## GW

#### 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.

## Prolif

#### 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.

## S

#### Innovation’s not key - Sound designs exist

**Gallagher, 11** – Associate Director for Research at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM) and a Senior Research Scholar at the University of Maryland’s School of Public Policy (Nancy, “INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ON THE ROAD TO NUCLEAR ZERO.” The Nonproliferation Review, Vol. 18, No. 2, p. 442.)

Current efforts to develop small modular reactors could be redirected to prioritize the most proliferation-resistant designs, even if they are not the designs that are closest to becoming commercially available. Technically sound designs exist for small reactors with sealed cores that would not require refueling for multiple decades. Regional fuel cycle centers could produce these lightweight, passively safe reactors; transport them by rail, road, or barge to the desired location; then return them to the regional center for spent fuel management. Implementing this hub-and-spoke arrangement on a large enough scale to help avert catastrophic climate change would require both nuclear disarmament and subordination of national and commercial advanced fuel cycle operations to international control. That is hard to envision under current conditions, but it is even harder to figure out how to simultaneously avert global warming and prevent proliferation in a less radical way.

#### Building new plants is vital to expanding the nuclear workforce

Howard, 7 – Vice President Office of the President Nuclear Energy Institute (Angie, 2/5. “Achieving Excellence in Human Performance: Nuclear Energy Training and Education.” <http://www.nei.org/newsandevents/speechesandtestimony/2007/americannuclearsocietyextended>)

And, finally, Number Four—New Plant Pressures on Current Workforce. Yes, new plant activities are putting additional pressure on scarce utility human resources in areas like operations training, licensing and engineering, not to mention the project management and construction skills that will be needed. But, utility announcements of plans to build new plants and the resulting media coverage are raising the interest level of young people in careers in our industry. This new plant activity has also resulted in new job creation at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And vendors are aggressively hiring in nuclear-related disciplines. What young people are hearing is that, right now, 14 companies or consortia have publicly announced plans to apply for licenses for up to 33 new nuclear reactors. The first applications for a license to construct and operate a new nuclear plant will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission later this year.

## Off Case

### 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.

#### Their solvency advocate supports it

#### --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.

### Heidegger 2AC

#### -- Perm do both – Alt alone fails – ‘letting be’ and waiting for metaphysical transformation dooms us to extinction

**Santoni 85** (Ronald E., Professor of Philosophy – Denison, Nuclear War, Ed. Fox and Groarke, p. 156-157)

To be sure, Fox sees the need for our undergoing “certain fundamental changes” in our “thinking, beliefs, attitudes, values” and Zimmerman calls for a “paradigm shift” in our thinking about ourselves, other, and the Earth. But it is not clear that what either offers as suggestions for what we can, must, or should do in the face of a runaway arms race are sufficient to “wind down” the arms race before it leads to **omnicide**. In spite of the importance of Fox’s analysis and reminders it is not clear that “admitting our (nuclear) fear and anxiety” to ourselves and “identifying the mechanisms that dull or mask our emotional and other responses” represent much more than examples of basic, often. stated principles of psychotherapy. Being aware of the psychological maneuvers that keep us numb to nuclear reality may well be the road to transcending them but it must only be a “first step” (as Fox acknowledges), during which we **simultaneously act** to eliminate nuclear threats, break our complicity with the arms race, get rid of arsenals of genocidal weaponry, and create conditions for international goodwill, mutual trust, and creative interdependence. Similarly, in respect to Zimmerman: in spite of the challenging Heideggerian insights he brings out regarding what motivates the arms race, many questions may be raised about his prescribed “solutions.” Given our need for a paradigm shift in our (distorted) understanding of ourselves and the rest of being, are we merely left “to prepare for a possible shift in our self-understanding? (italics mine)? Is this all we can do? Is it necessarily the case that such a shift “cannot come as a result of our own will?” – and work – but only from “a destiny outside our control?” Does this mean we leave to God the matter of bringing about a paradigm shift? Granted our fears and the importance of not being controlled by fears, as well as our “anthropocentric leanings,” should we be as cautious as Zimmerman suggests about our disposition “to want to do something” or “to act decisively in the face of the current threat?” In spite of the importance of our taking on the anxiety of our finitude and our present limitation, does it follow that “we should be willing for the worst (i.e. an all-out nuclear war) to occur”? Zimmerman wrongly, I contend, equates “resistance” with “denial” when he says that “as long as we resist and deny the possibility of nuclear war, that possibility will persist and grow stronger.” He also wrongly perceives “resistance” as presupposing a clinging to the “order of things that now prevails.” Resistance connotes opposing, and striving to defeat a prevailing state of affairs that would allow or encourage the “worst to occur.” I submit, against Zimmerman, that we should not, in any sense, be willing for nuclear war or omnicide to occur. (This is not to suggest that we should be numb to the possibility of its occurrence.) Despite Zimmerman’s elaborations and refinements his Heideggerian notion of “letting beings be” continues to be **too permissive** in this regard. In my judgment, an individual’s decision not to act against and resist his or her government’s preparations for nuclear holocaust is, as I have argued elsewhere, to be **an early accomplice to** the most horrendous crime against life imaginable – its **annihilation**.

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

#### -- No extinction – tech and calculation have existed forever – and the world is getting better

#### -- Extinction outweighs – pre-requisite to Being

**Zimmerman 93** (Michael E., Professor of Philosophy – University of Tulane, Contesting Earth’s Future: Radical Ecology and Postmodernity, p. 119-120)

Heidegger asserted that human self assertion, combined with the eclipse of being, threatens the relation between being and human Dasein. Loss of this relation would be even more dangerous than a nuclear war that might “bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth.” This controversial claim is comparable to the Christian teaching that it is better to forfeit the world than to lose one’s soul by losing ones relation to God. Heidegger apparently thought along these lines: it is possible that after a nuclear war, life might once again emerge, but it is far less likely that there will ever again occur in an ontological clearing through which life could manifest itself. Further, since modernity’s one dimensional disclosure to entities virtually denies that any “being” at all, the loss of humanity’s openness for being is already occurring. Modernity’s background mood is horror in the face of nihilism, which is consistent with the aim of providing material happiness for everyone by reducing nature into pure energy. The unleashing of vast quantities of energy in a nuclear war would be equivalent to modernity’s slow destruction of nature: unbounded destruction would equal limitless consumption. If humanity avoided a nuclear war only to survive as contended clever animals, Heidegger believed we would exist in a state of ontological damnation: hell on earth, masquerading as material paradise. Deep ecologists might agree that a world of material human comfort purchased at the price of everything wild would not be a world worth living in, for in killing wild nature, people would be as good as dead. **But most** of them **could not agree that the loss of humanity’s relation to being would be worse than nuclear omnicide**, for it is wrong to suppose that the lives of millions of extinct and unknown species are somehow lessened because they were never “disclosed” by humanity.

#### -- 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.

#### Management solves extinction—letting nature “be” cements existing destruction – only nuke power can solve warming

**Soulé 95** – Natural Resources Professor, California (Michael and Gary Lease, Reinventing Nature?, p 159-60, AG)

The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, **the idea that nature is** self-regulating and **capable of caring for itself**. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect—nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, **a century ago**, a hands-off policy **was the best policy. Now it is not. Given nature's** **current** fragmented and **stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating** spiral of **deterioration**. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change.' For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even **fifty years ago**, neglect might have been the best medicine, but **that was a world** with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world **largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species**. The alternative to neglect is active caring—in today's parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. **Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, management is the** only viable alternative **to massive attrition of living nature**.

#### -- Valuing nature as standing reserve of natural resources for human benefit is essential to the survival of all species

**Younkins 4** (Professor of Business Administration, Wheeling Jesuit (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, Quebecois Libre 147, http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm, gender modified, AG)

Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. **Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer**. These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. **People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently** of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. **All resources are [hu]man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, [humans]** men **affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress**. Mankind’s **survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things**, even man himself. **Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe**. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. **Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value**. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. **The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature**. Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. **Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, [humans]** men **sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them**. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, **only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation**. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This **antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.**

#### Alt doesn’t solve the case –

1. doesn’t build nuclear reactors – it rejects tech
2. changing relations to nature doesn’t change temp
3. there’s no spillover between demand we reject tech and people doing it

#### -- Case turns the K – nuclear tech is inevitable – other countries view nature as a standing reserve – plan sends a global signal to other countries to use environment-friendly tech.

#### Plan solves meltdowns from squo reactors

**Wheeler 10** – Workforce Planning Manager with Entergy; Producer “This Week in Nuclear” Podcast (John, 11/21 “Small Modular Reactors May Offer Significant Safety & Security Enhancements.” http://thisweekinnuclear.com/?p=1193)

They are smaller, so the amount of radioactivity contained in each reactor is less. So much less in fact, that even if the worst case reactor accident occurs, the amount of radioactive material released would not pose a risk to the public. In nuclear lingo we say SMRs have a smaller “source term.”  This source term is so small we can design the plant and emergency systems to virtually eliminate the need for emergency actions beyond the physical site boundaries.  Then, by controlling access to the site boundary, we can eliminate the need for off-site protective actions (like sheltering or evacuations). These smaller reactors contain less nuclear fuel.  This smaller amount of fuel (with passive cooling I’ll mention in a minute) slows down the progression of reactor accidents.  This slower progression gives operators more time to take action to keep the reactor cool.  Where operators in large reactors have minutes or hours to react to events, operators of SMRs may have hours or even days. This means the chance of a reactor damaging accident is very, very remote. Even better, most SMRs are small enough that they cannot over heat and melt down. They get all the cooling they need from air circulating around the reactor. This is a big deal because if SMRs can’t melt down, then they can’t release radioactive gas that would pose a risk to the public.  Again, this means the need for external emergency actions is virtually eliminated. Also, some SMRs are not water cooled; they use gas, liquid salt, or liquid metal coolants that operate at low pressures.  This lower operating pressure means that if radioactive gases build up inside the containment building there is less pressure to push the gas out and into the air.  If there is no pressure to push radioactive gas into the environment and all of it stays inside the plant, then it poses no risk to the public. SMRs are small enough to be built underground. This means they will have a smaller physical footprint that will be easier to defend against physical attacks.  This provides additional benefits of lower construction costs because earth, concrete and steel are less costly than elaborate security systems in use today, and lower operating costs (a smaller footprint means a smaller security force).

#### Meltdowns cause extinction

Lendman 11 – Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (Stephe, 3/13. “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan” The People’s Voice <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan>)

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe.Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event.

#### 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. § Marked 09:07 § 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.

### Obama Good/Russia Relations 2ac

#### Romney will win –

#### the MOST ACCURATE prediction models prove, Silver is wrong

Merkel 10/31/12 (Jesse, Political columnist @ Rochester Examiner, "Presidential Polls 2012: Gallup Puts Romney Ahead Nationally, in Swing States, and With Early Voters," http://www.policymic.com/articles/17752/presidential-polls-2012-gallup-puts-romney-ahead-nationally-in-swing-states-and-with-early-voters)

Several big predictors are forecasting a Romney victory. The bipartisan Battleground Poll has recently released its “vote election model” is predicting that Romney will defeat Obama, 52% to 45%.¶ The Yale University Economic Model also is now giving the election to Romney. This model, put together by economist Ray Fair has accurately predicted every election except two since 1916. Those two were JFK’s victory in 1960 and Bill Clinton’s victory in 1992. And there's still the University of Colorado election predictor model, which has called every race accurately since 1980. This model still shows a victory of 330 electoral votes for Governor Romney, as well as a popular vote victory.¶ Despite the pendulum-like Gallup approval index, and despite New York Times pollster Nate Silver's now widely-panned and ridiculed optimism, Obama's not in safe territory. With one week to go, it's now blatantly apparent that Mitt Romney could very well be elected the 45th president on November 6. Like everything else, it's all in the math. As former Clinton operative Dick Morris breaks it down, electorally, it's very likely that Romney makes it to 270.

#### Incentives now – just not enough to solve

Kramer 12 [David Kramer, Physics Today, Sept 2012, Romney, Obama surrogates spell out candidates’ energy policies, www.physicstoday.org/resource/1/phtoad/v65/i9/p20\_s1]

Both candidates favor growth in nuclear energy, and both support loan guarantees to back the initial deployment of advanced reactors. Stuntz said Romney would take steps to lower the cost of building new plants, “whether that means modular reactors that can be approved and rolled out in more cookie-cutter fashion . . . or whether that means smaller reactors.” The Obama administration’s support for nuclear power is evident from the $7 billion loan guarantee from DOE to back construction of two new reactors at an existing nuclear power plant in Georgia, Reicher noted. “**There’s serious money going into small modular reactors** and serious policy work going on in how to reform the licensing process” at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expedite approval.

#### Overwhelming public support for nuclear energy - multiple polls

WNA 12(WNA is the World Nuclear Association. “US Nuclear Power Policy.” August, 2012. http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41\_US\_nuclear\_power\_policy.html)

**Public opinion regarding nuclear power has generally been fairly positive, and has grown more so as people have had to think about security of energy supplies. Different polls show** continuing increase **in public opinion favorable to nuclear power in the USA. More than three times as many strongly support nuclear energy than strongly oppose it**. Two-thirds of self-described environmentalists favor it. A May 2008 survey (N=2925) by Zogby International showed 67% of Americans favored building new nuclear power plants, with 46% registering strong support; 23% were opposed[10](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). Asked which kind of power plant they would prefer if it were sited in their community, 43% said nuclear, 26% gas, 8% coal. Men (60%) were more than twice as likely as women (28%) to be supportive of a nuclear power plant. A March 2010 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed that strong public support for nuclear energy was being sustained, with 74% in favor of it[11](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). In particular, **87% think nuclear will be important in meeting electricity needs in the years ahead, 87% support license renewal for nuclear plants, 84% believe utilities should prepare to build more nuclear plants,** 72% supported an active federal role in encouraging investment **in "energy technology that reduces greenhouse gases", 82% agree that US nuclear plants are safe and secure, 77% would support adding a new reactor at the nearest nuclear plant, and 70% say that USA should definitely build more plants in the future.** Only 10% of people said they strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy. In relation to recycling used nuclear fuel, 79% supported this (contra past US policy), and the figure rose to 85% if "a panel of independent experts" recommended it. Although 59% were confident that used reactor fuel could be stored safely at nuclear power plant sites, 81% expressed a strong desire for the federal government to move used nuclear fuel to centralized, secure storage facilities away from the plant sites until a permanent disposal facility is ready. Half of those surveyed considered themselves to be environmentalists. A February 2011 Bisconti-GfK Roper survey showed similar figures, and that 89% of Americans agree that all low-carbon energy sources – including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy – should be taken advantage of to generate electricity while limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Just 10% disagreed. Also some **84% of respondents said that they associate nuclear energy "a lot" or "a little" with reliable electricity;** 79% associate nuclear energy with affordable electricity; 79% associate nuclear energy with economic growth and job creation; and 77% associate nuclear energy and clean air. A more general March 2010 Gallup poll (N=1014) on energy showed 62% in favor of using nuclear power, including 28% strongly so, and 33% against, the most favorable figures since Gallup began polling the question in 1994. However, only 51% of Democrat voters were in favor[12](http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf41_US_nuclear_power_policy.html#References). An early March 2011 Gallup poll just before the Fukushima accident showed 57% in favor and 38% against, and in March 2012 (N=1024) still 57% in favor with 40% against (men: 72%-27%, women 42%-51%). **Regarding plant safety, the polls showed consistent 56-58% positive views over 2009-12, but men-women split similar. A survey conducted in September 2011** by Bisconti Research Inc. with GfK Roper **showed that although support for nuclear power decreased following the Fukushima accident** and compared with a year earlier (a survey carried out in March 2010 by Bisconti Research found 74% of Americans favored nuclear power), **62%** of the 1000 **adults** surveyed in the latest poll **were supportive of utilizing nuclear power** while 35% expressed opposition. The survey found that **82% of Americans believed that lessons had been learned from** Fukushima and 67% of respondents considered US nuclear power plants safe (the same level as reported one month before the nuclear accident in Japan occurred). Also **85% of said that an extension of commercial operation should be granted to those plants that comply with federal safety standards**, and 59% believed more nuclear power plants should definitely be built in the future, while 75% contend that “Electric utilities should prepare now so that new nuclear power plants could be built if needed in the next decade.” Finally, further expansion of the site of the nearest already operating nuclear power plant is supported by 67% and opposed by 28%. By February 2012 support had increased slightly to 64% supported using nuclear power, while 33% opposed it. Some 81% of respondents believed that nuclear energy will be important in meeting the USA's future electricity needs (compared with 80% in September), and 82% thought the USA should "take advantage of all low-carbon energy sources, including nuclear, hydro and renewable energy." Significantly, 74% believed that nuclear power plants operating in the USA are safe, up from 67% in both 2011 surveys. However, a Harris survey in February 2012 (N=2056) showed that only 40% of US adults believed that the benefits of nuclear outweigh its risks, while 41% thought the reverse. A similar poll conducted in 2011 before the Fukushima accident occurred, indicated that 42% thought that the benefits outweighed the risks, while 37% believed the opposite. In a 2009 poll, 44% thought the benefits outweighed the benefits, while 34% thought they did not. The southern states had the highest percentage of people believing the benefits outweigh the risks (at 43%), compared with 33% in the East and 41% in the Midwest and West. Some 42% of Americans thought that the benefits of using coal outweighed the risks (up from 38% positive in 2011), while 40% said the risks outweighed the benefits.

#### Romney will maintain a working relationship with Russia.

Business Insider, 9/1/**2012** (Romney Could Screw Up US Relations With Russia, p. <http://www.businessinsider.com/mitt-romneys-foreign-policy-chops-come-into-light-2012-9>)

At the same time, the potential impact of a Romney presidency should not be exaggerated. Mr Romney is not an ideological politician, and he will have solid reasons to maintain a working relationship with Russia. These include reliance on Russian transit corridors to support US forces in Afghanistan to 2015 and beyond, Russia's veto in the UN Security Council, and its potential to act as interlocutor between the US and rogue states. Finally, there is a significant element of uncertainty that stems from the lack of clarity about what Mr Romney, who has often changed his position, actually stands for. In particular, the extent of the influence on him of several competing Republican foreign policy schools (neo-conservativism, populist isolationism, realism, liberal internationalism) is unclear.

#### No link – plan doesn’t happen till after the election

Lightman and Douglas 9/21 (David and William, “Unproductive Congress breaks until after November election”, 2012, <http://www.adn.com/2012/09/20/2633147/unproductive-congress-breaks-until.html>\_

Lawmakers spent Thursday pointing fingers and charging opponents with cynical political posturing. Among Congress' last decisions was a characteristic 2012 judgment: Punt action until later. It will let the farm bill, a broad measure that sets the nation's agriculture and food and nutrition assistance policies, expire Sept. 30. Congress also exits without any serious effort to edge away from the "fiscal cliff," the prospect of economy-damaging budget chaos if it doesn't act by year's end. Bush-era tax cuts are due to expire, and automatic spending cuts will take effect unless alternatives are passed. The public is noticing, as the legislative failures stir uncertainty and further roil an already-weak economy. This Congress' approval ratings were stuck at 13 percent in a Gallup survey Sept. 6-9, the lowest the pollster has ever logged this late in an election year since such measurements began in 1974. Yet **lawmakers are slinking out of town**, after a September session that was on and off for less than two weeks, following a summer recess that ran from Aug. 3 to Sept. 10. Congress is expected to return Nov. 13.

#### Bad weather on election day thumps the DA – will hurt Dem turnout and Obama

The Week 11/2/12 ("Will Hurricane Sandy suppress voter turnout and tip the election?," http://theweek.com/article/index/235732/will-hurricane-sandy-suppress-voter-turnout-and-tip-the-election)

There are plenty, but perhaps the biggest is the weather. Government storm forecasters are warning of a less-powerful but still wet and windy nor'easter hitting the East Coast on Election Day. Actually, there's rain forecast "in all the worst places for Democratic turnout" on Nov. 6, says W. E. Messamore at the Independent Voter Network, including the bluest parts of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Florida, as well as all of Michigan. Add that to the other effects of Sandy, and it's a real "blow to Democratic candidates, including President Obama." There will be problems at the polls, but "I think this storm is much more of a warning than an actual problem," Ohio State University law professor Steven Huefner tells BuzzFeed. To get a sense of how much worse it could be, "I'd like to invite people to think about what would be happening if the storm had arrived eight days later than it had."

### 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.

#### Timeframe means only nuclear can solve

**McCarthy, 4** – Environment Editor of 'The Independent' (Michael, 5/23. “Lovelock: 'Only nuclear power can now halt global warming'.” <http://www.energybulletin.net/node/320>)

Global warming is now advancing so swiftly that only a massive expansion of nuclear power as the world's main energy source can prevent it overwhelming civilisation, the scientist and celebrated Green guru, James Lovelock, says. His call will cause huge disquiet for the environmental movement. It has long considered the 84-year-old radical thinker among its greatest heroes, and sees climate change as the most important issue facing the world, but it has always regarded opposition to nuclear power as an article of faith. Last night the leaders of both Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth rejected his call. Professor Lovelock, who achieved international fame as the author of the Gaia hypothesis, the theory that the Earth keeps itself fit for life by the actions of living things themselves, was among the first researchers to sound the alarm about the threat from the greenhouse effect. He was in a select group of scientists who gave an initial briefing on climate change to Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Cabinet at 10 Downing Street in April 1989. He now believes recent climatic events have shown the warming of the atmosphere is proceeding even more rapidly than the scientists of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) thought it would, in their last report in 2001. On that basis, he says, there is simply not enough time for renewable energy, such as wind, wave and solar power - the favoured solution of the Green movement - to take the place of the coal, gas and oil-fired power stations whose waste gas, carbon dioxide (CO2), is causing the atmosphere to warm. He believes only a massive expansion of nuclear power, which produces almost no CO2, can now check a runaway warming which would raise sea levels disastrously around the world, cause climatic turbulence and make agriculture unviable over large areas. He says fears about the safety of nuclear energy are irrational and exaggerated, and urges the Green movement to drop its opposition. In today's Independent, Professor Lovelock says he is concerned by two climatic events in particular: the melting of the Greenland ice sheet, which will raise global sea levels significantly, and the episode of extreme heat in western central Europe last August, accepted by many scientists as unprecedented and a direct result of global warming.

#### SMR’s are key to desalination – solves water wars

Solan et al 10 – Assistant Professor of Public Policy & Administration and Director of the Energy Policy Institute at Boise State University (David, June. “Economic and Employment Impacts of Small Modular Nuclear Reactors.” Energy Policy Institute, Center for Advanced Energy Studies. http://epi.boisestate.edu/media/3494/economic%20and%20employment%20impacts%20of%20smrs.pdf)

Besides electricity generation, additional applications may be well-suited for SMR systems in the future. While the applicability of nuclear energy to additional applications is not dependent on facility size, the actual use of large nuclear facilities does not occur due to economic considerations. Currently, only a few countries utilize nuclear energy for non-generation purposes, primarily desalination and district heating (IAEA, 2008). A brief overview of the application possibilities for SMRs is provided below. Desalination.&&The IAEA has identified desalination as possibly the leading non-electric civilian use for nuclear energy. Water scarcity is becoming an increasingly problematic global issue in both developed and developing countries. As noted in an IAEA (2007) report, Because of population growth, surface water resources are increasingly stressed in many parts of the world, developed and developing regions alike. Water stress is counter to sustainable development; it engenders disease; diverts natural flows, endangering flora and fauna of rivers, lakes wetlands, deltas and oceans; and it incites regional conflicts over water rights. In the developing world, more than one billion people currently lack access to safe drinking water; nearly two and a half billion lack access to adequate sanitation services. This would only get worse as populations grow. Water stress is severe in the developed world as well…In light of these trends, many opportunities in both developed and developing countries are foreseen for supply of potable water generated using nuclear process heat or off-peak electricity (p. 23).

#### Nuclear War

Weiner 90 (Jonathan, Pulitzer Prize winning author, “The Next One Hundred Years”, p. 270)

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the Change Bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from North Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.