–83 percent. When international conditions demand it, states renounce risky ties, increase reliance on allies or adversaries, draw down their military obligations, and impose adjustments on domestic populations.

Second, we find that the magnitude of relative decline helps explain the extent of great power retrenchment. Following the dictates of neorealist theory, great powers retrench for the same reason they expand: the rigors of great power politics compel them to do so.12 Retrenchment is by no means easy, but necessity is the mother of invention, and declining great powers face powerful incentives to contract their interests in a prompt and proportionate manner. Knowing only a state’s rate of relative economic decline explains its corresponding degree of retrenchment in as much as 61 percent of the cases we examined.

Third, we argue that the rate of decline helps explain what forms great power retrenchment will take. How fast great powers fall contributes to whether these retrenching states will internally reform, seek new allies or rely more heavily on old ones, and make diplomatic overtures to enemies. Further, our analysis suggests that great powers facing acute decline are less likely to initiate or escalate militarized interstate disputes. Faced with diminishing resources, great powers moderate their foreign policy ambitions and offer concessions in areas of lesser strategic value. Contrary to the pessimistic conclusions of critics, retrenchment neither requires aggression nor invites predation. Great powers are able to rebalance their commitments through compromise, rather than conflict. In these ways, states respond to penury the same way they do to plenty: they seek to adopt policies that maximize security given available means. Far from being a hazardous policy, retrenchment can be successful. States that retrench often regain their position in the hierarchy of great powers. Of the fifteen great powers that adopted retrenchment in response to acute relative decline, 40 percent managed to recover their ordinal rank. In contrast, none of the declining powers that failed to retrench recovered their relative position. Pg. 9-10

#### US decline will not spark wars.

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

Our findings are directly relevant to what appears to be an impending great power transition between China and the United States. Estimates of economic performance vary, but most observers expect Chinese GDP to surpass U.S. GDP sometime in the next decade or two. 91 This prospect has generated considerable concern. Many scholars foresee major conflict during a Sino-U.S. ordinal transition. Echoing Gilpin and Copeland, John Mearsheimer sees the crux of the issue as irreconcilable goals: China wants to be America’s superior and the United States wants no peer competitors. In his words, “[N]o amount of goodwill can ameliorate the intense security competition that sets in when an aspiring hegemon appears in Eurasia.” 92

Contrary to these predictions, our analysis suggests some grounds for optimism. Based on the historical track record of great powers facing acute relative decline, the United States should be able to retrench in the coming decades. In the next few years, the United States is ripe to overhaul its military, shift burdens to its allies, and work to decrease costly international commitments. It is likely to initiate and become embroiled in fewer militarized disputes than the average great power and to settle these disputes more amicably. Some might view this prospect with apprehension, fearing the steady erosion of U.S. credibility. Yet our analysis suggests that retrenchment need not signal weakness. Holding on to exposed and expensive commitments simply for the sake of one’s reputation is a greater geopolitical gamble than withdrawing to cheaper, more defensible frontiers.

Some observers might dispute our conclusions, arguing that hegemonic transitions are more conflict prone than other moments of acute relative decline. We counter that there are deductive and empirical reasons to doubt this argument. Theoretically, hegemonic powers should actually find it easier to manage acute relative decline. Fallen hegemons still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them. Further, they are no longer the top target for balancing coalitions, and recovering hegemons may be influential because they can play a pivotal role in alliance formation. In addition, hegemonic powers, almost by definition, possess more extensive overseas commitments; they should be able to more readily identify and eliminate extraneous burdens without exposing vulnerabilities or exciting domestic populations.

We believe the empirical record supports these conclusions. In particular, periods of hegemonic transition do not appear more conflict prone than those of acute decline. The last reversal at the pinnacle of power was the AngloAmerican transition, which took place around 1872 and was resolved without armed confrontation. The tenor of that transition may have been influenced by a number of factors: both states were democratic maritime empires, the United States was slowly emerging from the Civil War, and Great Britain could likely coast on a large lead in domestic capital stock. Although China and the United States differ in regime type, similar factors may work to cushion the impending Sino-American transition. Both are large, relatively secure continental great powers, a fact that mitigates potential geopolitical competition. 93 China faces a variety of domestic political challenges, including strains among rival regions, which may complicate its ability to sustain its economic performance or engage in foreign policy adventurism. 94

Most important, the United States is not in free fall. Extrapolating the data into the future, we anticipate the United States will experience a “moderate” decline, losing from 2 to 4 percent of its share of great power GDP in the five years after being surpassed by China sometime in the next decade or two. 95 Given the relatively gradual rate of U.S. decline relative to China, the incentives for either side to run risks by courting conflict are minimal. The United States would still possess upwards of a third of the share of great power GDP, and would have little to gain from provoking a crisis over a peripheral issue. Conversely, China has few incentives to exploit U.S. weakness. 96 Given the importance of the U.S. market to the Chinese economy, in addition to the critical role played by the dollar as a global reserve currency, it is unclear how Beijing could hope to consolidate or expand its increasingly advantageous position through direct confrontation. In short, the United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism. Indeed, there is evidence that a policy of retrenchment could reap potential benefits. The drawdown and repositioning of U.S. troops in South Korea, for example, rather than fostering instability, has resulted in an improvement in the occasionally strained relationship between Washington and Seoul. 97 U.S. moderation on Taiwan, rather than encouraging hard-liners in Beijing, resulted in an improvement in cross-strait relations and reassured U.S. allies that Washington would not inadvertently drag them into a Sino-U.S. conflict. 98 Moreover, Washington’s support for the development of multilateral security institutions, rather than harming bilateral alliances, could work to enhance U.S. prestige while embedding China within a more transparent regional order. 99 A policy of gradual retrenchment need not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments or unleash destabilizing regional security dilemmas. Indeed, even if Beijing harbored revisionist intent, it is unclear that China will have the force projection capabilities necessary to take and hold additional territory. 100 By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can strengthen the credibility of its core commitments while accommodating the interests of a rising China. Not least among the benefits of retrenchment is that it helps alleviate an unsustainable financial position. Immense forward deployments will only exacerbate U.S. grand strategic problems and risk unnecessary clashes. 101

## 2NC

### 2NC Overview

#### And this is:

Lao Tzu, 300 B.C. –translated by S. Mitchell [record keeper of the Zhou dynasty, *Tao Te Ching*, chapter 16, as translated by Stephen Mitchell, http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/core9/phalsall/texts/taote-v3.html#16]

Empty your mind of all thoughts.

Let your heart be at peace.

Watch the turmoil of beings,

but contemplate their return.

Each separate being in the universe

returns to the common source.

Returning to the source is serenity.

If you don't realize the source,

you stumble in confusion and sorrow.

When you realize where you come from,

you naturally become tolerant,

disinterested, amused,

kindhearted as a grandmother,

dignified as a king.

Immersed in the wonder of the Tao,

you can deal with whatever life brings you,

and when death comes, you are ready.

#### Political approaches inevitably fail – spiritual enlightenment is our only hope.

Slabbert 1 [Jos, Taoist teacher and philosopher, “Tao te Ching: How to Deal with Suffering” http://www.taoism.net/theway/suffer.htm]

The inescapable The inescapable forms of suffering include the obvious: being born, aging, and bodily decay. In medicine, we have been desperately fighting to avoid and postpone the inevitable, but in the end we all have to suffer the pain of aging and dying. Of course, one should adopt a lifestyle minimizing suffering caused by disease, but even then the deterioration of old age ultimately brings disease, suffering and death. Suffering through old age and death are part of the natural way of Tao, and should be accepted as such. It is part of wisdom to accept these inevitabilities with equanimity. Unavoidable suffering also includes the results of your previous actions that will still influence your life in negative ways. Again, like with suffering coming from old age, you just have to accept these effects when they come, and deal with them in the best way possible. Inescapable suffering includes certain mental traumas as well, like experiencing the deaths of beloved ones and separation. It also includes some of the suffering others inflict upon you. Inescapable suffering encompasses everything that is linked to impermanence, which is extensive. Its common denominator is the pain of decay and separation. The avoidable The ignorant create their own agonies when they allow their desire, greed and hatred to turn the fiction in their minds into the reality of suffering. (The Tao is Tao, 79) Avoidable suffering includes physical, psychological and spiritual forms of suffering that can be avoided, eliminated or at least reduced. These forms of suffering would also include our inability to deal with unavoidable forms of suffering. For example, the way we handle our own illnesses can either alleviate or increase our suffering. **Most forms of our suffering are the results of inventions of our own minds, and our inability to deal with our thoughts and emotions**. The greatest tragedy is to suffer unnecessarily, as so many people do. You have probably seen it or experienced it, haven’t you? People who have everything - wealth, health and good friends - and they nevertheless turn what should be paradise into their own personal hell. There is a restlessness in people that comes from neglecting the spirit, and which can only be satisfied in the sphere of the spirit. As long as this aspect of the human being is neglected, the human will never come to peace, and will suffer in many ways. No amount of material wealth, success and status will satisfy this need. In fact, material wealth and success often prevent the development of the spirit. **It is only when the needs of the spirit are satisfied that most of the unnecessary forms of suffering will cease**. The Nature of suffering All-encompassing Suffering is an all-encompassing phenomenon, and it includes forms of suffering the sufferer is not even aware of. All forms of attachment incorporate suffering. These forms include attachment to the senses, and emotional attachment, which would inevitably lead to sorrow. The impermanence of things is the main reason even "positive" forms of attachment ultimately lead to suffering. Suffering cannot be totally eliminated in this life and this world. Even the enlightened suffer in this world. Sometimes their suffering is caused by their compassion and wisdom. Schools dedicated to the Bodhisattva tradition argue that suffering cannot end for anyone as long as a single creature on earth is still suffering. It is very true, isn’t it? How can anyone filled with compassion be totally happy as long as there is still suffering around one? Causes of suffering **Attachment and the ego are closely linked, and they are the main causes of suffering, for they encourage perpetual action to satisfy their unsatiable needs**. The ego not only causes harm on a personal level, but it is a source of destruction and hatred on a wide scale. As long as people are run by their egos, there is no chance for rest and peace. Attachment, the ego and greed are intertwined. Greed causes tremendous suffering not only to persons in service of their own greed, but also to those in the service of the greed of others. Attachment, the ego, greed and their natural ally, hatred, perpetuate suffering and destruction not only on a personal, but also on a vast geopolitical scale. Solutions The main problems of suffering lie in the sphere of the spirit, and they are problems of the mind. They are elusive problems difficult to solve. **Their solutions often lie outside the reach of political programs**. Many of the problems plaguing the world fall in the realm of the spirit, and they cannot be solved by political programs only. In fact, political interference sometimes seems to aggravate some of these problems, which does not mean that one should not take political action to combat problems like greed or hatred. Political programs, however, tend to **tackle the symptoms** more than the causes. As long as the human being has not solved the problem of greed in his heart, and as long as he is serving his own ego, any political system, no matter how noble, will be corrupted by the very people who should implement and protect it.

### Good and Bad

#### Good versus bad is a false dichotomy – the subjectivity of values means one can never know.

McClellan 93—John McClellan, lecturer at University of Colorado at Boulder [August, 1993, “Nondual Ecology: In Praise of Wildness and in Search of Harmony with Everything That Moves,” http://spot.colorado.edu/~mcclelr/NondualEcologyLight.htm]

Deep ecology is good, but not always useful in everyday life. We need a working ecology, something tough and flexible, that you can use to save the world with. A practical ecology might come in two parts, view and practice, as follows: The View. Reality is as perfect today as it has ever been. The world in this moment, along with one's mind in this same moment, is the Great Perfection spoken of in the teachings. It must be enjoyed just **as it is, pollution, warfare, famine & poverty,** confusion and materialistic greed and all, no matter how unlikely, unhappy or sorry a specimen it may seem to be (world or mind). **Ecosystems** like minds **are always in perfect balance**, even when they're neurotic, ill, confused or going extinct, miserably and unnecessarily. The Practice. A dynamic ecology has got to work in a world which is changing from one moment to the next. Ecology cannot be based on trying to preserve ecosystems at some particular stage of their evolution, no matter how beautiful that stage may have been. This is like trying to prevent our children from growing up, or our old people from dying. It is a form of materialism to be overly attached to a special set of God's Works, and is doomed to failure in any case. We will never "get" our dream of attractive, healthy ecosystems-they will always be collapsing around our ears. This is what ecosystems do! They have a natural lifespan, which in addition to being short, is frequently terminated 'unnecessarily' early by accident or misfortune. Just like our own lives. Wanting to freeze ecosystems at a certain charming stage of their existence is like our other foolish dream of always being young, attractive and healthy ourselves. Good luck! The only ease lies with the process of evolution itself. Sound ecology must be based on respect for God's creative/destructive working process, not on a childish clinging to pretty toys He may have made. Then we can live in this world, help it out a bit, and go with, lean into its mysterious unfolding. Everything That Moves To combine this challenging view with the challenging practice, one simply regards everything that moves as a form of sacred activity. The mad materialist technobic frenzy gripping the planet is nothing other than this. **There is only One Thing** happening, **not some things that are good and others** that are **bad**. This includes fragrant ecosystems, fresh and unsullied in wilderness areas on spring mornings, and it includes urban industrial megagrid, ghettos & famine zones, materialist mind greed, **the extinction of** wild animal **species** and the **slavery and torture of 'domesticated' ones**. Life and death. Even television. Everything we love will die, and everything we hate will live, and vice versa, and we will never be rid of such problems. No contemplative would want the buddhas and patriarchs to catch him trying to escape death, much less get rid of it. Death is sacred activity. What is happening on this planet today is the sacred activity of life and death, which we sometimes call evolution, Ed Abbey and his friends to the contrary notwithstanding. It is perfect as it stands, flawless, without blemish. But as Suzuki Roshi said, there is always room for improvement too. So it's proper to fight and struggle with the situation, to take care of each other, and try to save a few suffering sentient beings. We must do this!, and we do, just as we struggle to improve the 'climate' , 'landscape' and evolutionary process in our own minds and hearts. The thing to be careful about is not to reject what is ugly and cruel, dangerous and poisonous, even the heartless machines, the computers & TV's, cars & highways, **nuclear bombs**, **animal and plant slavery and torture**, and money. These are our sacred enemies. They might even be our sacred friends, one never knows for sure. **We should not try to know** for sure. It's none of our business. Friend and enemy are not distinguished on this level. It's disrespectful to try to do so. To the enemy, one offers a deep bow, as deep, and as filled with respect as one offers to one's friends and teachers. This bow is offered to everything without reservation. It is a form of protection. It saves us from **attachment and illusion**, and in the end, from the wrong sort of despair.

### AT: Extinction/Death Bad

#### 1. Calls to save humanity are based on a flawed fear of death and a misunderstanding of the continuous nature of the universe.

Kirkland 98 [Russell Kirkland, Associate Professor of Religion (and Asian Studies), “"Responsible Non-Action" In a Natural World: Perspectives from the Nei-Yeh, Chuang-Tzu, and Tao-Te Ching,” 1998, University of Georgia, http://kirkland.myweb.uga.edu/rk/pdf/pubs/ECO.pdf]

But by this definition, the natural order, which we are enjoined to respect and uphold by means of conscientious non-action, is a natural order that includes death. In fact, it includes death as a universal event, an event that ends the life-process for all living things. By this definition, death is not a horrible destruction of a meaningful life-process, but the natural and **correct completion of the meaningful life-process**. Life, as Chuang-tzu says, is the companion of death, and vice versa. **Neither can be demonstrated to be more meaningful or more desirable than the other**, and both Chuang-tzu and Lieh-tzu are replete with characters who learn that existence after death is actually as good as, or even better than, existence in life. For the person who truly understands life, death is the ultimately natural event. And if this be so for individual lives, no matter how respected or beloved a person's life may be, it would logically seem to hold also for the life of a species, or even for the life of a planet. When Chuang-tzu's wife died, and even when old "Master Lao," died, the wise and enlightened characters in Chuang-tzu's text put the matter into correct universal perspective, restrain their emotions, and admire the beauty of a universe wherein death is a natural and proper aspect of life. To have done otherwise would have been to demonstrate one's inability to understand and appreciate the integrity of life itself and the meaningfulness of natural process. To have done otherwise would have demonstrated a false and pernicious belief that the event that we call death is a nasty and undesirable event, an event that negates the value of what has gone before it. Such beliefs, the Taoist texts show, were common among the shallow-minded denizens of ancient China, just as they are common among both the religious and the secular minds of the modern world. The death of Chuang's wife, the death of "Master Lao," the death of the dinosaur, the death of the whooping crane: all of these are to be accepted with tranquillity, and with respect for the integrity and value of the natural processes of life, forces that ineluctably bring natural fulfillment to all living things, as long as humans do not disrupt the harmonious order of nature by interfering with it. If we see a baby floating down a river, we must learn not to impose our false impressions of wisdom upon the wisdom of nature itself, for nature is not cruel or insensate, but benign. It is only by an act of hubris and folly that we presume our human wisdom to be greater than that which is built into the operation of the world itself. The world itself is not merely designed wisely then left to run unattended. It is designed wisely and operated wisely, by a force that is like a caring mother. It nurtures and cares for all things, then at the end of their natural lives, they return to it. Treasuring tranquility, the conscientious Taoist observes that return, with awareness and due respect, and in due course he or she, too, follows the same course, returning without fuss to the immaterial state from which he or she originally emerged.

### AT: Predictions

#### 2. Living tomorrow is dying today – even if they accurately save the future, we can’t enjoy it when we get there – that’s our 1nc Watt’s evidence – more evidence.

Watts 51 (Alan, dean of the American Academy of Asian Studies and research fellow at Harvard University, *The Wisdom of Insecurity*, pg 34-36)

This is the typical human problem. The object of dread may not be an operation in the immediate future. It may be the problem of next month’s rent, of **a threatened war or social disaster**, of being able to save enough for old age, **or** of **death** at the last. This “spoiler of the present” may not even be a future dread. It may be something out of the past, some memory of an injury, some crime or indiscretion, which haunts the present with a sense of resentment or guilt. The power of memories and expecta- tions is such that for most human beings the past and the future are not as real, but more real than the present. The present cannot be lived happily unless the past has been “cleared up” and the future is bright with promise. There can be no doubt that **the power to** remember and **predict**, to make an ordered sequence out of a helter-skelter chaos of disconnected moments, **is a wonderful development** of sensitivity. In a way it is the achievement of the human brain, giving man the most extraordinary powers of survival and adaptation to life. But the way in which we generally use this power is apt to destroy all its advantages. For it is of little use to us to be able to remember and predict if it makes us unable to live fully in the present. What is the use of planning to be able to eat next week unless I can really enjoy the meals when they come? If I am so busy planning how to eat next week that I cannot fully enjoy what I am eating now, I will be in the same predicament when next week’s meals become “now.” If my happiness at this moment consists largely in reviewing happy memories and expectations, I am but dimly aware of this present. I shall still be dimly aware of the present when the good things that I have been expecting come to pass. For I shall have formed a habit of looking behind and ahead, making it difficult for me to attend to the here and now. If, then, my awareness of the past and future makes me less aware of the present, I must begin to wonder whether I am actually living in the real world. After all, the future is quite meaningless and unimportant unless, sooner or later, it is going to become the present. Thus to plan for a future which is not going to become present is hardly more absurd than to plan for a future which, when it comes to me, will find me “absent,” looking fixedly over its shoulder instead of into its face. This kind of living in the fantasy of expectation rather than the reality of the present is the special trouble of those business men who live entirely to make money. So many people of wealth understand much more about making and saving money than about using and enjoying it. **They fail to live because they are always preparing to live**. Instead of earning a living they are mostly earning an earning, and thus when the time comes to relax they are unable to do so. Many a “successful” man is bored and miserable when he retires, and returns to his work only to prevent a younger man from taking his place. From still another point of view the way in which we use memory and prediction makes us less, rather than more, adaptable to life. If to enjoy even an enjoyable present we must have the assurance of a happy future, we are “crying for the moon.” We have no such assurance. **The best predictions are still matters of probability rather than certainty**, and to the best of our knowledge **every one** of us **is going to suffer and die**. If, then, we cannot live happily without an assured future, we are certainly not adapted to living in a finite world where, **despite the best plans**, accidents will happen, and where death comes at the end.

### AT: You Link to the K

#### 1. Voting neg doesn’t require passing judgment only action is attached to achieving desired ends. Inaction is the natural result of emptying yourself of thought and living in the present moment. You are voting neg to avoid action not against the aff. Simply choose not to endorse their call to action. Presumption theory and the Tao agree.

Kirkland 98 [Russell Kirkland, Associate Professor of Religion (and Asian Studies), “"Responsible Non-Action" In a Natural World: Perspectives from the Nei-Yeh, Chuang-Tzu, and Tao-Te Ching,” 1998, University of Georgia, http://kirkland.myweb.uga.edu/rk/pdf/pubs/ECO.pdf]

But doesn't the Tao te ching enjoin the reader to somehow do something to correct a world that is now in disarray? Doesn't the Tao te ching urge the reader to engage in new and different behaviors, so that the world may thereby be redeemed from the problems that currently afflict it. The answer to these questions appear to be "yes." But note that neither question actually calls for humans to take any action to intervene in worldly events. Rather, the reader of the Tao te ching is enjoined to make a bold and meaningful change in the world by (1) beginning the bold and enlightened process of refraining from interventional activity, and (2) allowing the inherent beneficent forces of the world — forces that cannot be aided by human activity — to hold sway. The bold transition to new and different behavior that are urged upon the reader is a transition away from the assumption that humans can or ought to intervene in life's events. The only wise and beneficent behavior in which humans can engage is a behavior of humble and enlightened self-restraint, self-restraint that is necessary to ensure that we no longer interfere with the beneficent activity of the benign natural force called "the Tao."

### 2NC Export Controls

#### Trade policy is more important than production chain for nuclear leadership.

NEI, June 2012. Nuclear Energy Institute. “Improved Policies for Commercial Nuclear Trade Will Create American Jobs,” http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/policybrief/improved-policies-for-commercial-nuclear-trade-will-create-american-jobs.

As of June 2012, 30 countries operate 436 reactors for electricity generation, and 65 reactors are under construction in 14 countries. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the global export market for commercial nuclear materials, reactors, major components and equipment grew from $6.2 billion in 1994 to $16.1 billion in 2008.1¶ The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that the international nuclear market, including fuel and services, will expand to $500 billion to $740 billion over the next 10 years. Every $1 billion of exports represents 5,000 to 10,000 jobs. The commercial nuclear market is expected to remain robust in expanding economies such as China and India. Other nations are exploring nuclear energy as a way to provide elec- tricity for their growing economics. U.S. companies face varied obstacles in exporting nuclear technologies: poor coordination among numer- ous federal agencies involved, an inefficient licensing process and limited options for financing exports. Making matters worse, the global playing field is far from level. “Some of the largest markets for nuclear goods and services, such as France, Russia and South Korea, have significant barriers to entry for U.S. companies because of the presence of a state-owned competitor,” according to a 2010 report by the GAO.¶ The United States has the world’s largest commercial nuclear program, with 104 operating reactors provid- ing clean, safe, reliable electricity for one in five homes and businesses. The industry boasts world-class safety practices, nuclear products and nuclear services. Yet without supportive trade policies, U.S. companies have difficulty holding their own in the global nuclear market**.** Even as our nation’s commercial nuclear supply chain continues to grow and add jobs, the United States remains a net importer of the nuclear tech- nology it originally developed.2 U.S. trade policies must be reformed so the United States can reclaim its position as a world leader in nuclear technologies.

#### Export licensing delays are the key reason the U.S. is losing nuclear leadership.

Andrew Kadak, 12/6/2010. PhD, former president of ANS and advisor to the ANS Special Committee on Nuclear Non-Proliferation, Professor of the Practice in the Nuclear Engineering Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. “[Observations on U.S. nuclear export control policies](http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2010/12/06/observations-on-u-s-export-control-policies/),” ANS Nuclear Café, http://ansnuclearcafe.org/2010/12/06/observations-on-u-s-export-control-policies/.

Having recently attended a Pillsbury and Nuclear Energy Institute seminar on “Export Controls for the Nuclear Renaissance,” it became clear to me why the United States is losing its leadership position in nuclear energy: The bureaucracy is winning the war over effectiveness of policy and nonproliferation.¶ The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was written at a time when we were the dominant nuclear technology owner and efforts were made to keep it so. In the last 57 years, much has changed in that landscape that makes this law, as it pertains to export controls, ineffective in restraining the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but also in America’s ability to compete in the world market.¶ What did I learn at this meeting? I learned that we have a set of laws and regulations that are not even clear to the enforcers. Who are the delegated agencies responsible for export controls? Quite a few: the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Export Administration, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration, and the State Department.¶ If that was not enough, the nuclear island and the balance-of-plant operations are separately regulated as are the scientists’ and engineers’ ability to speak to each other. The additional requirements under the complicated regulatory regime include obtaining 10 CFR Part 810 approvals from the DOE, 10 CFR Part 110 approvals from the NRC, and compliance with Commerce Department export regulations found in 15 CFR Parts 730-774.¶ ﻿Navigating the export control regulatory maze¶ Even before we can sell our products and services to a nation and begin to navigate the maze of export control agencies and regulations, we must first obtain congressional approval according to Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act. This poses an additional restriction and burden on our companies that other nations do not have. These congressional and State Department approvals are being used to extract perceived nonproliferation benefits while other nations have no such restrictions. This deters nations that are Non-Proliferation Treaty signatories from dealing with U.S. firms since they have other options where no such pressures exist, which again denies U.S. firms access to markets.¶ While the goals of nonproliferation policy are laudable and needed, the bureaucracy established to implement these laws is not. We are at a point where U.S. participation in the world nuclear expansion is diminished, allowing other nations to be faster in granting approvals to work with other nations by implementing equally effective nonproliferation policies.¶ What is missing is common sense. What is needed is a rewrite of legislation to eliminate centers of delay to allow the United States to compete and affect nuclear expansion on a world scale. The limitations imposed on training and information exchange are at best archaic and totally contrary to expanding our influence to the development of safe nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

### India DA

**No risk of resource wars --- all the hotspots will disappear --- apocalyptic scenarios are invented to justify military spending.**

Thomas P. M. **Barnett**, 3/23/**2009**. Visiting scholar at the University of Tennessee's Howard Baker Center, former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College, AM in Regional Studies: Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia and a PhD in Political Science from Harvard. “Threat of Great Power War Recedes,” Korea Times, <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2009/03/137_41779.html>.

While difficult to keep in mind amidst today's economic nationalism, a global middle class of unprecedented size rises in the emerging markets of the East and South. **This accomplishment logically ensures the continuation of great-power peace**, as America's grand strategy of spreading its liberal trade order reaches its global apogee. Countering this view is a growing cohort of academics and analysts who insist that such rising consumer demand will inevitably trigger ``resource wars" among the world's great powers, with climate change as an unforgiving accelerant. A little secret here: a good portion of America's defense establishment desperately needs the long-term specter of resource wars to continue justifying the big-war-centric structure of our armed forces. It needs to sell this vision of future c onflict because, without it, the small-wars community will triumph in a looming budgetary battle that will define the Obama administration's legacy in national security affairs. Here's where it gets tricky for President Obama: the three conflict scenarios that currently justify our military's big-war focus are China-Taiwan; North Korea, and Iran. **All three scenarios will effectively disappear over the next half-decade**.

#### Empirical studies prove the navy is not capable of deterring threats

Daniel 2 [Donald C.F. “The Future of American Naval Power: Propositions and Recommendations,” Globalization and American Power. Chapter 27. Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books\_2002/Globalization\_and\_Maritime\_Power\_Dec\_02/0 1\_toc.htm]

In sum, there would seem to be a special role for the U.S. Navy in contingency response along littorals, but, outside the context of a specific crisis, constant day-to-day presence does not do much to deter unwanted behavior. Thus, it would seem a raising of false expectations to argue, for example, that the “gapping of aircraft carriers in areas of potential crisis is an invitation to disaster—and therefore represents culpable negligence on the part of America’s defense decision-makers.”33 In the early 1960s, the United States maintained three aircraft carrier battlegroups in the Mediterranean Sea but later gradually found that it needed to scale back. Currently, a single battlegroup operates there for less than 9 months of the year on average. This is a significant reduction, but no one can prove that the Mediterranean region became less stable. Conversely, the Navy began to maintain a regular presence in the Arabian Gulf in 1979, but this did not prevent Iran or Iraq from attacking ships during their war. In the 1980s, attacks generally increased in number over the 8 years of the war. As for deterring the initiation of a crisis in the first place, it is essentially impossible for an outsider to prove that such deterrence was successful except in the rare case in which a deterred party admits that he was deterred and states the reasons. Adam Siegel, John Arquilla, Paul Huth, Paul Davis, and a Rutgers Center for Global Security and Democracy team led by Edward Rhodes have each attempted to study the effects of forward presence and general deterrence. The deficiency of such study is always in making the definitive link between them. The majority of these studies suggest that “[h]istorically seapower has not done well as a deterrent” in preventing the outbreak of conflicts, principally because land-based powers not dependent on overseas trade are relatively “insensitive” to the operations of naval forces.

### 2NC State Powers Win

#### And, thorium switch takes decades, even with the plan

**Mindful Money 9-20**-12 [Social news and knowledge network for the investment community published by the Social Business Group, “Thorium: The billion dollar question,” <http://www.mindfulmoney.co.uk/14264/sector-watch/thorium-the-billion-dollar-question.html>]

As Edward **Guinness, energy expert at Guinness Asset Management, comments: "For nuclear power plants with an unproven technology the level of investment required to get it to market is** likely to run into the **billions**. That's best done by governments and large businesses. If the benefits are as described and **if the costs are not prohibitive then you're probably talking about it having an impact in 20-25 years' time."** **In order for the material to be used in the foreseeable future (defined by the NNL as the next 20 years) existing reactors will have to be repurposed to take the fuel**. This could mean that it is used "to augment the useful energy output produced per tonne of uranium ore" rather than as a primary source. Yet under the augmentation scenario the by-product of the reaction, U-233, may only offer a modest reduction in radiotoxicity risk. Furthermore although the NNL concedes that a full thorium cycle could provide a "substantial reduction" in toxicity levels, **building new types of reactor** that can use the fuel to its full potential **could take up to 40 years**.

#### China will do everything to maintain market position—it can leverage state financing and political relationships to undercut U.S. efforts.

**Goncharuk 11** [Artem, “[Chinese Nuclear Expansion: Are We Growing a New Rival?](http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=333:chinese-nuclear-expansion-are-we-growing-a-new-rival&catid=121:contentenergysecurity1111&Itemid=386),” Journal of Energy Security, 12-14, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=333:chinese-nuclear-expansion-are-we-growing-a-new-rival&catid=121:contentenergysecurity1111&Itemid=386>]

By the time China is ready to enter the global nuclear technology market, it will find the market already divided between the old, established players and it will have to make great efforts to build a niche for itself. There are actually two ways of cracking this nut.  First, it may use its financial strength in providing extremely beneficial financing for an importing-country. This is the path South Korea’s KEPCO took in the UAE. In order to persuade the Emirates KEPCO came up with very generous financial terms for their nuclear offer. The second option for entering the market is through political channels. This is pretty much the case of Russia’s Atomstroyexport; currently all the nuclear projects led by the corporation were obtained on the basis of friendly relations with a country while, the technological level of equipment is considered almost optional.  The Chinese like to develop their cooperation through so-called “guanxi” (personal relations), so some of the African regions, the countries from ASEAN and neighboring Pakistan might build nuclear partnerships without any tender competitions. China will most likely try every option available in order to conquer these markets. At first, it can be expected that Chinese corporations will be ready to construct anything and anywhere.

### 2NC Slow Prolif [Short]

#### Prolif is slow

Alagappa 8 (Muthiah, Distinguished Senior Fellow—East-West Center, in “The Long Shadow: Nuclear Weapons and Security in 21st Century Asia, Ed. Muthiah Alagappa, p. 18)

A fourth difference between the contemporary and the Cold War nuclear environment is in the increase in the number of nuclear weapon states. The number of overt nuclear weapon states has increased from five to seven, with Israel still maintaining its opaque status. Although India and Pakistan had already developed nuclear weapon capabilities during the Cold War, their move to overt status necessitates further development of their nuclear postures, capabilities, command and control arrangements, doctrines, and strategies. North Korea is a new entrant, and Iran is widely believed to be seeking nuclear weapons. In reality, the spread of nuclear weapons has been more gradual than the alarmist readings of nonproliferation advocates.

### AT: Unipolarity k2 trade

#### Trade won’t be disrupted.

Preble 10 [Christopher Preble, director of foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, August 2010 “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?” http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/]

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

## 1NR

**1NR—Overview**

**Undermining Russian relations causes terrorism, multiple hotspots, and adventurism --- turns prolif.**

**Allison 11**—Director @ Belfer Center for Science and Int’l Affairs @ Harvard’s Kennedy School, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Robert D. Blackwill, Senior Fellow—Council on Foreign Relations [Graham Allison, “10 Reasons Why Russia Still Matters”, Politico -- October 31 -- <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

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

**Leaves earth uninhabitable.**

**Starr 10** (Director of Clinical Laboratory Science Program @ University of Missouri [Steven Starr (Senior scientist @ Physicians for Social Responsibility.), “The climatic consequences of nuclear war,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 12 March 2010, Pg. http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/the-climatic-consequences-of-nuclear-war)

This isn't a question to be avoided. Recent scientific studies have found that a war fought with the deployed U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals would **leave Earth** virtually **uninhabitable**. In fact, NASA computer models have shown that even a "successful" **first strike** by Washington or Moscow would inflict catastrophic environmental damage that would make agriculture impossible and cause mass starvation. Similarly, in the January Scientific American, Alan Robock and Brian Toon, the foremost experts on the climatic impact of nuclear war, warn that the environmental consequences of a "regional" nuclear war would cause a global famine that could kill one billion people.

**Turns hegemony**

**Simes 7** (Dimitri, President of the Nixon Center and Publisher of The National Interest, Foreign Affairs, “Losing Russia; The Costs of Renewed Confrontation,” Nov/Dec – lexis)

But if the current U.S.-Russian relationship deteriorates further, it will not bode well for the United States and would be even worse for Russia. The Russian general staff is lobbying to add a military dimension to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and some top officials are beginning to champion the idea of a foreign policy realignment directed against the West. There are also quite a few countries, such as Iran and Venezuela, urging Russia to work with China to play a leading role in balancing the United States economically, politically, and militarily. And post-Soviet states such as Georgia, which are adept at playing the United States and Russia off against each other, could act in ways that escalate tensions. Putin's stage management of Moscow's succession in order to maintain a dominant role for himself makes a major foreign policy shift in Russia unlikely. But new Russian leaders could have their own ideas -- and their own ambitions -- and political uncertainty or economic problems could tempt them to exploit nationalist sentiments to build legitimacy. If relations worsen, the UN Security Council may no longer be available -- due to a Russian veto -- even occasionally, to provide legitimacy for U.S. military actions or to impose meaningful sanctions on rogue states. Enemies of the United States could be emboldened by new sources of military hardware in Russia, and political and security protection from Moscow. International terrorists could find new sanctuaries in Russia or the states it protects. And the collapse of U.S.-Russian relations could give China much greater flexibility in dealing with the United States. It would not be a new Cold War, because Russia will not be a global rival and is unlikely to be the prime mover in confronting the United States. But it would provide incentives and cover for others to confront Washington, with potentially catastrophic results.

**Their evidence doesn’t assume the change Romney will create.**

**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**.

**Turns Case**

**Bandow says Romney will pressure China & bash currency**

**Reuters 3/27/12** [“Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation-adviser,” 3-27-2012 <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328>]

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney is looking at ways to increase pressure on China over what he sees as currency manipulation and unfair subsidy practices, a Romney campaign adviser said on Tuesday.

"I think he wants to maximize the pressure," Grant Aldonas, a former undersecretary of commerce for international trade, said at a symposium on the future of U.S. manufacturing. Aldonas served at the Commerce Department under Republican President George W. Bush.

Romney, the front-runner in the Republican race to challenge President Barack Obama for the White House in November, has promised if elected he would quickly label China a currency manipulator, something the Obama administration has six times declined to do.

That would set the stage, under Romney's plan, for the United States to impose countervailing duties on Chinese goods to offset the advantage of what many consider to be China's undervalued currency.

Last year, the Democratic-controlled Senate passed legislation to do essentially the same thing.

However, the measure has stalled in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where leaders say they fear **it could start a trade war**, and the Obama administration has not pushed for a House vote on the currency bill.

The U.S. Treasury Department on April 15 faces a semi-annual deadline to declare whether any country is manipulating its currency for an unfair trade advantage. The department, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has not cited any country since 1994, when China was last named.

Asked if Romney was serious about declaring China a currency manipulator, Aldonas answered: **"He is."**

Aldonas said he would convey a questioner's suggestion back to the campaign that Romney prove his seriousness by urging House Ways and Mean Committee Chairman Dave Camp, a Michigan Republican, to take up the currency bill.

**It is the quickest timeframe.**

**CSM 9/1/12**—Obama vs. Romney 101: 4 ways they differ on China, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/DC-Decoder/2012/0901/Obama-vs.-Romney-101-4-ways-they-differ-on-China/China-as-currency-manipulator>

1. China as currency manipulator

Mr. Romney says China’s leaders are “cheaters” who keep their currency artificially low to make Chinese products cheaper on the world market. He says that on “Day 1” of a Romney presidency, he would declare China a currency manipulator—a step the US has not taken since 1994, but which would pave the way to imposing duties on Chinese products. The US trade deficit with China amounted to nearly $300 billion in 2011.

Obama has resisted demands from both Democrats and Republicans to make the “manipulator” designation, which he says could set off a trade war. Instead, he claims that steady diplomatic pressure has worked better. The administration’s evidence? China’s currency has risen by almost a third against the dollar since 2005, helping to raise Chinese labor and manufacturing costs.

This may be a rare issue where American business aligns more closely with Obama. The US Chamber of Commerce opposes a “manipulator” designation as unnecessary. But Romney’s get-tough position could win him points in some manufacturing swing states where anti-China sentiment runs strong.

**That escalates --- turns advantage two.**

**Landy 7**—Director Of Research And Strategy At The Atlantic Media Company, Publisher Of The Atlantic Monthly, National Journal, And Government Executive Magazines [Ben Landy, April 3, 2007, http://chinaredux.com/2007/04/03/protectionism-and-war/#comments]

The greatest threat for the 21st century is that these economic flare-ups between the US and China will not be contained, but might spill over into the realm of military aggression between these two world powers. Economic conflict breeds military conflict. The stakes of trade override the ideological power of the Taiwan issue. China's ability to continue growing at a rapid rate takes precedence, since there can be no sovereignty for China without economic growth. The United States' role as the world's superpower is dependent on its ability to lead economically. As many of you will know from reading this blog, I do not believe that war between the US and China is imminent, or a foregone conclusion in the future. I certainly do not hope for war. But I have little doubt that protectionist policies on both sides greatly increase the likelihood of conflict far more than increases in military budgets and anti-satellite tests

**Public opposition undermines nuclear investment.**

**CSI 12** (Civil Society Institute, 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."

**1NR—Impact D**

**Politicians will follow their election agendas – studies prove.**

**Bernstein 12** [Jonathan, writer for the Washington Monthly and a political scientist, “Campaign Promises,” Jan/Feb 2012, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january_february_2012/features/campaign_promises034471.php>]

I suspect that many Americans would be quite skeptical of the idea that elected officials, presidents included, try to keep the promises they made on the campaign trail. The presumption is that politicians are liars who say what voters want to hear to get elected and then behave very differently once in office. The press is especially prone to discount the more extreme positions candidates take in primaries on the expectation that they will “move to the center” in the general election. Certainly everyone can recall specific examples of broken promises, from Barack Obama not closing Gitmo to George W. Bush and “nation building” to, well, you may remember this from the Republican National Convention in 1988: And I’m the one who will not raise taxes. My opponent, my opponent now says, my opponent now says, he’ll raise them as a last resort, or a third resort. But when a politician talks like that, you know that’s one resort he’ll be checking into. My opponent won’t rule out raising taxes. But I will. And the Congress will push me to raise taxes, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push again, and I’ll say, to them, “Read my lips: no new taxes.” Political scientists, however, have been studying this question for some time, and what they’ve found is that out-and-out high-profile broken pledges like George H. W. Bush’s are the exception, not the rule. That’s what two book-length studies from the 1980s found. Michael Krukones in Promises and Performance: Presidential Campaigns as Policy Predictors (1984) established that about 75 percent of the promises made by presidents from Woodrow Wilson through Jimmy Carter were kept. In Presidents and Promises: From Campaign Pledge to Presidential Performance (1985), Jeff Fishel looked at campaigns from John F. Kennedy through Ronald Reagan. What he found was that presidents invariably attempt to carry out their promises; the main reason some pledges are not redeemed is congressional opposition, not presidential flip-flopping. Similarly, Gerald Pomper studied party platforms, and discovered that the promises parties made were consistent with their postelection agendas. More recent and smaller-scale papers have confirmed the main point: presidents’ agendas are clearly telegraphed in their campaigns. Richard Fenno’s studies of how members of Congress think about representation are relevant here, even though his research is based on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. Fenno, in a series of books beginning with Home Style in 1978, has followed members as they work their districts, and has transcribed what the world looks like through politicians’ eyes. What he has found is that representatives and senators see every election as a cycle that begins in the campaign, when they make promises to their constituents. Then, if they win, they interpret how those promises will constrain them once they’re in office. Once in Washington, Fenno’s politicians act with two things in mind: how their actions match the promises they’ve made in the previous campaign; and how they will be able to explain those actions when they return to their district. Representation “works,” then, because politicians are constantly aware that what they do in Washington will have to be explained to their constituents, and that it will have to be explained in terms of their original promises. Of course, there’s more to it than that; at the presidential level, one of the key ways that campaigns constrain presidents is that the same people who draft the candidate’s proposals usually wind up working on those same issue areas in the White House or the relevant departments and agencies, and they tend to be highly committed to the ideas they authored. And don’t sell short the possibility that candidates themselves are personally committed to the programs they advocate—either because those issues sparked their interest in politics to begin with (and that’s why they were advocating them on the campaign trail), or because it’s just a natural human inclination to start believing your own rhetoric.

**1NR—Energy Key**

**Energy key to the election**

**Kingston 12** – Director of News at Platts (John, “US election 2012: if not "all energy, all the time," a lot of energy for sure” The Barrel, http://china.platts.com/weblog/oilblog/2012/04/11/election\_2012\_i.html)

Get ready for the energy election of 2012. Maybe because it was at a New York Times forum devoted to energy, so the inclination was to talk with that sort of grand vision. But three reporters for the Times who are out on the campaign trail made it clear to a packed room that energy will be a key area in which Mitt Romney goes after Barack Obama in 2012. As Helene Cooper, the Times' White House correspondent, noted, the Obama adminstration has a lot of confidence going into the campaign. But if national retail gasoline prices were to head toward the $5/gal mark, "all bets would be off." And lurking in the background to that is the possibility of some sort of spike in price driven by an Iranian incident. With the Romney vs. Obama race all but assured, the campaigns are now focusing more on each other, rather than on the GOP nominating process. As as the Times' domestic correspondent Jim Rutenberg said, "so far, energy is what the campaign is all about." The panelists showed two ads, one from the Obama campaign and one from American Crossroads, the Karl Rove-led group. We weren't able to find them online, but found similar ones that pretty much say the same thing as those shown at the Times forum. You can see them here and here. The "gist" of the American Crossroads ad, according to Rutenberg, is that "the Obama administration is shirking blame for everything," and is doing so on energy policy as well. "Drilling is down on federal lands, and federal lands' output is down." But Cooper quickly noted that the Obama administration's retort is that "it's down because we took a time out (the moratorium after Macondo)." Although that move still gets criticized in some quarters, the administration is "screaming about this," since it believes the drop in federal lands' output is justified by the actions it took in the wake of the Macondo spill. (This report does show that federal onshore production has risen, though the total is down. See page 5). When the President talks about energy, the Romney campaign "just loves it," according to Ashley Parker, the Times' reporter covering the former Massachussetts governor. "They like it because it gives (them) an opening."

**Energy will be the deciding factor in the election**

**Belogolova 12** reports on energy and environment policy for National Journal and manages the bi-monthly Energy and Environment Insiders Poll, holds bachelor’s degrees in Journalism and European Studies from Boston University. She studied abroad at Oxford University, was one of 10 American journalism students selected for a press trip to Jordan. (Olga, May 17th, “Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama” http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517) Jacome

 “It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals."

Insiders said that **energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election** — to the very end.

“Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

**Energy policy will determine the election**

**Handley 8/21 -** business reporter for U.S. News & World Report (Meg, “3 Energy Issues No One's Talking About,” http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2012/08/21/3-energy-issues-no-ones-talking-about)

If recent campaign events by both the Democratic and Republican presidential candidates are any indication, energy policy is going to be a major political chip in the race for the White House.

President Obama and Mitt Romney have diametrically opposed views on energy security, efficiency, and innovation. That brings seemingly minute issues such as a wind tax energy credit (crucial to Iowans, coincidentally) to the forefront as well as more philosophical issues such as whether the government should subsidize companies researching and producing renewable energy sources.

**1NR—L/w**

**Nuclear alienates environmentalists who overwhelmingly oppose it --- that's Mick. They will not be energized if he angers them on energy --- that's TNF.**

**Anti-nuclear environmentalist groups take every advantage to protest nuke power.**

**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.

**Their link turns assume squo levels of nuke power – the world of the AFF is massively unpopular – how the question is asked is key.**

**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.”

**Independents up for grabs.**

**Mellman 9/18**. [Mark, president of The Mellman Group and has worked for Democratic candidates and causes since 1982, "Whither the independents" The HIll -- thehill.com/opinion/columnists/mark-mellman/250253-whither-the-independents]

Every national poll in the last week (save the reliably Republican Rasmussen) has shown the president leading within a fairly narrow band — 1 to 6 points — averaging to a 3-point Obama advantage. For those interested in where the race stands, it’s a clear and consistent message.¶ For those focused on the internal dynamics of the election, the picture is anything but clear with respect to one of the most important segments of the electorate — independents. There has rightly been tremendous focus on this group, as it will likely determine the outcome. Given the (usually reported) Democratic advantage in party identification, the president could probably still prevail if he lost independents, but he cannot afford to lose them by too much.¶ So where do things stand with this vital group of voters? Take your pick. (Hat tip to the always-astute Jon Cohen, the Washington Post’s polling director, for alerting me and others to the discrepancies.)¶ The same polls that reveal relative consistency overall contain extraordinary variation when it comes to the votes of independents. The CNN/ORC poll, which has Obama ahead by 6 overall, says he is losing independents by a vast 14 points. Rasmussen, which claims the president is behind overall by 1, has him down a lesser, but still large, 10 points among independents. The CBS/New York Times poll puts Obama ahead by 3 overall, but behind by 6 among independents. The Esquire/Yahoo Poll finds the president ahead by 4 overall, but says he leads with independents by a wide 11-point margin, while Fox suggests Obama is ahead by 5 points, both overall and with independents.¶ Of course, there is a middle ground between the extremes. Gallup and the Investor’s Business Daily/Christian Science Monitor/TIPP poll say the president is leading by 3 and 2 points, respectively, but both find him tied among independents.¶ In this confusing mishmash of data, it is worth noting that two of the polls with very discrepant results were conducted by the same firm, increasing our bewilderment. ¶ More importantly, there is little consistent relationship between findings about the race overall and the vote among independents across these polls. The survey that has the president faring best overall has him doing worst among independents.

**They hate plan the plan.**

**Shahan 12**. [Zach, Site Director & Publishing Services Manager at Important Media, “76% of Americans Want Clean Energy Instead of Nuclear, Natural Gas, & Coal” Clean Technica -- May 15 -- http://nuclear-news.info/2012/06/04/usa-public-opinion-wants-clean-energy-connects-nuclear-with-corrupt-politics/]

The ORC International survey, conducted for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI), found that 76% of Americans (58% of Republicans, 83% of Independents, and 88% of Democrats) want to see ”a reduction in our reliance on nuclear power, natural gas and coal, and instead, launch a national initiative to boost renewable energy and energy efficiency.” (And who knows what the remaining 24% are smoking?)¶ Not only that, the public has clearly picked up on the fact that corrupt politics is a key reason we don’t have more of that. 82% of Americans (69% of Republicans, 84% of Independents, and 95% of Democrats) agree with this statement: “The time is now for a new, grassroots-driven politics to realize a renewable energy future.

**They’re key.**

**Woodruff 12**. [Judy, Journalist, “Woodruff: Will Independents Return to Obama in 2012?” PBS -- February 29 -- http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2012/02/woodruff-will-independents-return-to-obama-2012.html]

There's a lot of talk thrown around in every election about the influence of independents -- voters who are registered as neither Democrat nor Republican or who swing back and forth. To listen to some pundits (even this reporter has been guilty of this), independent voters hold awesome power in close elections. This may be one election when that conventional wisdom holds up. With a stubbornly polarized atmosphere and partisans on each side fiercely holding to the candidates in their party, the role played by swing voters becomes even more significant. In recent years, independents have made up about 30 percent of the electorate. Republicans and Democrats split most of the other 70 percent, leaving a little room for minority parties. In 2008, President Obama won 52 percent of independent voters, helping propel him to the presidency. This year, there's good reason to believe those same voters who sided with Obama -- rather than the 44 percent of independents who went with Sen. John McCain -- will determine the outcome. First, it's safe to assume almost all self-described Republicans and Democrats will vote for their party's candidate. And it's almost as safe to assume that the McCain independents in 2008 will be reluctant to switch to Obama four years later. That leaves the focus on the Independents who swung to Obama four years ago. They are the subject of a paper by two policy analysts at the Third Way, a Washington, D.C.-based centrist think tank. According to Michelle Diggles and Lanae Erickson, the Obama independents of 2008 have certain qualities that may help us understand which way they'll go in 2012. Diggles and Erickson identify 10 qualities in particular but stress four. First, Obama independents are the most moderate segment of the electorate. Second, they are true swing voters in that nearly half of them did not vote for the Democratic candidate in 2004. Third, they look like the U.S. in that they include more women and are more racially diverse than McCain independents. Fourth, they are secular and attend church less often. With growing signs that independent voters may make up the highest proportion of the electorate since 1976, all eyes are on these prized citizens. But as Diggles and Erickson note: "Not all independents are the same, and the real showdown for 2012 is over who will win the Obama independents." They said that if Obama can win the majority of them, he will win re-election. But if he does no better among them than Democrats did in the 2010 congressional elections when a quarter of the Obama independents voted Republican, the story could be different. Watching how Obama appeals to this crucial voting group is one story we plan to watch throughout this exciting election.

**Obama has a huge lead with women now.**

**Yanover 9-19**. [Yori, journalist, "With Romney Stuck Practically Everywhere, It’s Obama’s Race to Lose" Jewish Press -- www.jewishpress.com/news/yoris-daily-news-clips/with-romney-stuck-practically-everywhere-its-obamas-race-to-lose/2012/09/19/]

And the final blow to the Romney campaign: a poll released last week by CBS News and The New York Times showed Obama with a 53% -41% lead among women.¶ This national average of a 12% lead grows to as much as 14% and 16% among women in states like Virginia, where recent anti-abortion legislation by Republican lawmakers and governors have convinced women that they must vote for Obama despite everything else, to preserve their reproductive rights. The Democrats have been as effective on convincing women Obama will protect their right to an abortion as they have been at warning elderly voters that Ryan will take away their medicate and social security.

**They hate nuke power.**

**Newport 12**. [Frank, PhD, Editor in Chief, “Americans Still Favor Nuclear Power a Year After Fukushima” Gallup -- March 26 -- http://www.gallup.com/poll/153452/Americans-Favor-Nuclear-Power-Year-Fukushima.aspx]

Although Republicans continue to be more supportive than Democrats of the use of nuclear energy, these political differences are dwarfed by the 30-point gender gap in views on nuclear energy. Men are more likely than women to be Republicans, but politics alone do not explain the gap in support for nuclear energy between men and women. Something about nuclear energy apparently strikes a strongly negative chord in the minds of the nation's women, making them one of the few demographic segments of any type in which opposition to nuclear power is higher than 50%.

**They’re key to swing states.**

**Casserly 12**. [Meghan, staff writer, “Where women matter most in election 2012” Forbes -- June 7 -- http://www.forbes.com/sites/meghancasserly/2012/06/07/election-2012-mitt-romney-obama-women-battleground-states/]

But why is the female vote so attractive to presidential candidates? According to Dianne Bystrom, the director of the Carrie Chapman Catt Center for Women and Politics at Iowa State University, the reason the gender gap is so important isn’t the popularity points, but the fact that more women are registered to vote than men in most states, and a much higher female turnout rate at the polls. “It’s sheer numbers,” she says. In the 2008 election, 60.4% of the female population over the age of 18 showed up at the polls. Men? Just under 56%. In plainer terms, 10 million more women than men voted. Quite simply: more female voters=more female power, particularly in battleground states.¶ Swing states, or the undecided “battleground” states that don’t historically vote with a specific party, are traditionally where candidates spend the most time eating pancakes, shaking hands and kissing babies and old people, particularly towards the end of campaign season. At this point, notes Susan Carroll, a senior scholar at the Center for American Women and Politics at Rutgers University, we begin to hear a lot of talk about “soccer moms.” Why’s that? As elections draw near, the few remaining undecided voters become priority. According to Carroll, “It’s traditionally the case that these voters are women.”¶ Presidential candidates, then, must be ready to snap them up—at town hall meetings and barbecue joints where they attempt to speak with female voters on the issues they weigh the most important. “The set of issues tend to be the same but the priorities men and women give them are different,” says Carroll, who says that men weigh the economic debt at a top priority where women tend to hold healthcare and education in high regard. “Women voters are incredibly important at the end of an election cycle,” she says, “They’re the voters who are up for grabs and candidates are prepared to win them over on the issues that matter most.”¶ And so, in battleground states where women out-vote men in the hundreds of thousands, the female voice becomes even more powerful than that of her sisters in solidly blue or red states. With that in mind, Obama and Romney would be smart to court Pennsylvanian women over New Yorkers, Floridians over Oklahomans. “Of course women are targeted,” says Bystrom. “When you look at the difference between the number of men and number of women, there are simply more women to woo.” For their ease (and yours, as it’s forever important for a women to known her own value—and that of her vote), we’ve crunched the Census data on the gender divide on voting in the most contentious states this fall.

**1NR—UQ O/w**

**Shits are still possible.**

**Silver 9/24** Election Guru [Nate Silver, The Statistical State of the Presidential Race, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/24/the-statistical-state-of-the-presidential-race/>]

Thus, although a shift of several percentage points in Mr. Romney’s favor **is far from impossible**, **or even all that unlikely**, this also looks like a year in which volatility in the polls might be lower than average. Third-party candidates are playing only a minor role this year, there are few undecideds and the late-stage movement in the polls has been on a secular downward trend over the past two decades.

Furthermore, there tends to be less movement in the polls in reasonably close elections than in blowouts, when the trailing candidate can sometimes receive a dead-cat bounce, or when the front-runner’s advantage grows from large to larger if the trailing candidate’s supporters are too despondent to turn out, as may have been the case for Walter Mondale’s Democrats in 1984.

And indeed, volatility has been low throughout the campaign. Just as in the stock market, past volatility seems to predict future volatility in the polls.

So this is why, despite the importance of the big picture, we will also need to sweat the small stuff this week. It seems plausible that by seven days from now, the consensus of data could point toward anything from Mr. Obama being a two-point favorite (about where the race was before the conventions) to being as much as six points ahead (as some of his stronger state polls seem to imply). Likewise, he could be at anywhere from about 47 percent of the vote (if his numbers recede from a convention bounce) to 50 percent (if his bounce holds and he inches forward as undecided voters commit.)

This makes an enormous amount of difference. Based on the way that our forecast model calculates it, a candidate ahead by two percentage points at this stage would be about a two-to-one favorite to win — odds that Mr. Romney might have to accept at this stage, improving his position enough to make further gains later. But a candidate ahead by six points would have around a 90 percent chance of victory.

**Especially after the debate.**

**Reuters 10/4** Romney gains ground on Obama after strong debate, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/04/us-usa-campaign-poll-idUSBRE8931E420121004

Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney gained ground on Democratic President Barack Obama after a strong performance in their first debate heading into the November 6 election, according to a Reuters/Ipsos poll taken after their prime-time face-off.

Romney is now viewed positively by 51 percent of voters, the first time he has enjoyed a net positive in the U.S. presidential race, the poll found. Obama's favorability rating remained unchanged at 56 percent, according to the poll.

Romney moved ahead of the president on several core issues after Wednesday's debate, which was widely seen as a victory for the Republican candidate.

Voters now see Romney as a better bet to boost the economy, spur job creation and manage the budget deficit, the poll found. He narrowed Obama's advantage on taxes, the Social Security retirement program and the Medicare health insurance program for the elderly and disabled.

Romney's strong performance could make the race more competitive, Ipsos pollster Cliff Young said.

"If he has more debates like this, is able to push through his message and target undecideds, we might see movement in voting intention, but he needs a lot more of this," Young said.

Obama and Romney have two more debates before the election.

The poll found that Obama's 7 percentage point advantage over Romney had narrowed to a lead of 5 percentage points, 48 percent to 43 percent.

The online poll surveyed 536 registered voters on Wednesday and Thursday after the debate. It has a credibility interval of 4.8 percentage points.

**Margins are close enough for voter switch to matter.**

**Business Insider 10/3** [You Have To Watch The Debate Tonight — Because It Really Will Matter, http://www.businessinsider.com/obama-romney-debates-will-matter-election-time-date]

In some elections, the presidential debates might be a meaningless ritual that does little to change the scope of the campaign.

In this election, the presidential debates will matter. In this election, Mitt Romney has a chance to start a comeback. In this election, President Barack Obama has a chance to cement himself as the probable victor.

**That's because this election is still extremely close**. Obama is up just 3 points in the Real Clear Politics average of national polls — 4 points in Wednesday's Gallup daily tracking poll — **and it doesn't take a major event to swing polls 3 points.**

Debates are a major part of the campaign — they can swing the race much more than 3 points. In an NBC/Wall Street Journal poll released Tuesday, 72 percent of respondents said the debates would be at least "somewhat" important in how they vote in November.

According to Gallup, 15 percent of declared Obama or Romney supporters said they could switch their vote, which is a higher percentage of "undecideds" than most polls find. And in a Washington Post poll, 83 percent of voters said they were interested in the debates.

**1NR—Link UQ**

**Nuclear power not mentioned now or perceived**

**JOHNSON ’12** (John; Nuclear Energy Insider, “US Campaign Trail: is nuclear in the equation?” 4/25, <http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/new-build/us-campaign-trail-nuclear-equation>)

Alternative energy policies have received a fair amount of publicity from the Obama administration, although **nuclear power** specifically **is rarely mentioned** on the campaign trial, primarily **due to** perceived **safety questions**.¶ Just the same, the Obama Administration is considered a nuclear supporter, having made several moves to help jumpstart America’s nuclear energy industry.¶ Obama plugged nuclear power during his first State Of The Union speech several years ago, and has generally been upbeat about the energy source’s future in the U.S.

**Obama distancing himself from nuclear issues in the run-up to the election**

**LEVINE 9/7**/12 (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.

## 2NR

#### The crisis will be full scale.

L.A. Times 7/2/12 [Paul Richter “Russian official: Romney's hard line could bring 'full-scale crisis'” July 2, 2012 [http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-russian-official-romneys-hard-line-could-bring-fullscale-crisis-20120702,0,4689534.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-russian-official-romneys-hard-line-could-bring-fullscale-crisis-20120702%2C0%2C4689534.story)]

Alexey Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee of the State Duma, said in a recent interview that Russian leaders have noted Romney’s comments with concern, and are watching with interest as neoconservative and “realist” advisers maneuver for influence within the campaign. “We don’t think that for us Romney will be an easy partner,” said Pushkov, an ally of President Vladimir Putin. “We think that Romney will be, on the rhetorical side, a replay of the Bush administration.” He also noted Romney’s statements that the United States should assert its dominance in the 21st century. “If he is serious about this, I’m afraid he may choose the neocon-type people…In the first year of his presidency, we may have a full-scale crisis,” he said.

#### Leads to belligerence in the DUMA.

Polman 9/14/12—Center for Programs in Contemporary Writing, University of Pennsylvania & National Political Columnist at the Philadelphia Inquirer [Dick Polman, Romney's blustering and blundering, Russia edition, http://www.newsworks.org/index.php/national-interest/item/44269-romneys-blustering-and-blundering-russia-edition]

And it's lucky for Romney that Ohioans hadn't yet heard about the latest episode concerning his blustering behavior toward Russia.

You may not have heard about it, either. In a busy news week, this episode has been largely overlooked. But it's enough to make one wish (yet again) that this guy would just confine himself to domestic issues, lest he do more damage to America on the world stage.

What you may remember is that, back in March, Romney went on CNN and announced that Russia is "without question, our number one geopolitical foe"—an assessment best suited for the Cold War, which ended two decades ago. It's true, of course, that Russia jockeys with us in many global hot spots, but Romney's remark (inspired, most likely, by the various neoconservatives and Cold War retreads that populate his foreign policy team) was woefully lacking in nuance.

Yes, Russia can be a pain in the butt, especially in Syria. But President Putin supports the strong western sanctions against Iran (which in turn benefits Israel), and he has aided our war in Afghanistan by allowing the U.S. and NATO to transport military materiel on his rail lines. Moreover, Russia continues to be a major supplier of crude oil to America.

So when you bluster in ignorance at an important semi-ally, and when you then double down by blustering anew in a radio interview (as Romney did earlier this week), you risk screwing things up for the nation you aspire to lead. Here's how:

NATO, led by America, is engaged in a sensitive minuet with Russia over NATO's plans for a missile defense shield in Europe. We've told Russia repeatedly that the shield is intended to deter Iran, not Russia. But Russia is wary of the project, in part because the most hawkish factions within the government oppose it—suspecting that it's American trick to put a cap on Russian power.

So here comes Romney, again, pounding away about how Russia is public enemy number one ...and guess what: his rhetoric has strengthened Russia's resolve to oppose the missile shield.

President Putin told reporters this week: "I'm grateful to (Romney) for formulating his stance so clearly, because he has once again proven the correctness of our approach to missile defense problems. The most important thing for us is that even if he doesn't win now, he or a person with similar views may come to power in four years. We must take that into consideration while dealing with security issues for a long perspective."

And the hawkish faction in Russia is citing Romney's remarks as confirmation of its deepest suspicions about a belligerent America. (That's a stereotype, of course, but Romney has played right into it.)

Andrei Klimov, deputy chair of the State Duma's international affairs commission, told reporters that Romney's bluster "is exactly what our generals have been telling us all along, that all these American strategic moves is really aimed against us. Romney has opened our eyes to the intrigues of American hawks, including the Pentagon and others. Maybe he intends it as election rhetoric, but isn't he expressing what the voters want to hear? If this is what half of American voters think, then how are we to plan our strategy for years ahead? Romney really has helped us by clearing the fog away from our eyes."

Gee thanks, Mitt! Could you please zip it for just 53 more days?