### 2AC: T – Production

#### We meet – the plan results in increased uranium extraction in order to enrich in SMR facilities

#### CI – Energy production means generation of power

IILS 11 (International Institute for Labour Studies, “Toward a Green Economy: The Social Dimensions,” <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inst/research/ecinst/greensyn.pdf>)

More accurate would be the term “generation of power”, since energy cannot be “produced”. For simplicity, we use the term “production of energy” throughout the report

#### “Production” of nuclear power includes heat content of steam of a nuclear reactor

Eurostat 5 (Statistical Office of the European Communities, “Energy Statistics Manual,” International Energy Agency, <http://www.iea.org/stats/docs/statistics_manual.pdf>)

Primary electricity and heat Setting a figure for the production of primary electricity and heat is closely related to the definition of these two forms of energy in the different conditions of their exploitation. In general, the statistical production point is chosen to be a suitable measurement point as far “downstream” as possible from the capture of the energy flow before the energy flow is used. For example, for hydroelectricity, this will be the electricity generated at the alternators driven by the water turbines. For nuclear reactors, it will be the heat content of the steam leaving the reactor; there are a few cases where some steam is taken from reactors and used for district heating purposes as well as electricity generation. Where this does not occur, the steam input to the turbine may be used.

#### Reasons to prefer –

#### A. Aff ground – only nat gas would be topical as all other energy forms require some infrastructure development and R&D that converts the energy source.

#### B. Education – the only nuke power affs are those that increase enrichment plants and require some R&D to be done, their interpretation eliminates 1/6th of the topic, which is the largest sixth which destroys topic education

#### Reasonability – good is good enough. Competing interpretation causes a race to the bottom, and forces bad debates.

### 2AC – Cap

#### Condo is a voter- results in argument irresponsibility, time and strat skews- no cost options in the 1nc make the 2ac impossible and kills in round education – 1 conditional advocacies solve your offense. Independently contradictory advocacies are a voting issue, they read an econ impact on the politics disad. We can’t read an addon to solve the economy because it links to cap and we can’t say growth good because that helps them

#### Capitalism is inevitable – their alternative caricaturizes the left and cedes the political sphere to the right.

**Wilson 1** [John K. Wilson, best-selling progressive author and coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 200. How the Left Can Win Arguments and Influence People: A Tactical Manual for Pragmatic Progressives, Published by NYU Press, ISBN 0814793630, p. 15-16]

Capitalism is far too ingrained in American life to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories or even more social welfare programs; they're hoping, usually in vain, for a fair chance to share in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism—they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town—the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up, make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an [end page 15] ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective activists for change are instead channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the *Socialist Worker* to an uninterested public.

#### No profit motive for the plan, their ICC evidence is about German and British projectsfor nuclear power that were guises for nuclear weapons NOT about the plan

#### Cap’s not the root cause

**Aberdeen, 03** (Richard, “THE WAY: A Theory of Root Cause and Solution”, http://richardaberdeen.com/essays/Etheway.html)

A view shared by many modern activists is that capitalism, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to change or eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a rather unfortunate and historically myopic view, reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon resorted to violence as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, modern anarchists who resort to violence to solve the problem are walking upside down and backwards, adding to rather than correcting, both the immediate and long-term Human Rights problem.  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors.  These business enterprises are deliberately structured to be empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation.  More than just investor greed, corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved, including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one examines “the course of human events” closely, it can correctly be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and similar negative individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective (see Gallo Brothers for more details).  So-called “classes” of people, unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism, free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this.

#### 5. Perm do both

#### 6. Total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance – the alternative never solves

J.K. **Gibson-Graham 96**, Katherine Gibson and Julie Graham, Feminist Economic Geographers at the Australian National University in Canberra and University of Massachusetts Amherst, Authors of A Postcapitalist Class and Class and Its Others, 1996

[“End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0-8166-4805-0]

**One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,”** Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force**. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against.** When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement **(or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist).** The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. **The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination. The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see.** If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces**. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.**

#### Perm do the plan and reject all other instances of capitalism

#### 7. Transitioning away from capitalism would collapse civilization and kill billions.

 **Rockwell 8** [Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., President of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2008 [“Everything You Love You Owe to Capitalism,” Ludwig von Mises Institute, May 18th, Available Online at http://mises.org/story/2982, Accessed 10-04-2008 ]

Whatever the specifics of the case in question, socialism always means overriding the free decisions of individuals and replacing that capacity for decision making with an overarching plan by the state. Taken far enough, this mode of thought won't just spell an end to opulent lunches. It will mean the end of what we all know as civilization itself. It would plunge us back to a primitive state of existence, living off hunting and gathering in a world with little art, music, leisure, or charity. Nor is any form of socialism capable of providing for the needs of the world's six billion people, so the population would shrink dramatically and quickly and in a manner that would make every human horror ever known seem mild by comparison. Nor is it possible to divorce socialism from totalitarianism, because if you are serious about ending private ownership of the means of production, you have to be serious about ending freedom and creativity too. You will have to make the whole of society, or what is left of it, into a prison. In short, the wish for socialism is a wish for unparalleled human evil. If we really understood this, no one would express casual support for it in polite company. It would be like saying, you know, there is really something to be said for malaria and typhoid and dropping atom bombs on millions of innocents.

#### SMR’s are key to successful 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).

#### Extinction

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.

#### 8. Capitalism best ensures value to life

**Tracinski 8** Robert, editor of the Intellectual Activist, The Moral and the Practical,http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity

#### 9. Capitalism promotes peace and solves global war

Bernstein 2 **(Andrew, Senior Writer for the Ayn Rand Institute and Ph.D. in Philosophy, “The Nobel Peace Prize Should Go to Those Who Really Support Peace”, October 11, http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5453)**

If one admires men who cause war, one will ignore or vilify men who promote peace. Those who respect and support individual rights and political/economic freedom are the only true lovers of peace. Private capitalists and businessmen are outstanding examples. Business requires the barring of the initiation of force. Businessmen deal with one another peacefully, by means of trade, persuasion and voluntary contracts and agreements. Because businessmen respect the rights of all individuals, they have helped liberate the best minds to innovate, invent and advance, and thereby helped produce great general prosperity and peace. By helping to spread free trade across the globe, they have created peaceful relations among the individuals of many nations. Yet perversely, capitalists are denounced as exploiters of man. If we sincerely seek to attain the inestimable value that is world peace, it is individual rights and therefore capitalism that we must endorse. Capitalism is the only political-economic system that protects individual rights by banning the initiation of force. As Ayn Rand observed, it was capitalism that gave mankind its longest period of peace--an era in which there were no wars involving the entire civilized world--from the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 to the outbreak of World War I in 1914. If we truly want to recognize and promote the cause of peace, let us award a peace prize to Capitalism

#### US-lead development of nuclear power solves poverty – clean, affordable energy is key

**Robinson and Orient 4** - Professor of Chemistry and Founder of Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine AND \*\* executive director of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (Arthur and Jane, 6/14. The New American, “Science, Politics and Death.” <http://www.thenewamerican.com/node/358>)

Easily usable energy is the currency of human progress. Without it, stagnation, regression and untold human deaths will result. The lamentations of the popular press notwithstanding, there is no shortage of energy. Scientists define everything that man can perceive in the natural world as forms of "energy," including all physical objects. These forms of energy differ, however, in how easily mankind can make use of them by means of current technology. Nuclear power plants convert mass into electrical energy. This converted "nuclear energy" is, by far, the safest, cleanest and least expensive energy source available with current technology. Its use improves the standard of living, increases the quality and length of human life, and maximizes technological progress. The United States was once the world leader in the production of useful energy. Had that American leadership continued, our country and our world would be very different. Technological miracles that are only dreams today would have already taken place. Moreover, very large portions of the world's poor and underdeveloped people would have been able to lift themselves from poverty - provided they had a laboratory of liberty in which to do so - and to escape the horrible conditions in which they lead lives of desperation, constantly at the edge of death. Many people strongly desire to help humanity. They spend their lives in efforts to increase the quantity and quality of human life. Most other people, even though they do not work actively toward these goals, share the same values. They passively support things that improve human life. Those who understand energy production and its link to technological progress and who have positive humanitarian values support nuclear power. They are also in favor of hydrocarbon power derived from coal, oil and natural gas, and of hydroelectric power. Their interest in solar power, biofuel power, wind power and other alternatives is less because those methods cannot yet generate large quantities of inexpensive useful energy.

#### Ongoing poverty outweighs nuclear war and genocide—only our impact evidence is comparative

Spina 00 (Stephanie Urso, Ph.D. candidate in social/personality psychology at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, Smoke and Mirrors: The Hidden Context of Violence in Schools and Society, p. 201)

This sad fact is not limited to the United States. Globally, 18 million deaths a year are caused by structural violence, compared to 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. That is, **approximately every five years, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths**, and **every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period**. This is, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war or genocide**, perpetuated on the weak and the poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. (See James Gilligan, Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic, New York: Vintage Books, 1997, 196).

#### The alt causes global conflict -~-- we cannot turn of capitalism.

**Barnhizer 6** [David Barnhizer – Professor of Law at Cleveland State University, ‘Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream”,’ Georgetown International Environmental Law Review Summer 2006, Chetan]

The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. n60 The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior.

#### Collapse of capitalism only strengthens growth mindset – empirics

**Mead 9** (Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Walter Russell, The New Republic, “Only Makes You Stronger: Why the Recession Bolstered America”)

But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks b**ase**d in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars

### 2AC – CP

#### Doesn’t solve the aff –

#### Heg –obviously doesn’t solve the grid because you don’t have DoD adoption, those impacts were on case

#### Doesn’t solve warming – reducing restrictions doesn’t send a signal that the US is putting its weight behind nuclear power through a government investment

#### Perm do the plan and eliminate all nuclear subsidies – the DoD procures the SMRs, it doesn’t lower the cost for private development do it doesn’t trigger the bubble disad. Their Koplow evidence is about things like loan guarntees which is NOT what the plan does

#### Incentives now non-uniques the bubble DA

#### Incentives now

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.

#### Federal SMR loans coming—announced in September

Energy Collective 12 [Energy Collective, 7/26/12, Race for DOE SMR money heats up, theenergycollective.com/dan-yurman/97081/race-doe-smr-money-heats]

The Department of Energy is reviewing proposals from B&W and several other SMR firms to be granted up to $452 million over five years to support SMR engineering and licensing work. The agency will make up to two awards by the end of September this year.

#### Perm do both – we can reduce restrictions on SMRs and have the DoD procure

#### No solvency advocate is a voter – they have zero evidence that says reducing restructions on evacuation zones boosts investment, means we can’t have good policy education

#### Accidents DA isn’t about SMRs

#### Plan solves meltdowns

**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).

#### No impact

Rod **Adams 12**, Former submarine Engineer Officer, Founder, Adams Atomic Engines, Inc., “Has Apocalyptic Portrayal of Climate Change Risk Backfired?”, May 2, <http://atomicinsights.com/2012/05/has-apocalyptic-portrayal-of-climate-change-risk-backfired.html?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AtomicInsights+%28Atomic+Insights%29>

Not only was the discussion enlightening about the reasons why different people end up with different opinions about climate change responses when presented with essentially the same body of information, but it also got me thinking about a possible way to fight back against the Gundersens, Caldicotts, Riccios, Grossmans and Wassermans of the world. That group of five tend to use apocalyptic rhetoric to describe what will happen to the world if we do not immediately start turning our collective backs on all of the benefits that abundant atomic energy can provide. They spin tall tales of deformed children, massive numbers of cancers as a result of minor radioactive material releases, swaths of land made “uninhabitable” for thousands of years, countries “cut in half”, and clouds of “hot particles” raining death and destruction ten thousand miles from the release point. Every one of those clowns have been repeating similar stories for at least two solid decades, and continue to repeat their stories even after supposedly catastrophic failures at Fukushima have not resulted in a single radiation related injury or death. According to eminent scientists – like Dr. Robert Gale – Fukushima is unlikely to EVER result in any measurable increase in radiation related illness. One important element that we have to consider to assess cancer risks associated with an accident like Fukushima is our baseline risk for developing cancer. All of us, unfortunately, have a substantial risk of developing cancer in our lifetime. For example, a 50-year-old male has a 42% risk of developing cancer during his remaining life; it’s almost the same for a 10-year-old. This risk only decreases when we get much older and only because we are dying of other causes. It’s true that excess radiation exposure can increase our cancer risk above baseline levels; it’s clear from studies of the survivors of the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of people exposed to radiation in medical and occupational settings, and of people exposed to radon decay products in mines and home basements. When it comes to exposures like that of Fukushima, the question is: What is the relative magnitude of the increased risk from Fukushima compared to our baseline cancer risk? Despite our fears, it is quite small. If the nuclear industry – as small and unfocused as it is – really wanted to take action to isolate the apocalyptic antinuclear activists, it could take a page from the effective campaign of the fossil fuel lobby. It could start an integrated campaign to help the rest of us to remember that, despite the dire predictions, the sky never fell, the predicted unnatural deaths never occurred, the deformations were figments of imagination, and the land is not really irreversibly uninhabitable for generations. The industry would effectively share the story of Ukraine’s recent decision to begin repopulating the vast majority of the “dead zone” that was forcibly evacuated after the Chernobyl accident. It would put some context into the discussion about radiation health effects; even if leaders shy away from directly challenging the Linear No Threshold (LNT) dose assumption, they can still show that even that pessimistic model says that a tiny dose leads to a tiny risk. Aside: My personal opinion is that the LNT is scientifically unsupportable and should be replaced with a much better model. We deserve far less onerous regulations; there is evidence that existing regulations actually cause harm. I hear a rumor that there is a group of mostly retired, but solidly credentialed professionals who are organizing a special session at the annual ANS meeting to talk about effective ways to influence policy changes. End Aside. Most of us recognize that there is no such thing as a zero risk; repeated assertions of “there is no safe level” should be addressed by accepting “close enough” to zero so that even the most fearful person can stop worrying. The sky has not fallen, even though we have experienced complete core meltdowns and secondary explosions that did some visible damage. Nuclear plants are not perfect, there will be accidents and there will be radioactive material releases. History is telling me that the risks are acceptable, especially in the context of the real world where there is always some potential for harm. The benefits of accepting a little nuclear risk are immense and must not be marginalized by the people who market fear and trembling.

#### Plan solves colonization

O’Neil 11[Ian, PhD from University of Wales, founder and editor of Astroengine, space producer for Discovery News “'Suitcase' Nuclear Reactors to Power Mars Colonies,” August 30th, <http://news.discovery.com/space/mars-colonies-powered-by-mini-nuclear-reactors-110830.html>]

Nuclear power is an emotive subject -- particularly in the wake of the Fukushima power plant disaster after Japan's March earthquake and tsunami -- but in space, it may be an essential component of spreading mankind beyond terrestrial shores. On Monday, at the 242nd National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society (ACS) in Denver, Colo., the future face of space nuclear power was described. You can forget the huge reactor buildings, cooling towers and hundreds of workers; the first nuclear reactors to be landed on alien worlds to support human settlement will be tiny. Think less "building sized" and more "suitcase sized." "People would never recognize the fission power system as a nuclear power reactor," said James E. Werner, lead of the Department of Energy's (DOE) Idaho National Laboratory. "The reactor itself may be about 1 feet wide by 2 feet high, about the size of a carry-on suitcase. There are no cooling towers. A fission power system is a compact, reliable, safe system that may be critical to the establishment of outposts or habitats on other planets. Fission power technology can be applied on Earth's Moon, on Mars, or wherever NASA sees the need for continuous power." The joint NASA/DOE project is aiming to build a demonstration unit next year. Obviously, this will be welcome news to Mars colonization advocates; to have a dependable power source on the Martian surface will be of paramount importance. The habitats will need to have a constant power supply simply to keep the occupants alive. This will be "climate control" on an unprecedented level. Water extraction, reclamation and recycling; food cultivation and storage; oxygen production and carbon dioxide scrubbing; lighting; hardware, tools and electronics; waste management -- these are a few of the basic systems that will need to be powered from the moment humans set foot on the Red Planet, 24 hours 39 minutes a day (or "sol" -- a Martian day), 669 sols a year. Fission reactors can provide that. However, nuclear fission reactors have had a very limited part to play in space exploration up until now. Russia has launched over 30 fission reactors, whereas the US has launched only one. All have been used to power satellites. Radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs), on the other hand, have played a very important role in the exploration of the solar system since 1961. These are not fission reactors, which split uranium atoms to produce heat that can then be converted into electricity. RTGs depend on small pellets of the radioisotope plutonium-238 to produce a steady heat as they decay. NASA's Pluto New Horizons and Cassini Solstice missions are equipped with RTGs (not solar arrays) for all their power needs. The Mars Science Laboratory (MSL), to be launched in November 2011, is powered by RTGs for Mars roving day or night. RTGs are great, but to power a Mars base, fission reactors would be desirable because they deliver more energy. And although solar arrays will undoubtedly have a role to play, fission reactors will be the premier energy source for the immediate future. "The biggest difference between solar and nuclear reactors is that nuclear reactors can produce power in any environment," said Werner. "Fission power technology doesn't rely on sunlight, making it able to produce large, steady amounts of power at night or in harsh environments like those found on the Moon or Mars. A fission power system on the Moon could generate 40 kilowatts or more of electric power, approximately the same amount of energy needed to power eight houses on Earth." "The main point is that nuclear power has the ability to provide a power-rich environment to the astronauts or science packages anywhere in our solar system and that this technology is mature, affordable and safe to use." Of course, to make these "mini-nuclear reactors" a viable option for the first moon and Mars settlements, they'll need to be compact, lightweight and safe. Werner contends that once the technology is validated, we'll have one of the most versatile and affordable power resources to support manned exploration of the solar system.

#### Colonization solves extinction

Schulze-Makuch and Davies 10 (Dirk Schulze-Makuch, Ph.D., School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Washington State University and Paul Davies, Ph.D., Beyond Center, Arizona State University, “To Boldly Go: A One-Way Human Mission to Mars”, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars108.html>)

There are several reasons that motivate the establishment of a permanent Mars colony. We are a vulnerable species living in a part of the galaxy where cosmic events such as major asteroid and comet impacts and supernova explosions pose a significant threat to life on Earth, especially to human life. There are also more immediate threats to our culture, if not our survival as a species. These include global pandemics, nuclear or biological warfare, runaway global warming, sudden ecological collapse and supervolcanoes (Rees 2004). Thus, the colonization of other worlds is a must if the human species is to survive for the long term. The first potential colonization targets would be asteroids, the Moon and Mars. The Moon is the closest object and does provide some shelter (e.g., lava tube caves), but in all other respects falls short compared to the variety of resources available on Mars. The latter is true for asteroids as well. Mars is by far the most promising for sustained colonization and development, because it is similar in many respects to Earth and, crucially, possesses a moderate surface gravity, an atmosphere, abundant water and carbon dioxide, together with a range of essential minerals. Mars is our second closest planetary neighbor (after Venus) and a trip to Mars at the most favorable launch option takes about six months with current chemical rocket technology.

### 2AC – Debt Ceiling

#### Heg turns the economy – need to police trade lines etc

#### Obama won’t spend capital on the debt ceiling.

New York Times, **1/2**/2013 (Lawmakers Gird for Next Fiscal Clash, on the Debt Ceiling, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/03/us/politics/for-obama-no-clear-path-to-avoid-a-debt-ceiling-fight.html?pagewanted=all>)

With the resolution of the year-end fiscal crisis just hours old, the next political confrontation is already taking shape as this city braces for a fight in February over raising the nation’s borrowing limit. But it is a debate President Obama says he will have nothing more to do with. Even as Republicans vow to leverage a needed increase in the federal debt limit to make headway on their demands for deep spending cuts, Mr. Obama — who reluctantly negotiated a deal like that 18 months ago — says he has no intention of ever getting pulled into another round of charged talks on the issue with Republicans on Capitol Hill. “I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills that they’ve already racked up through the laws that they passed,” the president said Tuesday night after he successfully pushed Republicans to allow tax increases on wealthy Americans.

#### No uniqueness evidence which is SHreyport – nothing that says Congress will raiseit, just that Obama needs to use PC to get a balancing solution

#### GOP aren’t crazy --- they won’t let the debt ceiling go

**Forbes**, **1/3**/2013 (Fiscal Cliff Deal Will Be the First of Many Republican Capitulations in 2013

The debt ceiling does not provide Republicans with ‘leverage’, p. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/aroy/2013/01/03/fiscal-cliff-deal-will-be-the-first-of-many-republican-capitulations-in-2013/>)

If Congress doesn’t raise the debt ceiling, the United States will be forced to default on some of its outstanding debt. Such an outcome would wreak havoc on financial markets, because U.S. treasury bonds play a critical, and very large, role in the global financial system. The stock market would crash. Interest rates on federal debt would skyrocket. The resultant economic chaos would make the fiscal cliff look like child’s play. And yet, we are to believe that a Republican party that was afraid of going over the fiscal cliff is totally fine with defaulting on the national debt? The Republican calculation appears to be that President Obama will get equally blamed for a debt default. But this seems unlikely. After all, it’s Republicans, not Democrats, who are arguing that the debt limit gives them some sort of “leverage.” It would have been unfair to blame Republicans if we had gone over the fiscal cliff; after all, Democrats are the ones who have opposed the Bush tax cuts all along. But in the case of the debt ceiling, if Republicans think they will escape blame for a default, they are delusional. Ezra Klein is one of the few people who has figured this out. “Republicans make a big show of being unreasonable,” he writes, “but they’re not nearly as crazy as the tea party would have you believe. In the end, they weren’t even willing to go over the fiscal cliff. The debt ceiling would do far more damage to the economy than the fiscal cliff, and Republicans would receive far more of the blame…No one thinks that the White House wants to breach the debt ceiling.” In 1996, when President Clinton vetoed a set of fiscal reforms from the Newt Gingrich-led Republican Congress, the resultant government shutdown forced Republicans into a free-spending crouch for the remainder of their time in the majority. A debt default would be far more damaging to the economy than that government shutdown was, and would have more far-reaching political consequences. They say that there’s no point in taking a hostage if you’re not willing to shoot the hostage. Hence, it is Republicans who will almost certainly capitulate in the 2013 debt-ceiling showdown. They’ll either do it to avoid default, or, even worse, they’ll do it after a default in which they are blamed for the turbulence that follows.

#### Sequestration cuts are weakened --- they won’t affect major programs.

**O’Connell**, 1/2/**2013** (Michael, Analysis: Sequestration postponed? What's does that mean?, Federal News Radio, p. <http://www.federalnewsradio.com/1007/3178452/Analysis-Sequestration-postponed-Whats-does-that-mean>)

Brian Friel, a federal business intelligence analyst with Bloomberg Government, told The Federal Drive with Tom Temin and Emily Kopp today that the new legislation both delayed sequestration and reduced its potential effect. "We were looking at $109 billion in potential sequestration prior to the passage of this bill," he said. "Now we're looking at $85 billion as the ceiling, because Congress took $24 billion of the original $109 billion and shifted it. So, $12 billion of that cut has now been taken care of through a change in the tax code. The other $12 billion is being dealt with by changes in the budget caps for 2013 and 2014, so kind of pushing out the potential effect of the cuts so that they can be dealt with later. It's basically a 22 percent reduction in the potential threat of sequestration, which will potentially take place in March unless Congress and the White House can agree on further reducing the potential impact of it." Currently, the government is operating under a 2012 countinuing resolution, which runs out in March. "The way they structured those cuts is they reduced what they called the discretionary spending caps for non-security and security spending both for 2013 and 2014," Friel said. "So, $8 billion of that $12 billion has been shifted out into 2014 in the form of lower overall caps for that year." That leaves only $4 billion in potential cuts for 2013, split 50-50 between defense and non-defense spending. New Congress must resolve sequestration Friel said those cuts would occur in an after-session sequestration, which the new law says will occur on March 27, the day the CR expires. "Essentially, that $4 billion would have to come through a second sort of follow-on sequestration order from the administration," he said. "One thing to keep in mind is that $2 billion on the non-defense side, the reduction in the cap, still leaves the overall cap higher than what the current spending level is for non-defense. Essentially, that's something of a phantom cut. It can be made without actually affecting any programs."

#### Link is non-unique – Obama already pushed SMRs and has taken credit for it, should’ve sapped his capital

#### SMRs have bipartisan support

Sullivan 10 (Mary Anne Sullivan – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Daniel F. Stenger – Partner in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Amy C. Roma – Senior associate in Hogan Lovells' energy practice in Washington, D.C., Are Small Reactors the Next Big Thing in Nuclear?, November 2010, Electric Light & Power, Nov/Dec2010, Vol. 88 Issue 6, p46)

Congress SMRs have enjoyed **bipartisan support** in Congress. The House Committee on Science and Technology and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee have approved similar legislation designed to promote the development and deployment of SMRs along the lines the DOE has proposed. Promoting SMR development in legislation has its price. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that the Senate bill would cost $407 million over the next five years to support cost-sharing programs with private companies for the development of two standard SMR designs. Costs for the out-years were not included in the estimate, but the bill would require the DOE to obtain NRC design certifications for the reactors by 2018 and to secure combined construction and operating licenses by Jan. 1, 2021. If Congress can pass an energy bill, it seems likely the bill **will support SMRs**. Even in the absence of new authorizing legislation, however, **appropriations bills** that must be passed to **keep the government running** almost certainly will contain strong support for the DOE's research and development program for SMRs. SMRs respond to a critical suite of power needs: reliable, low-carbon, baseload generation at a manageable capital cost for even small utilities. But as with many other power solutions, much still needs to happen to realize the promise

#### Not intrinsic – a logical policymaker can do the plan and pass immigration reform

#### Obama pushing SMRs now

Ervin 12-28 [Dan Ervin is a professor of finance at Salisbury University, “Dan Ervin: Modular reactors are the future of nuclear energy”, December 28th, 2012, <http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20121230/OPINION03/312300005>, Chetan]

The Obama administration’s decision to kick-start commercial use of small modular reactors has made one thing clear: The notion that nuclear power is slipping away is wrong. Although nuclear power faces difficult challenges, industry and government are working together to forge a new path. The Department of Energy has earmarked funds for a new public-private partnership to help develop innovative small reactors that are about one-third the size of those in large conventional nuclear plants. These small reactors are modular, meaning they will be built in factories before they are shipped and installed at nuclear sites. This production method has the potential to reduce the cost of nuclear power significantly.

#### Double bind – no PC now because Obama just used it on the fiscal cliff, and if he does it proves that winners win

#### PC not key

**Dickinson 9** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP)

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is **rarely influenced by anything a president does.** Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – **this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence.** Once we control for other factors – **a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.** (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.

#### DoD shields the link

Merchant 10 (Political & Environment Columnist-Discovery, 10/21, “How the US Military Could Bring Solar Power to Mass Market,” http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/how-the-us-military-could-bring-solar-power-to-mass-market.html)

Furthermore, **Congress is infinitely more likely to approve funding for R&D**; and infrastructure **if the projects are military-related**. Which is depressing, but true -- the one thing that **no politician can get caught opposing is the safety of American troops.** In fact, the whole premise of the article is rather depressing, on point though it may be: The only way we may end up getting a competitive clean energy industry is through serious military investment, which is of course, serious government spending. Which **under any other guise would be vehemently opposed by conservatives**.

#### Winners Win

**Green 10** 6/11/10 – professor of political science at Hofstra University (David Michael Green, 6/11/10, " The Do-Nothing 44th President ", http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around**.** This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### 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)]

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).