## Prolif

### 2AC – Prolif

#### They’ve conceded Prolif cause nuclear conflict—

#### First is uncertainty—countries can’t predict conflict, so they default to force

#### Second is inexperience—new proliferators won’t know how to negotiate—ensures inevitable miscalc

#### Third is instability—a use it or lose it mindset makes new proliferators uniquely aggressive

### A2: No Modeling

#### Group influence and spillover - Other countries are looking to the US for leadership and will model if the US shows national commitment and solid regulatory framework – that’s Lovering

### A2: Causes prolif

#### SMRs are prolif proof – low enrichment uranium, closed fuel cycle, barriers to radiation and low fissile material – That’s Kuznetsov

#### Can’t make weapons from SMRs

**Szondy, 12** – freelance writer based in Monroe, Washington (David, 2/16. “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/)

SMRs can help with proliferation, nuclear waste and fuel supply issues because, while some modular reactors are based on conventional pressurized water reactors and burn enhanced uranium, others use less conventional fuels. Some, for example, can generate power from what is now regarded as "waste", burning depleted uranium and plutonium left over from conventional reactors. Depleted uranium is basically U-238 from which the fissible U-235 has been consumed. It's also much more abundant in nature than U-235, which has the potential of providing the world with energy for thousands of years. Other reactor designs don't even use uranium. Instead, they use thorium. This fuel is also incredibly abundant, is easy to process for use as fuel and has the added bonus of being utterly useless for making weapons, so it can provide power even to areas where security concerns have been raised.

#### Solves problems with large reactors – they’re buried underground, are protected by concrete, and have secure refueling

**Loudermilk, 11** – research associate with the Energy & Environmental Security Policy program at National Defense University (Micah, 5/31. “Small Nuclear Reactors and US Energy Security: Concepts, Capabilities, and Costs.” Journal of Energy Security. <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?view=article&catid=116%3Acontent0411&id=314%3Asmall-nuclear-reactors-and-us-energy-security-concepts-capabilities-and-costs&tmpl=component&print=1&page=&option=com_content&Itemid=375>)

As to the small reactors themselves, the designs achieve a degree of proliferation-resistance unmatched by large reactors. Small enough to be fully buried underground in independent silos, the concrete surrounding the reactor vessels can be layered much thicker than the traditional domes that protect conventional reactors without collapsing. Coupled with these two levels of superior physical protection is the traditional security associated with reactors today. Most small reactors also are factory-sealed with a supply of fuel inside. Instead of refueling reactors onsite, SMRs are returned to the factory, intact, for removal of spent fuel and refueling. By closing off the fuel cycle, proliferation risks associated with the nuclear fuel running the reactors are mitigated and concerns over the widespread distribution of nuclear fuel allayed.

### A2: Deterrence Theory

#### Deterrence theory is flawed - modern weapons are small, compact, and immediate – more states causes deterrence to break down that’s Cimbala

## GW

### 2AC – Warming

#### They’ve conceded Warming causes extinction only a question of the extent to which plans solves, any rtisk of solvency you vote aff it’s try or die–warming is comparatively worse than nuclear war –that’s Diebel. Only we control 100% probability since we are seeing signs of it right now

#### AND it’s a conflict multiplier – even if they win wars happen now, those are fueled by climate change, as resource competition, refugees and humanitarian crises cause international tension – that’s Brozka

### A2: Long TF To Commercialization

#### Put all the TF stuff here –

#### This doesn’t assume incentives which spur rapid commercialization and accelerate solvency – that’s Rosner and Goldberg

### A2: Citing

#### Citing doesn’t block –

#### A – Investors have a near unanimous view that the largest barrier to SMRs is difficulty obtaining financing, not licensing or citing – investment solves any existing problems – that’s Domenici and Miller

#### B – Standardized components and enhanced safety fixes citing – that’s Cunningham

#### C – At minimum, permitting extensions on status quo nuclear facilities that are being renewed because of a lack of new tech cease post SMRs and they go where the old and dangerous squo facilities are

### Renewables Disad

#### Shift to renewables is a long way off

**Alic, 12** – geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel in Sarajevo and Tel Aviv, and the former editor-in-chief of ISN Security Watch in Zurich (Jen, 8/19. “We are Decades Away from a Cure for our Fossil Fuel Addiction.” http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/We-are-Decades-Away-from-a-Cure-for-our-Fossil-Fuel-Addiction.html)

With natural gas prices low and supplies high, we are decades away from being able to wean ourselves off fossil fuels and move to renewable energy, but there is no reason for dismay. There seems to be a knee-jerk reaction to render the renewable energy-versus-fossil fuels debate in black and white terms, in a one-or-the-other symposium. A sudden “switch” to clean energy is not possible; rather it must be a gradual introduction of renewable energy sources combined with an increase in domestic fossil fuels production. Renewable energy is a natural revolution that will indeed take place, however slowly. But for now, it is responsible for only a very small percentage of energy production. Renewable energy accounts for less than 12% of total energy consumption in the US, according to the Energy Information Administration (EIA). The EIA’s figures for 2010 show that natural gas and coal each accounted for 22% of US energy production, followed by crude oil at 12%, nuclear energy at 8%, biomass at 4%, natural gas plant liquids at 3%, hydroelectric power at 3%, and geothermal/solar/wind at 1%. Natural gas remains the dominant energy source and that will continue to increase in the coming decade. Fossil fuels will remain the key source of energy for decades to come, but at the same time, renewable energy will continue to develop until it can compete on the market. There is no way around the fact that market and environment must be in line in order to see a shift to renewable energy, and this alignment takes time. For now, the market favors natural gas and it is impossible to force big business to shift to renewable energy when natural gas prices are so low. It is also impossible to convince the average consumer to go along with this.

#### Renewables can’t solve warming fast enough – that’s the 1AC Harvey evidence, only global nuclear adoption can solve fast enough.

#### Plan solves warming – only nuclear fuel can reach carbon targets – that’s Harvey in 12

#### Nuclear power is comparably better than any renewable option – solar and wind do more environmental damage and cost trillions

**Eerkens, 6 –** adjunct research professor, Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute at the University of Missouri in Columbia,

(Jeff W., “The Nuclear Imperative: a critical look at the approaching energy crises,” Springer Press)

For the USA, replacement of primary oil and coal requires an investment of $35 trillion for solar, $25 trillion for wind, and $6 trillion for nuclear power, Besides these capital cost disincentives, the enormous land areas needed for solar and wind energy cause a disturbance of local ecologies and will spoil many scenic landscapes. Exclusive use of these sources for prime energy would make them very unpopular with environmentalists, Aside from capital costs, one must consider maintenance costs. Solar cells require constant cleaning to remove dust or bird droppings, and must be replaced every ten to twenty years due to erosion and deterioration (sand storms, etc). They are made of gallium-arsenide or copper­indium-diselenide, requiring toxic silanes, arsenic, etc. for their manufacture. Toxic wastes generated in producing solar cells for global use, dwarf the amount of nuclear fuel and waste for the nuclear option. For wind-power generation, the mechanical maintenance of thousands of turbines and protective measures to avoid killing thousands of birds, seriously effects its economics. The secret of controlled nuclear power is that it is a thousand times more concentrated than any non-nuclear method .

#### Chinese Dysprosium is key to Panels and Turbines – and it’s running out

Rhodes 12 (July 30, Chris, chemistry and doctor phil, youngest professor of Physical Chemistry in UK, “The No.1 Source for Oil and Energy News,” “Peak Minerals: Shortage of Rare Earth Metals Threatens Renewable Energy” <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Renewable-Energy/Peak-Minerals-Shortage-of-Rare-Earth-Metals-Threatens-Renewable-Energy.html>)

Of the other REEs, demands for dysprosium and terbium, which are harder elements to extract than their lighter relatives, are such that supply will be outpaced within a decade. The latter have been described as "miracle" ingredients for green energy production since small quantities of dysprosium can result in magnets with only one tenth the weight of conventional permanent magnets of similar strength, while terbium can be used to furnish lights that use as little as 20% of the power consumed by normal illumination. By alloying neodymium with dysprosium and terbium, magnets are created that more readily maintain their magnetism at the high temperatures of hybrid car engines. However, far more dysprosium relative to neodymium is required than occurs naturally in the REE ores, meaning that another source of dysprosium must be found if hybrid cars are to be manufactured at a seriously advancing rate. As noted, almost all REEs come from China whom it appears will run out of dysprosium and terbium within 15 years, or sooner if demand continues to soar, notwithstanding that Chinese hegemony for its own future energy projects may mean that the current amount of REEs being released onto the world markets will be severely curbed. Almost certainly, new sources of REEs will be sought, given their vital importance to providing future renewable energy, and Japanese geologists have reported that there may be 100 billion tonnes of REEs in the mud of the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Since the minerals were found at depths of 3,500 to 6,000 metres (11,500-20,000 ft) below the ocean surface, the undertaking required to recover them will not be trivial, however, and the practicalities of the enterprise remain to be seen.

#### Tightening REE supply causes US-China trade wars

Time 12 (Time Science & Space, “Raring to Fight: The US Tangles with China over Rare-Earth Exports,” Bryan Walsh, March 13, http://science.time.com/2012/03/13/raring-to-fight-the-u-s-tangles-with-china-over-rare-earth-exports/)

Or not. This morning Obama announced that the U.S. — along with the European Union and Japan — had filed a case with the World Trade Organization requesting talks with China over its export controls of the rare-earth minerals used in the high-tech and clean-tech manufacturing industries. The request for consultations is the first step in a process that will lead to a full legal case within two months, unless China agrees to the demands to ease its tightening export quotas on rare-earth minerals. That isn’t likely — and the fact that Obama chose to make his case publicly, from the White House Rose Garden, indicates that both sides could be gearing up for a trade war in a presidential-election year. “Being able to manufacture advanced batteries and cars is too important to sit back and do nothing,” Obama said. “We can’t let the new energy industry take root in other countries because they are allowed to break the rules.”

#### Trade Wars Empirically Go Hot

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable.

#### Conflict with China will escalate to global nuclear war

**Hunkovic 9** (Lee J, American Military University, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict: Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, [http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/ Hunkovic.pdf](http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf))

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential **to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

### Warming Bad – CCP Instability

#### Warming causes CCP instability

IPS 7 (Inter Press News Service, “Global Warming Fuels Inflation”, 9-5, http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=39144)

Yet government officials now fear that the combined effects of climate change and inflation pressures could destabilise public mood ahead of the 17th Communist Party Congress -- a five-yearly meeting, designed to chart the party’s policy and seal the legacy of its current leaders. Drought is already affecting 22 of China’s 31 provinces. Meteorological experts say that global warming would exacerbate things as a one-degree rise in temperature could aggravate ground water evaporation by seven percent. Zheng Guogan, head of the State Meteorological Administration forecasts global warming will cut China’s annual grain harvest by up to 10 percent. That would mean about 50 million tonnes less grain in the current tight supply situation and a potential for further inflation. "Given the tightened food supply in the international market, a decline in domestic grain production could lead to more price hikes," Song Tingmin, vice-president of the China National Association of Grain told the China Daily. A surge in food prices saw China’s consumer price index (CPI) rise to a 10-year high of 5.6 percent in July, far above the government’s upper target of 3 percent for the whole year. Economists say the August inflation rose even higher on the back of soaring pork costs. The social dimensions of such leaps in inflation are not lost on a government, which remembers that 1989 pro-democracy movement that saw thousands of students, workers and intellectuals out in street protests was triggered by public anger over inflation.

#### CCP will lash-out – killing a billion

Rexing 5 (Sen, Staff Writer – The Epoch Times, “CCP Gambles Insanely to Avoid Death”, Epoch Times, 8-3, <http://www.theepochtimes.com/news/5-8-3/30931.html>)

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weaponsin its attempt to postpone its life. The CCP, that disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, coupled with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. The “speech,” free of all disguises, lets the public see the CCP for what it really is: with evil filling its every cell, the CCP intends to fight all of mankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. And that is the theme of the “speech.” The theme is murderous and utterly evil. We did witness in China beggars who demanded money from people by threatening to stab themselves with knives or prick their throats on long nails. But we have never, until now, seen a rogue who blackmails the world to die with it by wielding biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. Anyhow, the bloody confession affirmed the CCP’s bloodiness: a monstrous murderer, who has killed 80 million Chinese people, now plans to hold one billion people hostageand gamble with their lives.

## S

### A2: Nat Gas Blocks

#### SMRs are competitive with natural gas

Skutnik, 11

[Skutnik, Steve. Assistant Professor of Nuclear Engineering at the University of Tennessee; regular contributor toThe Neutron Economy. His areas of research expertise include nuclear fuel cycles, waste management, and nuclear nonproliferation. “Small Modular Reactors and the Economics of Nuclear,” The Neutron Economy. Saturday, June 25, 2011. http://neutroneconomy.blogspot.com/2011/06/excellent-op-ed-on-small-modular.html]

SMRs have the potential to change the economics of the game by several means. First, many proposed SMR designs are engineered to be mass-produced and pre-fabricated in factories, rather than built on-site. This could tremendously push down prices while also shortening construction times, thus ameliorating what is currently one of nuclear's biggest weaknesses at the moment. Meanwhile, the "small" in SMRs also may have potentially positive implications for both cost and safety: SMRs can be potentially built into the ground, using the surrounding earth as containment, due to their relatively small size. Given the lower total power and nuclear material within the reactor, it can be said to have a lower overall "radiological footprint," meaning simplified safety planning. Finally, the "right-size" power of SMR capacity may allow them to be sold in a greater number of markets - places both where a new full-sized reactor is too big for the needs of a community (for example, Fort Calhoun, north of Omaha, is the smallest reactor in the U.S. nuclear fleet, clocking in at only 500 MW; compare this to currently proposed new reactor designs, which begin in the neighborhood of 1000-1100 MW). Likewise, the smaller size means that for utilities only looking to incrementally expand capacity, small reactors may prove to be competitive with alternatives such as natural gas turbines.

#### Natural gas prices rising – industrial and electricity demand

Lackey 12 (Mark, energy analyst with CHF Investor Relations, “This Is Your Energy Entry Point: Mark Lackey,” 8-30-12, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/14243>)

Natural gas has been somewhat weaker, but it bounced off the $2/thousand cubic feet (Mcf) price a few months ago up to the $2.85–3/Mcf range in North America. With more industrial demand coming back, particularly in the auto sector, and stronger demand from electric utilities, gas should move back up closer to $3.25–3.30/Mcf in the next year. By way of comparison, prices in Europe can be anywhere from $4–8/Mcf, and in China they're as high as $15/Mcf.

#### Fracking is unsustainable – the US doesn’t have much nat gas left and their cards cite the best opportunities and best possible scenarios which have been exhausted – prefer Berman, he’s a consultant for the American Association of Petroleum Geologists – his job revolves around unbiased studies

#### Fracking is economically unsustainable and can’t maintain low prices

Newman 12 (Alfred, “How do we keep getting these articles about low cost, unlimited amounts of natural gas?,” 8-21-12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertlenzner/2012/08/21/the-exquisite-symmetry-of-the-natural-gas-revolution/

Natural gas prices are increasing and will continue to increase until the price of natural gas balances with the cost of production of natural gas. Fracking is expensive and the cost of natural most likely will double in the coming year to reflect the high cost of fracking. And the price of natural will remain at the cost of natural gas extraction – something called supply and demand. Anyone who makes assumptions based on todays unsustainable low natural gas prices is in for a rude awakening. And anyone who thinks we can just turn the knob on more natural gas production is living in a dream world. Natural gas fracking wells have an 80% depletion rate during the first year. Keeping natural gas production level requires drilling immense numbers of new wells each year – something the natural gas producers are not willing to do at todays unprofitable natural gas prices. To drive this message home, we are producing 4% less natural gas today than we were in January of this year and at the end of this year we will be producing about 10% less natural gas than we were in January of this year. we are in a natural gass bubble and this bubble has been likened to a Ponzi scam. Fracking is not the renaissance of natural gas. fracking is the funeral of natural gas. If you do not understand what this means, you will soon.

## Off

### States CP 2ac

#### Perm do both –

#### states are acting now to provide incentives but it won’t work without a sustained federal commitment

Bowman 8 (President and Chief Executive Officer Nuclear Energy Institute (Frank, CQ Congressional Testimony, “Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction”, 6/19, lexis)

In terms of new nuclear plant construction, one of the most significant financing challenges is the cost of these projects relative to the size, market value and financing capability of the companies that will build them. New nuclear power plants are expected to cost at least $6 to 7 billion. U.S. electric power companies do not have the size, financing capability or financial strength to finance new nuclear power projects on balance sheet, on their own-particularly at a time when they are investing heavily in other generating capacity, transmission and distribution infrastructure, and environmental controls. These first projects must have financing support-either loan guarantees from the federal government or assurance of investment recovery from state governments, or both. The states are doing their part. Throughout the South and Southeast, state governments have enacted legislation or implemented new regulations to encourage new nuclear plant construction. Comparable federal government commitment is essential. The modest loan guarantee program authorized by the 2005 Energy Policy Act was a small step in the right direction, but it does not represent a sufficient response to the urgent need to rebuild our critical electric power infrastructure. We believe the United States will need something similar to the Clean Energy Bank concept now under consideration by a number of members of Congress-a government corporation, modeled on the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, to provide loan guarantees and other forms of financing support to ensure that capital flows to clean technology deployment in the electric sector. Creation of such a financing entity should be an integral component of any climate change legislation. Such a concept serves at least two national imperatives. First, it addresses the challenge mentioned earlier-the disparity between the size of these projects relative to the size of the companies that will build them. In the absence of a concept like a Clean Energy Bank, new nuclear plants and other clean energy projects will certainly be built, but in smaller numbers over a longer period of time. Second, federal loan guarantees provide a substantial consumer benefit. A loan guarantee allows more leverage in a project's capital structure, which reduces the cost of capital, in turn reducing the cost of electricity from the project. Electricity consumers-residential, commercial and industrial-are already struggling with increases in oil, natural gas and electricity prices. The high cost of energy and fuel price volatility has already compromised the competitive position of American industry. We know that the next generation of clean energy technologies will be more costly than the capital stock in place today. In this environment, we see a compelling case for federal financing support that would reduce consumer costs. If it is structured like the loan guarantee program authorized by Title XVII of the 2005 Energy Policy Act, in which project sponsors are expected to pay the cost of the loan guarantee, such a program would be revenue-neutral and would not represent a subsidy. The public benefits associated with a robust energy loan guarantee program-lower cost electricity, deployment of clean energy technologies at the scale necessary to reduce carbon emissions-are significant. That is why the U.S. government routinely uses loan guarantee programs to support activities that serve the public good and the national interest-including shipbuilding, steelmaking, student loans, rural electrification, affordable housing, construction of critical transportation infrastructure, and for many other purposes. Achieving significant expansion of nuclear power in the United States will require stable and sustained federal and state government policies relating to nuclear energy.

#### prevents race to the bottom by imposing a federal floor

Suh 11 (Katrina – Associate Professor of Law, Hofstra University School of Law. B.A. Yale University; J.D. Yale Law School, “CAPTURING INDIVIDUAL HARMS”, Harvard Environmental Law Review 35 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 155, lexis)

Domestic environmental law involves state and, indirectly, local governments in the design and implementation of environmental policy through a cooperative federalism framework that imposes federal minimum standards but largely reserves decisions about implementation to state authorities. n31 One of the chief rationales for this division of authority is that it "allows ... pollution [control] strategies to be tailored to individual geographic areas," n32 thereby (at least potentially) maximizing social welfare and efficiency by allowing policy to incorporate local conditions and local preferences. n33 Proponents of the devolution of even greater authority to the states and local government than that afforded by cooperative federalism also emphasize the benefits of local tailoring. n34 Local tailoring is hypothesized to require state and local involvement because "[a] national bureaucracy like EPA, with its limited resources and knowledge, cannot possibly take into account ... regional and subregional differences." n35 Moreover, "EPA has relatively little incentive to reflect local preferences about how to assign ... pollution reduction burdens -- about whether, for instance, to tighten automobile emissions inspection programs or to impose stricter limits on small businesses." n36 This traditional account of the benefits of cooperative federalism and local tailoring is subject to robust debate. A voluminous environmental federalism literature evidences continuing and deep divisions about the advisability and efficacy of cooperative federalism [\*163] approaches as well as about the appropriate role of local governments in environmental regulation and the benefits of local tailoring.

#### Condo is a voter- results in argument irresponsibility, time and strat skews- no cost options in the 1nc make the 2ac impossible- one condo advocacy/ dispo solves your offense

#### Solvency Deficits -

#### Nuke leadership – the Wallace and Williams ev indicates strong federal action to reverse our decline in nuclear leadership is key to send an international signal – countries view the NRC as the gold standard and CP kills it– that’s Lovering

#### And there’s no international perception of states – empirically proven for nuclear power – China hasn’t perceived the Votgle project

#### Specifically Congress is key

Fertel 5 [Marvin Fertel - Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer Nuclear Energy Institute “Nuclear Power's Place In A National Energy Policy,” April 28th, 2005, Lexis (CQ Congressional Testimony), Chetan]

Industry and government will be prepared to meet the demand for new emission-free baseload nuclear plants in the 2010 to 2020 time frame only through a sustained focus on the necessary programs and policies between now and then. As it has in the past, strong Congressional oversight will be necessary to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the **federal** government's nuclear energy programs, and to maintain America's leadership in nuclear technology development and its influence over important diplomatic initiatives like nonproliferation.

#### Warming – extend the Lovering evidence, nations see the NRC as the gold standard of licensing practices and are ready to follow their lead on SMR development – international transition to nuclear DEPENDS on NRC action

#### AND - Federal government key to uniformity for climate mitigation

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

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

#### Can’t build enough – their ev only talks about a few states building even fewer nuclear power plants

#### Investor Confidence

#### Extend the Wallace evidence – investors think federal tax credits are necessary to offset risks and generate licensing certainty – only after investors can see that will they be willing to finance future projects

#### AND – Investors will see that states are broke - they won’t trust any incentive without the government

Oliff et al 12 [Phil Oliff, Chris Mai, and Vincent Palacios – Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact”, June 27th, 2012, <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711,m>, Chetan]

As a new fiscal year begins, the latest state budget estimates continue to show that states’ ability to fund services remains hobbled by slow economic growth. The budget gaps that states have had to close for fiscal year 2013, the fiscal year that begins July 1, 2012, total $55 billion in 31 states. That amount is smaller than in past years, but still very large by historical standards. States’ actions to close those gaps, in turn, are further delaying the nation’s economic recovery. The budget gaps result principally from weak tax collections. The Great Recession that started in 2007 caused the largest collapse in state revenues on record. Since bottoming out in 2010, revenues have begun to grow again but are still far from fully recovered. As of the first quarter of 2012, state revenues remained 5.5 percent below pre-recession levels, and are not growing fast enough to recover fully soon. Meanwhile, states’ education and health care obligations continue to grow. States expect to educate 540,000 more K-12 students and 2.5 million more public college and university students in the upcoming school year than in 2007-08.[1] And some 4.8 million more people are projected to be eligible for subsidized health insurance through Medicaid in 2012 than were enrolled in 2008, as employers have cancelled their coverage and people have lost jobs and wages.[2] Consequently, even though the revenue outlook is trending upward, states have addressed large budget shortfalls by historical standards as they considered budgets for 2013. The vast majority of these shortfalls have been closed through spending cuts and other measures in order to meet balanced-budget requirements. As of publication all but five states have enacted their budgets, and those five will do so soon. To the extent these shortfalls are being closed with spending cuts, they are occurring on top of past years’ deep cuts in critical public services like education, health care, and human services. The additional cuts mean that state budgets will continue to be a drag on the national economy, threatening hundreds of thousands of private- and public-sector jobs, reducing the job creation that otherwise would be expected to occur. Potential strategies for lessening the impact of deep spending cuts include more use of state reserve funds in states that have reserves, more revenue through tax-law changes, and a greater role for the federal government.

#### Financial protection is the only thing that gets investors on board

Morse 7 – Washington Post Staff Writer (Dan, “Money Matters in Debate Over New Reactor Project; Financing, Rather Than Safety, Appears to Be Key Factor in Whether Plans Proceed” Washington Post Staff Writer 2007, September 5. The Washington Post,p. B.5.  ProQuest)

It's not the greenies who worry those aiming to build a new nuclear reactor in Southern Maryland. It's the green. This seemed perfectly clear at a recent community meeting in Calvert County, where Constellation Energy has proposed the first new reactor project in the United States in nearly 30 years. The price tag: about $4.5 billion. "Without the federal loan guarantees, this whole thing will come to a stop," George Vanderheyden, a Constellation executive, said while standing outside the hotel conference room where the meeting was about to start. Ten feet from him, a row of environmentalists greeted Calvert residents with stacks of brochures. "Threatened Communities," from Greenpeace, showed rows of grave markers next to a nuclear cooling tower. Vanderheyden showed little concern and later said his company could dispel such notions during the long approval process for the reactor. What concerns him more -- and what appears to be the larger factor in whether the Calvert reactor gets built -- is taking place 55 miles away in Washington. There, nuclear companies such as Constellation, along with Wall Street bankers, are lobbying hard to get the federal government to help kick-start construction of a series of reactors. Their argument: Nuclear power is clean energy that can reduce greenhouse gases. Wall Street investors could help finance new reactors. But they're skittish, remembering nuclear projects in the 1970s and 1980s dogged by regulatory delays, cost overruns and the Three Mile Island meltdown. The government, according to the nuclear industry, should protect investors if the initial projects go bad.

#### Regulatory Delays

#### Extend the Gale evidence – federal financing controls the risk factors that give rise to regulatory delays. Private lenders are much more eager to finance projects when they know that regulatory regimes won’t get in the way.

#### -- States fiat is a voter --- steals all the Aff, uniformity circumvents the best literature, its contrived and unpredictable because there isn’t a single solvency advocate for the counterplan, and illogical because no policy-maker can choose between all 50 states doing the plan vs. the federal government doing it.

#### -- Links to politics --- state action create national controversy and draws in Obama – people will equally backlash to him devolving authority to the state

#### -No solvency advocate is a voter – makes it unqieuly unpredictable and uneducational, need 1 solvency advocate for all planks

#### Counterplan causes race to the bottom – undermines enforcement and the environment

Pursley and Wiseman 11 (Garrick – Assistant Professor of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, and Hannah - Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law, “LOCAL ENERGY”, 2011, Emory Law Journal, 60 Emory L.J. 877, lexis)

In the end, then, the efficiency debate leaves us with no general answer to the institutional-choice question in the context of distributed renewables. Leaving aside the observation that efficiency in the "provision of environmental goods" may not be the best criterion for evaluating environmental policy, n251 there simply is no economic justification for lodging all environmental regulatory power at any one level of government. At best, the literature shows that the question of efficiency in the allocation of regulatory power is complex, that the proper allocation likely varies from one environmental policy area to another - air and water pollutants with effects beyond state boundaries clearly merit federal regulation, for example - and that races to the bottom remain a risk at the subnational level. Although there is no empirical evidence to suggest that the economic dynamics differ substantially from the general field of environmental regulation to the specific subject of distributed renewables policy, differences in the nature of technologies and business interests may raise distinct issues. n252 For now, we assume relative similarity between environmental and distributed renewables regulation and that decentralizing regulatory authority to the state or local government level risks a race to the bottom. We address remedies for that risk in Part II.B, below. 2. The Politics Debate A second theoretical dilemma in identifying an optimal level of land-energy governance cautions against too hasty a leap toward vesting primary regulatory authority in state or local governments. This dilemma arises from the literature applying public choice theory to environmental regulation. n253 Public choice theory holds that government policy is disproportionately shaped [\*923] by the preferences of concentrated interest groups that provide significant electoral support for representatives and thereby secure access and influence over those representatives' decisions. n254 It thus highlights the importance of understanding the alignment and actions of relevant interest groups in describing the causes of past policy outcomes and predicting future outcomes. n255 The classical objection is that interest groups that favor lax environmental regulation and have high individual stakes in regulatory outcomes - paradigmatically industry groups - tend to be small and cohesive, but groups favoring stricter environmental regulation tend to be more diffuse and less organized. n256 This disparity in political power, from the perspective of economies of scale in political organization and advocacy of the two camps, is exacerbated at the state and local government levels. n257 Diffuse environmental interests may muster the resources to organize and act within a single political forum, but organizing at multiple state or government locations would be too taxing upon their relatively undisciplined and typically underfunded infrastructures. n258 Interests favoring laxer regulation, by contrast, are thought to possess relatively greater capacity to organize and advocate in multiple [\*924] government forums and thus enjoy a comparative advantage. n259 Comparative institutional analysis thus suggests that federal environmental authority is preferable to state or local authority because the federal level is the most efficient receiver of broadly shared but often under-organized public interests in environmental protection, which are needed to counterbalance industrial interests that would otherwise dominate the political process and impose their narrow interests on the unwitting public. n260

#### Fiat doesn’t solve --- implementation will vary

Bryner 2 (Gary C. - Professor, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, and Research Associate, Natural Resources Law Center. University of Colorado School of Law., “ARTICLE: Policy Devolution and Environmental Law: Exploring the Transition to Sustainable Development”, Fall, 26 Environs Envtl. L. & Pol'y J. 1, lexis)

Federal agencies are believed to be insulated enough from resource-depleting communities to ensure preservationist values are pursued. When agencies fail to protect resources or reduce pollution, the solution is to replace them with more ambitious regulators and to strengthen the regulatory authority of federal officials. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=056abf4cf7f767d2655ae1b274fe4dc3&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAB&_md5=3dc0dbf11daf78ff84a8925ba322737c#n2#n2) A number of studies have compared states according to their commitment to environmental protection and found significant variation in expenditures, legal authority, methodologies to determine environmental quality, reporting  [\*3]  requirements, enforcement actions, and in the environmental standards they are authorized to set under federal law. [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=056abf4cf7f767d2655ae1b274fe4dc3&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAB&_md5=3dc0dbf11daf78ff84a8925ba322737c#n3#n3)

#### Workers DA -

#### A. Federal funds drive private sector investment and recruiting skilled workers for construction

Kammen 3 - professor of nuclear engineering at Berkeley (Daniel, Federal News Service, Prepared Testimony before the House Committee on Science, 6/12, lexis)

The federal government plays the pivotal role in the encouragement of innovation in the energy sector. Not only are **federal** funds critical, but as my work and that of others has demonstrated6, private funds generally follow areas of public sector support. One particularly useful metric although certainly not the only measure --. of the relationship between funding and innovation is based on patents. Total public sector funding and the number of patents - across all disciplines in the United States have both increased steadily over at least the past three decades (Figure 5). The situation depicted here, with steadily increasing trends for funding and results (measured imperfectly, but consistently, by patents) is not as rosy when energy R&D alone is considered. In that case the same close correlation exists, but the funding pattern has been one of decreasing resources (Figure 6A). Figure 6A shows energy funding levels (symbol: o) and patents held by the national laboratories (symbol: ). The situation need not be as bleak as it seems. During the 1980s a number of changes in U.S. patent law permitted the national laboratories to engage in patent partnerships with the private sector. This increased both the interest in developing patents, and increased the interest by the private sector in pursuing patents on energy technologies. The squares (l) in figure 6 show that overall patents in the energy sector derived. Figure 6B reveals that patent levels in the nuclear field have declined, but not only that, publicprivate partnerships have taken placed (shaded bars), but have not increased as dramatically as in energy field overall (Figure 6A). There are a number of issues here, so a simple comparison of nuclear R&D to that on for example, fuel cells, is not appropriate. But it is a valid to explore ways to increase both the diversity of the R&D. This is a particularly important message for **federal** policy. Novel approaches are needed to encourage new and innovative modes of research, teaching, and industrial innovation in the nuclear energy field. To spur innovation in nuclear science a concerted effort would be needed to increase the types and levels of cooperation by universities and industries in areas that depart significantly from the current 'Generation III+' and equally, away from the 'Generation IV' designs. Similar conclusions were reached by M. Granger Morgan, head of the Engineering and Public Policy Program at Carnegie Mellon University, in his evaluation of the need for innovative in the organization and sociology of the U. S. nuclear power industrys. A second important issue that this Committee might consider is the degree of **federal** support for nuclear fission relative to other nations. Funding levels in the U.S. are significantly lower than in both Japan and France. Far from recommending higher public sector funding, what is arguably a more successful strategy would be to increase the private sector support for nuclear R&D and student training fellowships. Importantly, this is precisely the sort of expanded publicprivate partnership that has been relatively successful in the energy sector generally. It is incorrect, however, to think that this is a process that can be left to the private sector. There are key issues that inhibit private sector innovation. As one example, many nuclear operating companies have large coal assets, and thus are unlikely to push overly hard, in areas that threaten another core business. This emphasis on industry resources used to support and expanded nuclear program - under careful public sector management - has been echoed by a variety of nuclear engineering faculty members: I believe that if you. were to survey nuclear engineering department heads, most would select a national policy to support new nuclear construction, over a policy to increase direct financial support to nuclear engineering departments. A firm commitment by the federal government, to create **incentives** sufficient to ensure the construction of a modest number of new nuclear plants, with the **incentives** reduced for subsequent plants, would be the best thing that could possibly be done for nuclear engineering education and revitalization of the national workforce for nuclear science and technology. - Professor Per Peterson, Chair, Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

#### B. Skilled worker shortage will wreck solvency

Bengelsdorf 7 – consultant and former director of both key State and Energy Department offices that are concerned with international nuclear and nonproliferation affair

(HAROLD, “THE U.S. DOMESTIC CIVIL NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE AND U.S. NONPROLIFERATION POLICY”, White Paper prepared for the American Council on Global Nuclear Competitiveness May, http://www.nuclearcompetitiveness.org/images/COUNCIL\_WHITE\_PAPER\_Final.pdf)

Thus the challenge the U.S. nuclear industry faces today is whether the U.S. civil nuclear infrastructure will be strong enough to support a hoped for nuclear revival in this country, which could entail the construction and commissioning of up to eight nuclear power units during the 2010 to 2017 period. Several studies have been devoted to this question, and the answer is by no means certain. The shortage in skilled labor is expected to double in this country by the year 2020 and the workforce will stop growing as the baby boomers start to retire.

### Cap K – 2AC

#### Case outweighs –

#### Domestic rejection of capitalism doesn’t remove the motive for prolif

#### Absent the plan runaway warming is imminent – even if they win root cause it’s too late for that to matter – rejecting the system doesn’t change the temperature

#### Perm – do both

#### It’s net beneficial – using capitalism to fight itself is more effective

Rothkrug 90 (Paul, Founder – Environmental Rescue Fund, Monthly Review, March, 41(10), p. 38)

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

#### Perm do the plan and all parts of the alternative that don’t consist of reject the aff

#### Double bind – either the alt can overcome residual links to the perm or it can’t overcome the status quo and is doomed to failure

#### Alternatives to capitalism will inevitably collapse

Taylor 94 (Jerry, Director of Natural Resource Studies – Cato Institute, “The Challenge of Sustainable Development”, Regulation, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/reg17n1-taylor.html)

The free, competitive marketplace creates not only human capital but natural capital as well. That is because capitalism is the most productive engine of intellectual and technological advance, and it is that stock of human knowledge and technology that turns the earth's material into useful commodities. "Humans are the active agent, having ideas that they use to transform the environment for human purposes, observes economist Thomas De Gregori. "Resources are not fixed and finite because they are not natural. They are a product of human ingenuity resulting from the creation of technology and science." David Osterfeld adds that "since resources are a function of human knowledge, and since our stock of knowledge has increased over time, it should come as no surprise that the stock of physical resources has also been expanding." Closed societies and economies under the heavy hand of state planning are doomed to live within the **confines of dwindling resource bases** and **eventually experience the** very collapse feared by the proponents of sustainable development.

#### Alt causes transition wars

Harris 3 (Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html)

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, **a full-fledged** civil **war** not just within one society, but **across the globe**. Without this **catastrophic upheaval**, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

**Extinction**

Kothari 82 (Rajni, Professor of Political Science – University of Delhi, Toward a Just Social Order, p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centres of power -- and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification of the old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for **eventual global holocaust**.

#### Framework – evaluate the aff vs. status quo or a competitive policy option. That’s best for fairness and predictability – there are too many frameworks to predict and they moot all of the 1ac – makes it impossible to be aff. Only our framework solves activism.

#### Capitalism is resilient – it’ll bounce back

Foster 9 (JD, Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of fiscal policy – Heritage Foundation, "Is Capitalism Dead? Maybe," 3-11, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=101694302)

Capitalism is down. It may even be out. But it's **far from dead**. Capitalism is **extremely resilient**. Why? Because here, as in every democratic-industrial country around the world, it has always had to struggle to survive against encroachments — both benign and malevolent — of the state. At the moment, capitalism is losing ground most everywhere. But when the economic crisis passes, capitalism and the freedoms it engenders will **recover again**, if only because freedom beats its lack. It is said that the trouble with socialism is socialism; the trouble with capitalism is capitalists. The socialist economic system, inherently contrary to individual liberties, tends to minimize prosperity because it inevitably allocates national resources inefficiently. On the other hand, a truly capitalist system engaged in an unfettered pursuit of prosperity is prone to occasional and often painful excesses, bubbles and downturns like the one we are now experiencing globally. When capitalism slips, governments step in with regulations and buffers to try to moderate the excesses and minimize the broader consequences of individual errors. Sometimes these policies are enduringly helpful. Severe economic downturns inflict collateral damage on families and businesses otherwise innocent of material foolishness. Not only are the sufferings of these innocents harmful to society, but they are also downright expensive. A little wise government buffering can go a long way. The trick, of course, is the wisdom part. A good example of a wise government buffer is deposit insurance at commercial banks. Without it, depositors would have withdrawn their funds en masse, leading to a rapid collapse of the banking system. It happened in years gone by. But today, deposits have flowed into the banking system in search of safety, helping banks staunch their many severe wounds. Yet for every example of helpful government intervention, there are many more that do more harm than good. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac leap to mind. These congressional creatures helped create, then inflate the subprime market. When that balloon popped, it triggered a global economic meltdown. The current financial crisis clearly has capitalism on its back foot. Government ownership of the largest insurance company, the major banks, and Fan and Fred are awesome incursions into private markets. But, as President Obama has underscored, these incursions are only temporary. In time, these institutions — even Fan and Fred — will be broken up and sold in parts. It will leave government agents with stories to tell their grandkids, and taxpayers stuck with the losses. But the power of the state will again recede, and **another new age of** freedom and **capitalism will arrive and thrive**… until we repeat the cycle again sometime down the road.

#### Rejection won’t dislodge capitalism – no critical mass exists

Grossberg 92 (Lawrence, Professor of Communication Studies – UNC-Chapel Hill and Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Program in Cultural Studies, We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture, p. 388-389)

If it is capitalism that is at stake, our moral opposition to it has to be **tempered by** the **realities** of the world and the possibilities of political change. Taking a simple negative relation to it, as if the moral condemnation of the evil of capitalism were sufficient (granting that it does establish grotesque systems of inequality and oppression), is not likely to establish a viable political agenda. First, it is not at all clear what it would mean to overthrow capitalism in the current situation. Unfortunately, despite our desires, "the masses" are not waiting to be led into revolution, and it is not simply a case of their failure to recognize their own best interests, as if we did. Are we to decide-rather undemocratically, I might add-to overthrow capitalism in spite of their legitimate desires? Second, as much as capitalism is the cause of many of the major threats facing the world, at the moment it may also be one of the few forces of stability, unity and even, within limits, a certain "civility" in the world. The world system is, unfortunately, simply too precarious and the alternative options not all that promising. Finally, the appeal of an as yet unarticulated and even unimagined future, while perhaps powerful as a moral imperative, is **simply too weak** in the current context to effectively organize people, and **too vague** to provide any direction.

#### No prior questions

**Owen 02** David Owen, 2 Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognise that it can provide powerful accounts of certain kinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not **undermine** the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may **provide the best account available to us.** In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the **most important** kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology and epistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, **it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR.** Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous **grip on** the **action,** event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a **reductionist program’** in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the **preferred model** or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, **this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science** since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomena is a question for social-scientific inquiry, **not to be prejudged** before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of **generality over** that of **empirical validity.** The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and **prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right**, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially **vicious circle arises.**

#### The alternative is a goal - not a mechanism to create that goal – their repoliticization never moves beyond the seminar room

Jones 99 (Richard Wyn, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics – University of Wales, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, CIAO, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html)

Because emancipatory political practice is central to the claims of critical theory, one might expect that proponents of a critical approach to the study of international relations would be reflexive about the relationship between theory and practice. Yet their thinking on this issue thus far does not seem to have progressed much beyond **grandiose statements of intent**. There have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel. Robert Cox, for example, has described the task of critical theorists as providing “a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (R. Cox 1981: 130). Although he has also gone on to identify possible agents for change and has outlined the nature and structure of some feasible alternative orders, he has not explicitly indicated whom he regards as the addressee of critical theory (i.e., who is being guided) and thus how the theory can hope to become a part of the political process (see R. Cox 1981, 1983, 1996). Similarly, Andrew Linklater has argued that “a critical theory of international relations must regard the practical project of extending community beyond the nation–state as its most important problem” (Linklater 1990b: 171). However, he has little to say about the role of theory in the realization of this “practical project.” Indeed, his main point is to suggest that the role of critical theory “is not to offer instructions on how to act but to reveal the existence of unrealised possibilities” (Linklater 1990b: 172). But the question still remains, reveal to whom? Is the audience enlightened politicians? Particular social classes? Particular social movements? Or particular (and presumably particularized) communities? In light of Linklater’s primary concern with emancipation, one might expect more guidance as to whom he believes might do the emancipating and how critical theory can impinge upon the emancipatory process. There is, likewise, little enlightenment to be gleaned from Mark Hoffman’s otherwise important contribution. He argues that critical international theory seeks not simply to reproduce society via description, but to understand society and change it. It is both descriptive and constructive in its theoretical intent: it is both an intellectual and a social act. It is not merely an expression of the concrete realities of the historical situation, but also a force for change within those conditions. (M. Hoffman 1987: 233) Despite this very ambitious declaration, once again, Hoffman gives no suggestion as to how this “force for change” should be operationalized and what concrete role critical theorizing might play in changing society. Thus, although the critical international theorists’ critique of the role that more conventional approaches to the study of world politics play in reproducing the contemporary world order may be persuasive, their account of the relationship between their own work and emancipatory political practice is unconvincing. Given the centrality of practice to the claims of critical theory, this is a very significant weakness. Without some plausible account of the **mechanisms** by which they hope to aid in the achievement of their emancipatory goals, proponents of critical international theory are hardly in a position to justify the assertion that “it represents the next stage in the development of International Relations theory” (M. Hoffman 1987: 244). Indeed, without a more convincing conceptualization of the theory–practice nexus, one can argue that critical international theory, by its own terms, has no way of redeeming some of its central epistemological and methodological claims and thus that it is a **fatally flawed** enterprise.

### Lame Duck PTX Farm Bill

#### Doesn’t cite a single congressman, no risk of bill passage, this evidence is terrible – there’s no uniqueness

#### No reason congress dislikes SMRs ENOUGH to stop compromise on something they agree is important – make them prove the link

#### Congress loves SMR’s, even in budget-slashing mode

**Makhijani, 11** – President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (Arjun, 6/15. “The problems with small nuclear reactors.” The Hill. http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/166609-the-problems-with-small-nuclear-reactors)

Yet, the enthusiasts of small reactors are back, promoting "small modular reactors" (SMRs) which, they say, can solve the central economic problem of large reactors that each cost so much and take so long to build that it becomes a "bet the farm" risk. But this is hype and hope more than substance. Unfortunately, Congress and the administration are buying into it. Even in a budget-slashing environment, the U.S. Department of Energy has already requested $67 million in FY2012 to pay for part of the design certification and licensing for up to two designs. Sixteen bipartisan House members have sent a letter in support of this subsidy. Meanwhile, Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.), chair of the Senate Energy Committee, has introduced a bill to require the development of two SMR designs, as have Reps. Jason Altmire (D-Pa.) and Tim Murphy (R-Pa.).

#### Neither candidate will have enough PC to push anything – fiscal cliff proves

MarksJarvis 11/1

[Gail, Finance Columnist- Chicago Tribune, 11/1/12, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/yourmoney/ct-biz-1101-bf-gail--20121101,0,4460906.column>]

The main drama in a treacherous political and economic environment is expected to play out in late December and into 2013 as a running clock presses politicians into crucial, but unpopular, tax and government spending decisions. Some analysts think investors could be as unsettled by the scenes as they were in August 2011. That's when the Dow Jones industrial average plunged more than 500 points in a day amid congressional paralysis on extending the nation's debt ceiling and a punishing downgrade of the nation's debt rating by Standard & Poor's. With the stock market now near a five-year high, investors have "left no buffer for bad news," warns Morgan Stanley strategist Gregory Peters. "We see significant risk — as high as 1 in 3 — that the U.S. fiscal 'cliff' ends badly enough to cause economic contraction." The "fiscal cliff," named by Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, involves about $800 billion in tax increases and government spending cuts that will happen automatically at the end of 2012 if Congress can't compromise or doesn't vote to kick decisions into next year. Bernanke has warned that if the nation plunges over that cliff, Americans will be left with less spending money and the nation likely will go into a recession. While action isn't required until the end of December, analysts anticipate that the afterglow of the presidential election will quickly dissipate during the next two months as investors grow anxious about the December deadline and the potential outcome for the economy. "Continued gridlock is a risk," Chadha said. On the other hand, "bipartisan compromise with orderly negotiations would see equities rally." But current political polls indicate that neither candidate will win with a mandate. So analysts are not anticipating orderly negotiation on tax and spending cuts this year or next. "A close race or disputed result could reduce the political capital of the winner, diminishing prospects for a compromise solution for the fiscal cliff in the lame-duck session of Congress," said Citigroup global political analyst Tina Fordham. Even if one candidate earns a clear victory, there will be no mandate for that president-elect to take any particular action because before the election "no one addressed the core economic issues that face us," said Howard Simons, stock market strategist for Bianco Research. "They have only spoken in grand irrelevancies. We know we will have a different tax law, but no one put forth any concrete proposal." Fordham said the groundwork for a compromise will be especially fragile if the election is so close that it prompts legal challenges, such as the George W. Bush/Al Gore election of 2000. When Gore announced after that election that he would contest the results in Florida, the Dow fell 280 points during the day. Bush entered office with Democrats asserting that the president had no mandate, and Fordham argues that it wasn't until after the 9/11 terrorist attacks that Bush had the political strength to pass tax cuts. Some analysts expect what is being called a "bungee jump" off the fiscal cliff in December. In other words, current elected leaders will let the Dec. 31 deadline for actions on taxes and spending expire. As a result, American taxpayers will start 2013 with higher taxes, and consequently less spending money, as government defense cuts also take money out of the economy.

#### -- Billions won’t die – their data is wrong

Khosla 7 (Vinod, Founder – Sun Microsystems and Khosla Ventures, “Food versus Fuel” or the “Salve for Africa”?, <http://www.khoslaventures.com/presentations/FOODvFUEL.pdf>)

Stopping bad policy is a worthwhile goal, but we should not abandon all biofuels. There is no doubt that we can produce biofuels in the right or wrong way. However, at each step, we need to evaluate the costs of biofuels vs. the long-term costs of continuing with our current path. There exists vast tracts of underutilized pastureland worldwide and good energy crop practices can improve the sustainability of farming while meeting our energy needs. Lester Brown’s assertions that food supplies are likely to be threatened by corn ethanol (800M motorists vs. 2 billion poor people) is illogical and ill-thought out – the data is extrapolated from corn ethanol projections (without a basic understanding that cellulosic, and not corn ethanol, is the long term future) is flawed at best. To repeat what we have cited before: taking this “logic” to Brown’s idealistic vision of wind power – it would be akin to extrapolating to “if we produced all our electricity with wind 75% of the planet would be without electricity 75% of the time (or worse!)”. Irrational, fear-mongering extrapolation of data leads to irrational results.

#### -- Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### -- No shortages – food is abundant

Poole 6 (Holly Kavana, Institute for Food and Development Policy,“12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths)

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products

### SK Da

#### No leadership trade off – plan is about increasing domestic SMRs, Korean market can still exist – plan spurs global SMRs, only a risk of a link turn – korea can sell electricity to other countries not just the US

#### Their hodge card says that the Nuclear industry has ALREADY BOOSTED south koreas economy – means no decline

#### No escalation

**Kang 10 (**David, Professor of International Relations and Business and Director of the Korean Studies Institute –University of Southern California, “Korea’s New Cold War,” 12-31, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/koreas-new-cold-war-4653)

However, despite dueling artillery barrages and the sinking of a warship, pledges of “enormous retaliation,” in-your-face joint military exercises and urgent calls for talks, the risk of all-out war on the Korean peninsula is less than it has been at any time in the past four decades. North Korea didn’t blink, because it had no intention of actually starting a major war. Rather than signifying a new round of escalating tension between North and South Korea, the events of the past year point to something else—a new cold war between the two sides. In fact, one of my pet peeves is the analogies we use to describe the situation between South and North Korea. We often call the situation a “powder keg” or a “tinderbox,” implying a very unstable situation in which one small spark could lead to a huge explosion. But the evidence actually leads to the opposite conclusion: we have gone sixty years without a major war, despite numerous “sparks” such as the skirmishing and shows of force that occurred over the past month. If one believes the situation is a tinderbox, the only explanation for six decades without a major war is that we have been extraordinarily lucky. I prefer the opposite explanation: deterrence is quite stable because both sides know the costs of a major war, and both sides—rhetoric and muscle-flexing aside—keep smaller incidents in their proper perspective. How can this be, when North Korea threatens to use massive retaliation and mentions its nuclear weapons in its rhetoric, and when the South Korean leadership and military is determined to "respond relentlessly" to meet any North Korean provocation? Local skirmishing has stayed local for sixty years. The key issue is whether a local fight could escalate into all-out war, such as North Korea shelling Seoul with artillery or missiles. Such a decision would clearly have to be taken at the top of the North Korean leadership. Especially when tensions are high, both militaries are on high alert and local commanders particularly careful with their actions. Without a clear directive from the top, it is not likely that a commander one hundred kilometers away from the military exercises would make a decision on his own to start shooting at Seoul. For their part, North Korean leaders have not made such a decision in sixty years, knowing that any major attack on Seoul would cause a massive response from the South Korean and U.S. forces and would carry the war into Pyongyang and beyond. After the fighting, North Korea would cease to exist. Thus, while both North and South Korean leaders talk in grim tones about war, both sides have kept the actual fighting to localized areas, and I have seen no indication that this time the North Korean leadership plans to expand the fighting into a general war.

#### Low chance of war now

**Luo 10** (Yuan, Deputy Secretary General – Society of China Military Sciences, “All-out war unlikely on the Korean Peninsula,” Global Times, 12-23, http://opinion.globaltimes.cn/commentary/2010-12/603684.html)

PO: Is there any possibility of a war between the two sides if the situation continues to deteriorate? What measures would China adopt?

Luo: I suppose local clashes and conflicts are most likely to happen, yet the chance of an all-out war is remote. Neither side is showing a will for war. South Korea's backer, the US, would forbid South Korea to begin a war. The US cannot afford another war when it is still bogged down in Afghanistan and Iraq. China is going to actively mediate between the two sides to settle them down by using its international influence to encourage a restrained and peaceful way to settle the dispute.

[Continues]

PO: Could you predict the upcoming situation on the Korean Peninsula?

Luo: Conflicts will often occur, but there's little possibility of war. They'll fight for an advantageous position in negotiations, yet finally return to the negotiation table.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Tir 10 [Jaroslav Tir - Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and is an Associate Professor in the Department of International Affairs at the University of Georgia, “Territorial Diversion: Diversionary Theory of War and Territorial Conflict”, The Journal of Politics, 2010, Volume 72: 413-425), Ofir]

Empirical support for the economic growth rate is much weaker. The finding that poor economic performance is associated with a higher likelihood of territorial conflict initiation is significant only in Models 3–4.14 The weak results are not altogether surprising given the findings from prior literature. In accordance with the insignificant relationships of Models 1–2 and 5–6, Ostrom and Job (1986), for example, note that the likelihood that a U.S. President will use force is uncertain, as the bad economy might create incentives both to divert the public’s attention with a foreign adventure and to focus on solving the economic problem, thus reducing the inclination to act abroad. Similarly, Fordham (1998a, 1998b), DeRouen (1995), and Gowa (1998) find no relation between a poor economy and U.S. use of force. Furthermore, Leeds and Davis (1997) conclude that the conflict-initiating behavior of 18 industrialized democracies is unrelated to economic conditions as do Pickering and Kisangani (2005) and Russett and Oneal (2001) in global studies. In contrast and more in line with my findings of a significant relationship (in Models 3–4), Hess and Orphanides (1995), for example, argue that economic recessions are linked with forceful action by an incumbent U.S. president. Furthermore, Fordham’s (2002) revision of Gowa’s (1998) analysis shows some effect of a bad economy and DeRouen and Peake (2002) report that U.S. use of force diverts the public’s attention from a poor economy. Among cross-national studies, Oneal and Russett (1997) report that slow growth increases the incidence of militarized disputes, as does Russett (1990)—but only for the United States; slow growth does not affect the behavior of other countries. Kisangani and Pickering (2007) report some significant associations, but they are sensitive to model specification, while Tir and Jasinski (2008) find a clearer link between economic underperformance and increased attacks on domestic ethnic minorities. While none of these works has focused on territorial diversions, my own inconsistent findings for economic growth fit well with the mixed results reported in the literature.15 Hypothesis 1 thus receives strong support via the unpopularity variable but only weak support via the economic growth variable. These results suggest that embattled leaders are much more likely to respond with territorial diversions to direct signs of their unpopularity (e.g., strikes, protests, riots) than to general background conditions such as economic malaise. Presumably, protesters can be distracted via territorial diversions while fixing the economy would take a more concerted and prolonged policy effort. Bad economic conditions seem to motivate only the most serious, fatal territorial confrontations. This implies that leaders may be reserving the most high-profile and risky diversions for the times when they are the most desperate, that is when their power is threatened both by signs of discontent with their rule and by more systemic problems plaguing the country (i.e., an underperforming economy).

## Add Ons