# GSU Neg Rounds

## Round 2 1NC vs. South Florida DG

### 1NC – Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

**Massive opposition to wind power – local NIMBY groups working with oil and gas industry**

**Goldenberg 12** (Suzanne, US environment correspondent, “Conservative thinktanks step up attacks against Obama's clean energy strategy,” 5-8-12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/may/08/conservative-thinktanks-obama-energy-plans>)

A network of ultra-conservative groups is ramping up an offensive on multiple fronts to turn the American public against wind farms and Barack Obama's energy agenda. A number of rightwing organisations, including Americans for Prosperity, which is funded by the billionaire Koch brothers, are attacking Obama for his support for solar and wind power. The American Legislative Exchange Council (Alec), which also has financial links to the Kochs, has drafted bills to overturn state laws promoting wind energy. Now a confidential strategy memo seen by the Guardian advises using "subversion" to build a **national movement of wind farm protesters**. The strategy proposal was prepared by a fellow of the American Tradition Institute (ATI) – although the thinktank has formally disavowed the project. The proposal was discussed at a meeting of self-styled 'wind warriors' from across the country in Washington DC last February. "These documents show for the first time that local Nimby anti-wind groups are co-ordinating and working with national fossil-fuel funded advocacy groups to wreck the wind industry," said Gabe Elsner, a co-director of the Checks and Balances, the accountability group which unearthed the proposal and other documents. Among its main recommendations, the proposal calls for a **national PR campaign** aimed at causing "subversion in message of industry so that it effectively because so bad that no one wants to admit in public they are for it." It suggests setting up "dummy businesses" to buy anti-wind billboards, and creating a "counter-intelligence branch" to track the wind energy industry. It also calls for spending $750,000 to create an organisation with paid staff and tax-exempt status dedicated to building public opposition to state and federal government policies encouraging the wind energy industry. The proposal was reviewed by John Droz Jr, a senior fellow at ATI, for discussion at the Washington meeting, which he also organised. ATI's executive director, Tom Tanton, said Droz had acted alone on the memo, although he confirmed he remains a fellow at the thinktank. Droz is a longtime opponent of wind farms, arguing that the technology has not yet been proven and that wind technology should not receive government support. He claims 10,000 subscribers to his anti-wind-power email newsletter. In a telephone interview, Droz said the Washington strategy session was his own initiative, and that neither he nor any of the participants had been paid for attending the session. Their main priority was co-ordinating PR strategy. "Our No 1 reason for getting together was to talk about whether there should be agreement to talk about a common message." The strategy session is the latest evidence of a **concerted attack** on the clean energy industry by thinktanks and lobby groups connected to oil and coal interests and free-market ideologues.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

Allison & Blackwill 11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.

### 1NC – Electricity Prices DA

#### A. Electricity prices are declining

**Burtraw 8/21/12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector. “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### Renewable energy skyrockets electricity prices – cost of production and transmission lines

Bryce 12 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Center for Energy Policy and the Environment - Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Renewable Energy Mandates," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper\_10.htm)

Although supporters of renewable energy claim that the RPS mandates will bring benefits, their contribution to the economy is problematic because they also impose costs that must be incorporated into the utility bills paid by homeowners, commercial businesses, and industrial users. And those costs are or will be substantial. Electricity generated from renewable sources generally costs more—often much more—than that produced by conventional fuels such as coal and natural gas. In addition, large-scale renewable energy projects often require the construction of many miles of high-voltage transmission lines. The cost of those lines must also be incorporated into the bills paid by consumers.¶ These extra costs amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says Suedeen Kelly, a former member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.[5] Indeed, with Congress unwilling to approve national carbon dioxide restrictions or renewable-energy quotas, the RPS mandates have become a sprawling state system of de facto carbon-reduction taxes.

#### C. Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### D. Manufacturing strength is key to both the economy and military power

Ettlinger and Gordon 11 (Michael and Kate, the Vice President for Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress, former director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network of the Economic Policy Institute and Vice President for Energy Policy at the Center for American Progress. Most recently, Kate was the co-director of the national Apollo Alliance, where she still serves as senior policy advisor. Former senior associate at the Center on Wisconsin Strategy, "The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing" <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-)>

Manufacturing is critically important to the American economy. For generations, the strength of our country rested on the power of our factory floors—both the machines and the men and women who worked them. We need manufacturing to continue to be a bedrock of strength for generations to come. Manufacturing is woven into the structure of our economy: Its importance goes far beyond what happens behind the factory gates. The strength or weakness of American manufacturing carries implications for the entire economy, our national security, and the well-being of all Americans. Manufacturing today accounts for 12 percent of the U.S. economy and about 11 percent of the private-sector workforce. But its significance is even greater than these numbers would suggest. The direct impact of manufacturing is only a part of the picture. First, jobs in the manufacturing sector are good middle-class jobs for millions of Americans. Those jobs serve an important role, offering economic opportunity to hard-working, middle-skill workers. This creates upward mobility and broadens and strengthens the middle class to the benefit of the entire economy. What’s more, U.S.-based manufacturing underpins a broad range of jobs that are quite different from the usual image of manufacturing. These are higher-skill service jobs that include the accountants, bankers, and lawyers that are associated with any industry, as well as a broad range of other jobs including basic research and technology development, product and process engineering and design, operations and maintenance, transportation, testing, and lab work. Many of these jobs are critical to American technology and innovation leadership. The problem today is this: Many multinational corporations may for a period keep these higher-skill jobs here at home while they move basic manufacturing elsewhere in response to other countries’ subsidies, the search for cheaper labor costs, and the desire for more direct access to overseas markets, but eventually many of these service jobs will follow. When the basic manufacturing leaves, the feedback loop from the manufacturing floor to the rest of a manufacturing operation—a critical element in the innovative process—is eventually broken. To maintain that feedback loop, companies need to move higher-skill jobs to where they do their manufacturing. And with those jobs goes American leadership in technology and innovation. This is why having a critical mass of both manufacturing and associated service jobs in the United States matters. The "industrial commons" that comes from the crossfertilization and engagement of a community of experts in industry, academia, and government is vital to our nation’s economic competitiveness. Manufacturing also is important for the nation’s economic stability. The experience of the Great Recession exemplifies this point. Although manufacturing plunged in 2008 and early 2009 along with the rest of the economy, it is on the rebound today while other key economic sectors, such as construction, still languish. Diversity in the economy is important—and manufacturing is a particularly important part of the mix. Although manufacturing is certainly affected by broader economic events, the sector’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets— gives it great potential resiliency. Finally, supplying our own needs through a strong domestic manufacturing sector protects us from international economic and political disruptions. This is most obviously important in the realm of national security, even narrowly defined as matters related to military strength, where the risk of a weak manufacturing capability is obvious. But overreliance on imports and substantial manufacturing trade deficits weaken us in many ways, making us vulnerable to everything from exchange rate fluctuations to trade embargoes to natural disasters.

#### E. Heg solves multiple scenarios for nuke war

Kagan 7 (Robert, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “End of Dreams, Return of History: International Rivalry and American Leadership”, Policy Review, August/September, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10)

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying —  its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not only on the goodwill of peoples but also on American power. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War II would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe ’s stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that ’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world ’s great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China ’s neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. Conflicts are more likely to erupt if the United States withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore  to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of “offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances.

### 1NC – Waivers CP

#### Text: The Environmental Protection Agency should then grant regulatory waivers that exempt all parties siting, construction, expansion and operation of offshore wind farms under the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. The EPA should summarize the decision in an annual agency publication in the Federal Register.

#### -- It competes –

#### The CP doesn’t reduce – “reductions” must be in quantity, not quality

**GEP 99** (Georgia Environmental Protection , http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/bank/forms/faqsheet.pdf)

The reductions **must be "quantifiable;"** i.e., the amount, rate and characteristics of the reduction must be measured or calculated through a reliable method and approved by the Environmental Protection Division;

#### The CP is a functionally different – it keeps the rule “on the books” and tailors it’s application – the plan creates a new rule – rulemaking is distinct from adjudication

Rossi 95 (Jim, Professor of Law – Vanderbilt University, “Making Policy through the Waiver of Regulations at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,” Administrative Law Review, 47 Admin. L. Rev. 260, Hein Online)

A. RULEMAKING VERSUS ADJUDICATION Two distinctive methodologies are available to agencies in formulating law and policy: **rulemaking and ad hoc adjudication**. As defined in the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), a rule is a statement of general applicability and future effect that implements, interprets, or prescribes **law or policy** or the organization, procedures, and standards for practice before an agency.95 Rules arise from formal or informal rulemaking proceedings before the issuing administrative agency. Rules create law in the form of statements that are binding on those persons or entities to whom they are addressed, regardless whether those persons or entities participated in the rulemaking proceeding that generated the rule. Rules generally bind the agency in future cases, although, as this article suggests, this is not always the case, nor should it be. An adjudicative order, on the other hand, is an agency statement of particular applicability determining the rights of, or applying law or policy to, specific individuals or entities on the basis of their special circumstances.96 Such orders generally arise as the result of an adjudicative proceeding involving persons who have asserted an interest sufficient to meet the agency's intervention standards.97 An individualized adjudicative proceeding allows the agency to tailor application of its law or policy to the specific time, place, and context of persons affected. An adjudicative order generally adopts principles or rules of law on an ad hoc basis as necessary to solve the specific case before the agency. The impact of adjudicative orders, however, is often broader than the specific case at hand because they may serve as precedent in similar future cases. As a general matter, most commentators have argued that agencies should adopt and elaborate law and policy by rulemaking rather than ad hoc adjudica- tion.98 By overlooking the particularities of time, place, and context, rules have the inherent values of predictability, stability, uniformity, and control. Yet, it is these very values about which adjudication is most skeptical. In addition to the inherent values of rules, rulemaking is generally regarded as a preferable decisionmaking methodology for several process-based reasons.99

#### -- It solves the whole case better

Glicksman and Shapiro 4 (Robert L., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, and Sidney A., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, “Improving Regulation through Incremental Adjustment,” Kansas Law Review, 52 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1179, Hein Online)

Reform of environmental and other regulation has been a popular topic for academics, think-tanks, and interested parties for the last two decades. Claiming that existing regulation is excessive and irrational, critics have successfully convinced Congress and the White House to implement a plethora of procedural requirements to analyze a proposed regulation before it is promulgated.1 In our recent book, Risk Regulation at Risk,2 we argued that the previous initiatives address the possibility of regulatory failure on the wrong end of the regulatory policy implementation process. Current efforts to rationalize environmental and other health and safety regulation at the "front end" of the regulatory process are doomed to fail because of moral, methodological, and informational limitations.3 We suggested that one way of improving regulation would be to rely on incremental adjustments in regulation on the "back end" of the regulatory process.4 One important advantage of proceeding in this manner is that regulatory policy is adjusted in light of its actual impact, as compared to the significant guesswork that is required to use front-end analysis. In this manner, a back-end adjustment process is consistent with the pragmatic approach to public policy that we advocated in the book.5 This article addresses in more detail the potential of two types of back-end processes: (1) deadline extensions and (2) waivers, exceptions, and variances.6 Our analysis proceeds in three steps. Part II describes the almost exclusive focus of regulatory reformers on the front end of the process. Part III offers a close examination of five federal statutes that provide opportunities for the two types of adjustments we are studying. The results confirm our earlier assertion that Congress has authorized agencies such as **the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),** the Occu- pational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and **the Interior Department** to make these types of back-end adjustments available in a variety of contexts and for a variety of reasons.7 Our analysis reveals that Congress has established six different grounds for back-end adjustment, and we assess the potential for each of these grounds to improve regulatory policy. Although we recommend the imposition of conditions on the issuance of some of these back-end adjustments, we find that these adjustments are generally consistent with the precautionary tilt of the statutes in which they are located because they still require the regulated entity to do the best it can to protect people and the environment. Where such protective mechanisms are absent, we urge that the statutes be amended to include them. Part IV analyzes the procedures by which requests for back-end adjustments are currently processed. We find that agencies consider most applications for back-end adjustments using informal procedures that include public notice and solicitation of public comments, although in a few instances, more formal procedures apply. We favor the informal approach because it is an efficient way for agencies to respond to the issues raised by requests for back-end adjustments and because more elaborate procedures are not necessary to promote rational decision- making, given the nature of the issues likely to be raised in back-end adjustment proceedings. We are concerned, however, about the extent to which effective public participation will occur under these procedures. We therefore endorse two steps to enhance the transparency of back-end adjustment decision-making: the establishment of electronic reading rooms and the issuance by agencies of **annual reports on back-end adjustments**.8 We argue that these two mechanisms will facilitate involvement by public interest groups and interested citizens by allowing them to prioritize the adjustment proceedings in which they wish to become involved. The result is likely to be enhanced agency accountability and reduced opportunities for agency abuse of the back-end adjustment process.

### 1NC – Heidegger K

#### Energy production through modern technology places nature as a standing reserve – to be dominated and ordered by humanity – causes planetary ecocide

DeLuca 5 (Kevin Michael – Professor of Communications at University of Utah, “Thinking with Heidegger: Rethinking Environmental Theory and Practice”, 2005, Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 10, No. 1, JSTOR)

In addition to meditating on media and public relations practices, a careful reading of Heidegger would compel environmentalism to meditate on its relations to technology and to images. To address the issue of tech- nology first, environmental groups often rely on modern technology while writing off such use as a necessary cost of 'doing business' in a mod- ern, mass media public sphere. That may be true, but Heidegger's writings caution us against gliding over the writing off. What are the costs of using modern technology? Besides relying on the technological infrastructure of the communication industry (computers, telephones, video camcorders, etc. . . .) to appear on TV, issue press releases, maintain web sites, lobby politicians, and raise money, environmentalists in the course of working and living rely on cars, planes, air conditioning, highways, microwaves, electricity, and a plethora of plastic products. In short, environmentalists are implicated and imbricated in the technosphere. Now Heidegger's meditation on the essence of technology and the essence of humanity's relation to technology serves to displace the conventional questions concerning technology. Heidegger refuses the question of whether technology is good or bad or neutral. As he puts it, "Everywhere we remain unfree and chained to technology, whether we passionately affirm or deny it. But we are delivered over to it in the worst possible way when we regard it as something neutral; for this conception of it, to which today we particularly like to do homage, makes us utterly blind to the essence of technology" (1993, 311-12). Instead, Heidegger is asking after the essence of technology, which, he famously declares, "is by no means anything technological" (1993, 311). Rejecting the understand- ing of technology as a "mere means" that humans can master, what he terms the merely correct but not true "instrumental and anthropological definition of technology" (1993, 312), Heidegger proposes technology as "a way of revealing" (1993, 318). Avoiding the romanticism of a return to the Pleistocene or the utopi- anism of embracing a Star Trek futurism, from a Heideggerian perspective the question becomes, "What sort of revealing does a particular regime of technology make possible?" More prosaically, what sort of relationships to the earth and world does a technology enable? To this question, Heidegger provides a stinging critique of modern technology [albeit, admittedly, tempered by an ontological hope (see 1993, 333-41)]. The way of revealing of modern technology is Gestell or enframing: "The revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of a setting-upon, in the sense of a challenging-forth. ... a challenging, which **puts to nature** the unreasonable demand that it supply energy **which can be extracted and stored** as such" (1993, 321, 320). Nature, then, is reduced to a "standing-reserve ... a calculable coherence of forces" (1993, 322, 326),6 so that "nature reports itself in some way or other **that is identifiable through calculation and that it remains orderable** as a system of information" (1993, 328).7 Heidegger gives examples from the fields of agriculture and energy that ring even more true today (see 1993, 320-21). Of farming, Heidegger writes: The work of the peasant does not challenge the soil of the field. In sow- ing grain it places seed in the keeping of the forces of growth and watches over its increase. But meanwhile even the cultivation of the field has come under the grip of another kind of setting-in-order, which sets upon nature. It sets upon it in the sense of challenging it. Agricul- ture is now the mechanized food industry. (1993, 320) Of course, the all-too-immediate reaction to such an example is to charge Heidegger with a dangerous romanticism. With the benefit of a few decades experience around the world with the products of the mecha- nized food industry, from tasteless food, soil erosion, and ubiquitous pesticides to emptied communities, alienated consumers, and green impe- rialism, in retrospect Heidegger's critique seems understated. More significantly, though, the question is not a moral one of good or bad but an exploration of **what possible ways of relating to nature are opened and foreclosed** with different practices of revealing. Heidegger himself dis- misses the possibility of romanticism in response to the giganticism and the progress of science, "whose onset can neither be hindered nor even held up in any way, by any romantic remembering of what was earlier and different" (1999, 108). Indeed, Heidegger's fundamental critique of modern technology is not directed at the world it reveals **but the world it erases**: Where this ordering holds sway, it drives out every other possibility of revealing. Above all, enframing conceals that revealing which, in the ~~^ 79 sense of poiesis, lets what presences come forth into appearance. As compared with that other revealing, the setting-upon that challenges forth thrusts man into a relation to whatever is that is at once antithet- ical and rigorously ordered. Where enframing holds sway, **regulating and securing of the standing-reserve** mark all revealing. (1993, 332) The problem, then, is not that nature is seen as "standing-reserve," a "cal- culable coherence of forces," but that that is all it can be seen as.

#### Vote Neg to recognize humanity’s solidarity with nature – this can repair our relationship with both nature and our own being

**Best and Nocella 6** (Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Texas at El Paso, “Igniting a Revolution: Voices in Defense of the Earth”, p. 82-84)

Yet, for both Heidegger and revolutionary environmentalists, **there exist possibilities for transformation despite the destructiveness of Enframing**. In the midst of technological peril – indeed, precisely because the peril strikes at and thus awakens us to the bond between human and nonhuman life – there emerges a sense of solidarity of human with nonhuman beings. Looking at the well-heeled, bureaucratic discourse of “human resource management” and “personnel resources,” the challenging forth of human beings into standing reserve is fairly evident. Factory-farmed cows, pigs, and chickens obviously have it far worse than people, but in both cases the purpose is to harness resources for maximum efficiency and profit. Ultimately human and nonhuman beings are similarly enframed within one giant “gasoline station.” It is precisely the experience of this solidarity which must be constantly rearticulated – in arts, poetry, ceremony, music, and especially in socioeconomic and political action – in order to provide a historically and ontologically authentic break with the metaphysics of technical control and capitalist exploitation. Action **will only be truly revolutionary if it revolves around engagement in solidarity with nature**, where liberation is always seen both as human liberation from the confines of Enframing and simultaneously as liberation of animal nations and eco-regions from human technics. **Anything less will always lapse back into the false and** oppressive hierarchy of “man” over “nature” and “man” over animals with attendant effects of technological, disciplinary control over humans, nonhumans, and the Earth. Using a familiar title from the anarchist Crimethinc collective, revolutionary environmentalism is truly an instance of “fighting for our lives” where the pronoun refers to all life not just human life. Heidegger describes the possibility of transformation through a return of Being as a re-figured humanism. It is the possibility of suspending the will and attaining a lucid sense of the free play of Being within which all of life emerges and is sustained. A human being, like any entity, *is* – s/he stands forth as present. But “his distinctive feature lies in [the fact] that he, as the being who thinks, is open to Being….Man is essentially this relationship of responding to Being. Such experience is the clearing of a space (symbolically represented, for example, in the building of an arbor for a ceremony or in the awesome silence created by the space within a cathedral or a grove of old-growth Redwoods), and the patient readiness for Being to be brought to language. Given the appropriate bearing and evocation through language, human beings can become aware of dwelling, along with all other existent beings, within Being – the open realm within which entities are “released” into presence (Gelassenhait – or “releasement”). What comes to the fore in suspension of willed manipulation is an embrace of other beings and the enduring process of evolution within which all beings emerge and develop. By reflecting on or experiencing oneself within the dimension of freedom that is the domain through which all beings pass, human beings can repair the willed manipulation **inherent in calculative thinking and realize a patient equanimity toward Life**. It is only in the context of this reawakened sense of the unity of life that revolutionary action gains an authentic basis. It is the engagement with “the Other” that shows the ELF actions are truly about defense of plant and animal life, and they demonstrate genuine liberation concerns that typically are trapped within Enframing. That is to say, ELF (and similar) actions, show themselves as part of a dynamic and necessary historical evolution and transformation process, not merely a gesture of opposition and negation, because of their profound solidarity with animals and the Earth. Such guidance solidarity thus serves as a general basis for a post-Enframing, post-capitalist order, an ecological, not a capitalist society. What will change is, first, the preeminence of Enframing as that which animates the epoch and, correspondingly, our relationship to technology. No longer will technical solutions be sought after in realms of activity where technique is not applicable. No longer will everyday activities be pervaded by the standardization and frenzied pace of technology. **No longer will nature be looked upon as a homogenous field of resources to be extracted and exploited**. No longer will resource-intensive and polluting technologies be utilized simply because they serve the blind interests of corporations over the needs of the Earth. No longer will human beings take from the Earth without thought of the far-reaching consequences of such actions on all present and future forms of life. Critics would wrongly denounce this position as atavistic, primitivist, or anti-science/technology. But as the turning toward the re-emergence of Being unfolds, both through revolutionary action rooted in solidarity with nature and through new, non-exploitative modes of acting in the world, technics will not disappear; instead, the limits of technology as a mode of revealing will begin to be discerned so that new forms and uses of technology can emerge. Questions about technology will center on whether a given technology can be developed and used so that plant and animal life can appear as it is and not be reduced to standing reserve. The question, for Heidegger, is not whether technology, in the sense of a set of tools, is done away with, but whether Enframing is surmounted. It is in this sense of releasement Heidegger writes, “Mortals dwell in that they save the earth….Saving does not only snatch something from a danger. To save really means to set something free intro its own presencing. I take this as the literal equivalent of the masked ALF activist reclaiming a puppy from a research lab so that it can become a dog rather than a unit of research, or an ELF activist who stops the destruction of an aquifer or forest so that it can remain an aquifer or forest rather than become a water or wood resource. It is just this new ethos which must guide a revolutionary reconstruction of society on grounds that preserve the openness to Being and the ability of each kind of being to become what it is in its essence. For those who charge Heidegger with merely recycling, and not transcending, Western anthropocentrism, it is important to note that there are possibilities here for an emerging post-humanism – a new orientation to nature beyond egocentric forms of human agency and **towards interrelation with other beings and Being itself**. Heidegger’s philosophy allows for multiple modes of engagement with others and nature as equals, all of them rooted in a relationship of solidarity, respect, and concern. I call this kind of pluralistic, egalitarian, and ecological outlook ontological anarchism. It begins with the rejection of illegitimate “rule” of metaphysical constructs that have served to justify unlimited technological appropriation of the world. In place of Enframing with its subjectivist metaphysical underpinnings, ontological anarchism proclaims a multiplicity of forms of experience in which a sense of revealing comes to the fore – such as in art, music, religion, and philosophy. One such experience, a pre-dominant theme of spiritual re-awakening in the ELF communiques, is found in Native American philosophy and practice.

### 1NC – Economy

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

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

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

Decoupling means US isn’t key to the global economy

Bloomberg 10 [“Wall Street Sees World Economy Decoupling From U.S.”, October 4th, 2010, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-10-03/world-economy-decoupling-from-u-s-in-slowdown-returns-as-wall-street-view.html, Chetan]

The main reason for the divergence: “Direct transmission from **a U.S. slowdown** to other economies through exports **is** just **not large enough to spread** a U.S. demand problem **globally**,” Goldman Sachs economists Dominic Wilson and Stacy Carlson wrote in a Sept. 22 report entitled “If the U.S. sneezes...” Limited Exposure **Take** the so-called BRIC countries of **Brazil, Russia, India and China**. While **exports account for** almost **20 percent of their g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct, **sales to the U.S. compose less than 5 percent** of GDP, according to their estimates. That means **even if U.S. growth slowed** 2 percent, **the drag on these** four **countries would be about 0.1** percentage point, the economists reckon. Developed economies including the **U.K., Germany and Japan also have limited exposure**, they said. **Economies outside the U.S. have room to grow that the U.S. doesn’t**, partly because of its outsized slump in house prices, Wilson and Carlson said. The drop of almost 35 percent is more than twice as large as the worst declines in the rest of the Group of 10 industrial nations, they found. The risk to the decoupling wager is a repeat of 2008, when the U.S. property bubble burst and then morphed into a global credit and banking shock that ricocheted around the world. For now, Goldman Sachs’s index of U.S. financial conditions signals that bond and stock markets aren’t stressed by the U.S. outlook. Weaker Dollar The break with the U.S. will be reflected in a weaker dollar, with the Chinese yuan appreciating to 6.49 per dollar in a year from 6.685 on Oct. 1, according to Goldman Sachs forecasts. The bank is also betting that yields on U.S. 10-year debt will be lower by June than equivalent yields for Germany, the U.K., Canada, Australia and Norway. U.S. notes will rise to 2.8 percent from 2.52 percent, Germany’s will increase to 3 percent from 2.3 percent and Canada’s will grow to 3.8 percent from 2.76 percent on Oct. 1, Goldman Sachs projects. Goldman Sachs isn’t alone in making the case for decoupling. Harris at BofA Merrill Lynch said he didn’t buy the argument prior to the financial crisis. Now he believes global growth is strong enough to offer a “handkerchief” to the U.S. as it suffers a “growth recession” of weak expansion and rising unemployment, he said. Giving him confidence is his calculation that the **U.S. share of global GDP has shrunk** to about 24 percent from 31 percent in 2000. He also notes that, unlike the U.S., many countries avoided asset bubbles, kept their banking systems sound and improved their trade and budget positions. Economic Locomotives A book published last week by the World Bank backs him up. “The Day After Tomorrow” concludes that **developing nations aren’t only decoupling**, **they** also **are** undergoing a “switchover” that will make them such **locomotives for the world economy**, they can help rescue advanced nations. Among the reasons for the revolution are greater trade between emerging markets, the rise of the middle class and higher commodity prices, the book said. Investors are signaling they agree. **The U.S. has fallen behind Brazil, China and India** as the preferred place to invest, according to a quarterly survey conducted last month of 1,408 investors, analysts and traders who subscribe to Bloomberg. Emerging markets also attracted more money from share offerings than industrialized nations last quarter for the first time in at least a decade, Bloomberg data show. Room to Ease Indonesia, India, China and Poland are the developing economies least vulnerable to a U.S. slowdown, according to a Sept. 14 study based on trade ties by HSBC Holdings Plc economists. **China, Russia and Brazil** also **are among nations with more room** than industrial countries **to ease policies if a U.S. slowdown does weigh on their growth**, according to a policy- flexibility index designed by the economists, who include New York-based Pablo Goldberg. “Emerging economies kept their powder relatively dry, and are, for the most part, in a position where they could act countercyclically if needed,” the HSBC group said. Links to developing countries are helping insulate some companies against U.S. weakness. Swiss watch manufacturer Swatch Group AG and tire maker Nokian Renkaat of Finland are among the European businesses that should benefit from trade with nations such as Russia and China where consumer demand is growing, according to BlackRock Inc. portfolio manager Alister Hibbert. “There’s a lot of life in the global economy,” Hibbert, said at a Sept. 8 presentation to reporters in London.

#### Crane migration routes are prime land for wind turbines – threatening the species

WCCA 11 (Whooping Crane Conservation Association, “Wind Farms and Whooping Cranes” <http://whoopingcrane.com/vast-wind-energy-proposal-could-kill-endangered-birds/>)

The development of wind farms is occurring at a rapid pace in the Central Flyway with many of the best wind sites located in the whooping crane migration corridor. Tom Stehn, Whooping Crane Coordinator, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) advised the Whooping Crane Conservation Association (WCCA) that multiple wind farms have already been built with more planned. Stehn stated, “It is important to analyze the potential impact of literally tens of thousands of wind turbines that may be placed in the whooping crane migration corridor in the coming years.

#### Whooping Cranes are a Keystone Species and their survival is key to ours

Clemency and Duff 7 (Louise, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Joe, Operation Migration, Whooping Crane Eastern Partnership 2007 Annual Report <http://www.bringbackthecranes.org/whatwedo/wcep07.html>)

Despite the challenges of the 2007 season, 27 birds were added to the eastern whooping crane population, almost twice the number that existed in the 1940s. The combined efforts of many agencies and the dedication of a large team of field staff and volunteers is safeguarding these birds from extinction. Each and every member of the partnership remains committed to seeing this project through to its successful completion. Once known as the white ghost of the wetlands, these magnificent birds are a keystone species and an indicator of the health of our environment. Their existence in the eastern flyway inspires an increased effort to safeguard their habitat and in doing so it is preserved for many less engaging creatures that are so important to biodiversity. Our focus is to save whooping cranes but in the end it may be the whooping crane that saves us.

#### Ecosystem breakdown via keystone species destruction is a threat to human survival

Arlington Institute 7 (Paul Alois and Victoria Cheng, July, “Keystone Species Extinction Overview” <http://www.arlingtoninstitute.org/wbp/species-extinction/443>)

Human beings have recklessly exploited the resources on this planet and continue to do so despite the obvious widespread negative consequences. Due to the severe effects of human expansion in the last 10,000 years, some scientists now believe that the Earth has entered a new “extinction phase”.[1] According to the World Resources Institute, the current rate of species extinction is between 50 and 1000 times more than the geo-historical norm.[2] The World Conservation Union’s (IUCN) Red List reports that of the 40,117 species the organization examined, 16,119 were in danger of extinction: one in eight species of birds, one in three of amphibians, and one in four of mammals.[3] Considering the convenience of modern life, it is easy for people to forget that they rely on natural ecosystems to live as much as other animals do. Advances in the production and distribution of food in the last fifty years have created the impression that humans have mastered their environment, but that is far from being the case. In recent years it has become apparent that much of the progress made in the past several decades came with a price. The ecosystems that human beings depend on for their very survival have been radically undermined, and today many of them appear to be on the verge of breaking down.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Trade Wars Empirically Go Hot

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

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

### 1NC – Ports

Protectionism is inevitable—current recession means countries will choose what’s best for them, no one else. AND your impact is non-unique.

Khaleej Times 09 [“Protectionism inevitable?”, 2-9-09, LexisNexis]

When unemployment hits record high, it is tempting to erect import barriers ignoring the repercussion the policy may have on neighbouring countries. It is all about survival, the government's at least. While the policy may lack economic sense, governments usually choose what is best for them over what is best for the country. Desperate to get out of economic slump of 1920s, the United States Congress adopted Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 that raised tariffs to record levels for over 20,000 imported goods. This provoked a wave of foreign retaliation that plunged the world deeper into the Great Depression. The world trade shrank by over 66 per cent during 1929-1934. It is happening all over again. The wildcat strikes over foreign workers or restriction on lending by banks only to local companies are modern day manifestation of protectionism. **A trade war**, though not as dangerous as the 1930s, **has already begun. The first move however, was done by the developing countries rather than the West**. Just after the November G-20 meeting, in which India and Russia warned against protectionist tendencies, raised duties on soya bean and cars respectively. India slapped 20 per cent duty on crude soya bean oil to help its palm oil producers. Russia slapped a similar duty on foreign cars to help its ailing auto industry and has either enacted or proposed 27 such tariff hikes to protect its industries. Argentina, Indonesia, Turkey and Egypt have imposed import restrictions on textiles. While China has increased export tax rebates for garment and textile makers and has further hinted that it will expand export tax rebates to other sectors. Meanwhile, India and China are in war over toys. It recently issued a 6 month ban on Chinese toys citing safety concerns. The move sent Indian Toy maker, Hanung Toys shares up 20 per cent in a day. The European Union's decision to bring back the dairy subsidy has upset Australia and New Zealand. The US congress might have backed off from an overt "Buy America" clause while agreeing on $820 billion stimulus package, one can be pretty sure that the softer version that is buried deep in the bill would be equally trade distorting. The US has already imposed strict limits on foreign guest workers (H1B visa holders). Senator Chuck Grassley wants a ban on hiring foreign worker at US banks.

No impact to blackouts

ASME 12 (American Society of Mechanical Engineers, engineering society, a standards organization, a research and development organization, a lobbying organization, a provider of training and education, and a nonprofit organization March 2012 “Report on Mercury Standard Sees No Danger of Blackouts.” EBSCO, CJD)

A report released by the Congressional Research Service analyzes emissions standards for mercury and other toxic pollution completed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in December 2011. The report found that claims of widespread blackouts due to the new standards are grossly overstated. The standards seek to reduce mercury and other toxic emissions from electric generating units by approximately 90 percent. The EPA estimates that the annualized cost of maximum achievable control technology could total $9.6 billion. It also predicts that the rule will save $37 billion to $90 billion, largely by avoiding 11,000 premature deaths annually. According to the report, "EPA's Utility MACT: Will the Lights Go Out?" the rule's costs will fall primarily on older coal-fired units that do not have state-of-the art pollution controls. The CRS report reviews industry data on planning reserve margins and potential retirement of units that do not currently meet the standards. Based on these data, it appears that, although the rule may lead to the retirement or derating of some facilities, almost all of the capacity reductions will occur in areas that have substantial reserve margins. The EPA estimates that the rule will raise the average price of electricity nationally by 3.1 percent by 2015.

Meltdowns don’t cause extinction- empirics

WNA 12 (World nuclear association members are responsible for 95% of the world's nuclear power outside of the U.S., as well as the vast majority of world uranium, conversion and enrichment production, “Safety of Nuclear Power Reactors”, March 2012, WNA, <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf06.html>, CJD)

In the 1950s attention turned to harnessing the power of the atom in a controlled way, as demonstrated at Chicago in 1942 and subsequently for military research, and applying the steady heat yield to generate electricity. This naturally gave rise to concerns about accidents and their possible effects. However, with nuclear power safety depends on much the same factors as in any comparable industry: intelligent planning, proper design with conservative margins and back-up systems, high-quality components and a well-developed safety culture in operations. A particular nuclear scenario was loss of cooling which resulted in melting of the nuclear reactor core, and this motivated studies on both the physical and chemical possibilities as well as the biological effects of any dispersed radioactivity. Those responsible for nuclear power technology in the West devoted extraordinary effort to ensuring that a meltdown of the reactor core would not take place, since it was assumed that a meltdown of the core would create a major public hazard, and if uncontained, a tragic accident with likely multiple fatalities. In avoiding such accidents the industry has been very successful. In over 14,500 cumulative reactor-years of commercial operation in 32 countries, there have been only three major accidents to nuclear power plants - Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima - the second being of little relevance to reactor design outside the old Soviet bloc. It was not until the late 1970s that detailed analyses and large-scale testing, followed by the 1979 meltdown of the Three Mile Island reactor, began to make clear that even the worst possible accident in a conventional western nuclear power plant or its fuel would not be likely to cause dramatic public harm. The industry still works hard to minimize the probability of a meltdown accident, but it is now clear that no-one need fear a potential public health catastrophe simply because a fuel meltdown happens. Fukushima has made that clear, with a triple meltdown causing no fatalities or serious radiation doses to anyone, while over two hundred people continued working on the site to mitigate the accident's effects. The decades-long test and analysis program showed that less radioactivity escapes from molten fuel than initially assumed, and that most of this radioactive material is not readily mobilized beyond the immediate internal structure. Thus, even if the containment structure that surrounds all modern nuclear plants were ruptured, as it has been with at least one of the Fukushima reactors, it is still very effective in preventing escape of most radioactivity. It is the laws of physics and the properties of materials that mitigate disaster, more than the required actions by safety equipment or personnel. In fact, licensing approval for new plants now requires that the effects of any core-melt accident must be confined to the plant itself, without the need to evacuate nearby residents. The three significant accidents in the 50-year history of civil nuclear power generation are: Three Mile Island (USA 1979) where the reactor was severely damaged but radiation was contained and there were no adverse health or environmental consequences Chernobyl (Ukraine 1986) where the destruction of the reactor by steam explosion and fire killed 31 people and had significant health and environmental consequences. The death toll has since increased to about 5 Fukushima (Japan 2011) where three old reactors (together with a fourth) were written off and the effects of loss of cooling due to a huge tsunami were inadequately contained. A table showing all reactor accidents, and a table listing some energy-related accidents with multiple fatalities are appended. These three significant accidents occurred during more than 14,000 reactor-years of civil operation. Of all the accidents and incidents, only the Chernobyl and Fukushima accidents resulted in radiation doses to the public greater than those resulting from the exposure to natural sources. The Fukushima accident resulted in some radiation exposure of workers at the plant, but not such as to threaten their health, unlike Chernobyl. Other incidents (and one 'accident') have been completely confined to the plant. Apart from Chernobyl, no nuclear workers or members of the public have ever died as a result of exposure to radiation due to a commercial nuclear reactor incident. Most of the serious radiological injuries and deaths that occur each year (2-4 deaths and many more exposures above regulatory limits) are the result of large uncontrolled radiation sources, such as abandoned medical or industrial equipment. (There have also been a number of accidents in experimental reactors and in one military plutonium-producing pile - at Windscale, UK, in 1957, but none of these resulted in loss of life outside the actual plant, or long-term environmental contamination.) See also Table 2 in Appendix.

#### Grid Problems Prevent Solvency

Rosenbloom 6 (Eric, Science Writer, president of National Wind Watch, September 2006, A Problem with Wind Power, <http://www.aweo.org/ProblemWithWind.html>, summary)

The biggest problem with large-scale wind-powered electricity generation is the grid. A home system can work well because the fluctuating output (even in the windiest places it is highly variable) can be regulated by batteries, and another source (the grid or a gas-powered generator) is tied in to kick in when need be. This is the model where larger systems work in isolated villages, too. But industrial-scale wind plants designed to supply the grid do not work well, even where the wind is superb. The grid is meant to respond to demand, constantly modulating the various suppliers to match the demand exactly. Wind plants respond only to the wind, forcing the more controllable "conventional" plants to change their output in response to wind production as well as to grid demand. And the need to respond within seconds to a drop in wind production requires a plant that runs more inefficiently than one that could run if the grid didn't have to cope with the unpredictable fluctuations of significant wind-powered sources. That is to say, wind farms may actually cause more fossil fuel burning. The huge turbines designed for the grid can't work without electricity from the grid, either. They produce on average 25%-35% of what they are capable of, but they are using electricity (apparently free) 100% of the time. And a problem about sites with good steady strong winds is that they are too windy. The turbines can't handle strong gusts and automatically shut down (typically around 55 mph). So "good" sites turn out to be very little more productive than less windy ones.

#### Wind can never support the grid – requires back up fuel

Driessen 12 (MAKE THIS CITE MATCH, 8 May 2012, Big Wind Subsidies: Time to Terminate?, <http://www.masterresource.org/2012/05/wind-subsidies-terminate/#more-19930>)

Energy 101. It is impossible to have wind turbines without fossil fuels, especially natural gas. Turbines average only 30% of their “rated capacity” – and less than 5% on the hottest and coldest days, when electricity is needed most. They produce excessive electricity when it is least needed, and electricity cannot be stored for later use. Hydrocarbon-fired backup generators must run constantly, to fill the gap and avoid brownouts, blackouts, and grid destabilization due to constant surges and falloffs in electricity to the grid. Wind turbines frequently draw electricity from the grid, to keep blades turning when the wind is not blowing, reduce strain on turbine gears, and prevent icing during periods of winter calm.¶ Energy 201.Despite tens of billions in subsidies, wind turbines still generate less than 3% of US electricity. Thankfully, conventional sources keep our country running – and America still has centuries of hydrocarbon resources. It’s time our government allowed us to develop and use those resources.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### Grid Problems Prevent Solvency

Rosenbloom 6 (Eric, Science Writer, president of National Wind Watch, September 2006, A Problem with Wind Power, <http://www.aweo.org/ProblemWithWind.html>, summary)

The biggest problem with large-scale wind-powered electricity generation is the grid. A home system can work well because the fluctuating output (even in the windiest places it is highly variable) can be regulated by batteries, and another source (the grid or a gas-powered generator) is tied in to kick in when need be. This is the model where larger systems work in isolated villages, too. But industrial-scale wind plants designed to supply the grid do not work well, even where the wind is superb. The grid is meant to respond to demand, constantly modulating the various suppliers to match the demand exactly. Wind plants respond only to the wind, forcing the more controllable "conventional" plants to change their output in response to wind production as well as to grid demand. And the need to respond within seconds to a drop in wind production requires a plant that runs more inefficiently than one that could run if the grid didn't have to cope with the unpredictable fluctuations of significant wind-powered sources. That is to say, wind farms may actually cause more fossil fuel burning. The huge turbines designed for the grid can't work without electricity from the grid, either. They produce on average 25%-35% of what they are capable of, but they are using electricity (apparently free) 100% of the time. And a problem about sites with good steady strong winds is that they are too windy. The turbines can't handle strong gusts and automatically shut down (typically around 55 mph). So "good" sites turn out to be very little more productive than less windy ones.

#### Intermittency dooms Wind

The Washington Times 8/9/12 (George Steeg, <http://p.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/aug/9/wind-turbine-hot-air/>, Letter to the Editor: Wind Turbine Hot Air)

Paul Driessen presents a grisly picture of the slaughter of eagles, whooping cranes and other “majestic sovereigns of the sky,” large and small (“Wind-energy tax credits fund bird murder,” Commentary, Tuesday). What Mr. Driessen omits is perspective on the paltry amount of electricity generated by what he aptly calls “bird Cuisinarts.” Total electricity from the existing and planned wind turbines in the six whooping crane flyway states will amount to only one-quarter of the output of one nuclear plant. Even worse, wind farms provide electricity at full-power output for only an average of eight hours a day, and output can drop to zero without warning. Full nuclear-power output, and the electricity from smaller coal- and gas-fired alternatives, is available 24 hours every day and never drops to zero. Since an intermittent megawatt generated by wind is no substitute for a dependable megawatt generated by coal, gas or nuclear power, and each wind megawatt must be backed up by a coal, gas or nuclear megawatt, why can’t
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### Overview

#### \*\*\*\*\*-- It solves the whole case better

Glicksman and Shapiro 4 (Robert L., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, and Sidney A., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, “Improving Regulation through Incremental Adjustment,” Kansas Law Review, 52 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1179, Hein Online)

Reform of environmental and other regulation has been a popular topic for academics, think-tanks, and interested parties for the last two decades. Claiming that existing regulation is excessive and irrational, critics have successfully convinced Congress and the White House to implement a plethora of procedural requirements to analyze a proposed regulation before it is promulgated.1 In our recent book, Risk Regulation at Risk,2 we argued that the previous initiatives address the possibility of regulatory failure on the wrong end of the regulatory policy implementation process. Current efforts to rationalize environmental and other health and safety regulation at the "front end" of the regulatory process are doomed to fail because of moral, methodological, and informational limitations.3 We suggested that one way of improving regulation would be to rely on incremental adjustments in regulation on the "back end" of the regulatory process.4 One important advantage of proceeding in this manner is that regulatory policy is adjusted in light of its actual impact, as compared to the significant guesswork that is required to use front-end analysis. In this manner, a back-end adjustment process is consistent with the pragmatic approach to public policy that we advocated in the book.5 This article addresses in more detail the potential of two types of back-end processes: (1) deadline extensions and (2) waivers, exceptions, and variances.6 Our analysis proceeds in three steps. Part II describes the almost exclusive focus of regulatory reformers on the front end of the process. Part III offers a close examination of five federal statutes that provide opportunities for the two types of adjustments we are studying. The results confirm our earlier assertion that Congress has authorized agencies such as **the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),** the Occu- pational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and **the Interior Department** to make these types of back-end adjustments available in a variety of contexts and for a variety of reasons.7 Our analysis reveals that Congress has established six different grounds for back-end adjustment, and we assess the potential for each of these grounds to improve regulatory policy. Although we recommend the imposition of conditions on the issuance of some of these back-end adjustments, we find that these adjustments are generally consistent with the precautionary tilt of the statutes in which they are located because they still require the regulated entity to do the best it can to protect people and the environment. Where such protective mechanisms are absent, we urge that the statutes be amended to include them. Part IV analyzes the procedures by which requests for back-end adjustments are currently processed. We find that agencies consider most applications for back-end adjustments using informal procedures that include public notice and solicitation of public comments, although in a few instances, more formal procedures apply. We favor the informal approach because it is an efficient way for agencies to respond to the issues raised by requests for back-end adjustments and because more elaborate procedures are not necessary to promote rational decision- making, given the nature of the issues likely to be raised in back-end adjustment proceedings. We are concerned, however, about the extent to which effective public participation will occur under these procedures. We therefore endorse two steps to enhance the transparency of back-end adjustment decision-making: the establishment of electronic reading rooms and the issuance by agencies of **annual reports on back-end adjustments**.8 We argue that these two mechanisms will facilitate involvement by public interest groups and interested citizens by allowing them to prioritize the adjustment proceedings in which they wish to become involved. The result is likely to be enhanced agency accountability and reduced opportunities for agency abuse of the back-end adjustment process.

### Perm Do Both – 2NC

#### Perm links to elections – the president will influence agency decision and get the blame

Stephenson 6 (Matthew C., Assistant Professor of Law – Harvard Law School, “Legislative Allocation of Delegated Power: Uncertainty, Risk, and the Choice between Agencies and Courts,” Harvard Law Review, 119 Harv. L. Rev. 1035-1047, Ebsco)

Some slack-minimization theories also emphasize institutional differences between agencies and courts. For example, because courts are more politically insulated than agencies, they may be less susceptible to ongoing congressional influence.^" While this observation suggests that legislators would prefer delegation to agencies, over which they have more control, such a conclusion is problematic. Agencies are also susceptible to influence by the President, and the President's influence over agency decision making is almost certainly greater than Congress's.'° Legislators might also fear that the preferences of future legislatures will diverge from their own.\*' A legislator who anticipates ideological divisions with the President or future legislators might therefore prefer delegation to courts.^^ Slack-minimization considerations thus entail complex tradeoffs and do not clearly favor agencies or courts as a general matter.

#### \*CP avoids elections by submerging presidential influence – perm magnifies presidential action – swings the election

-perm shows consistency with agency decision 🡪 accountability

-presidential influence inevitable – question of how much – cp shields, perm links

-voters are dumb

-even if voters are smart, presidents are nifty

Mendelson 10 (Nina A., Professor of Law – University of Michigan Law School, “Disclosing “Political” Oversight of

Agency Decision Making,” Michigan Law Review, Vol. 108, p.1127-1175, http://www.michiganlawreview.org/assets/pdfs/108/7/mendelson.pdf)

Even if presidential supervision of agency decisions is well known to the voting population, holding a President accountable for particular agency decisions is hard enough, given the infrequency of elections, the number of issues typically on the agenda at the time of a presidential election, presidencies that only last two terms, and presidential candidates who are vague about how the administrative state would run. 175 It is all the more difficult if the public does not know what influence the President may have had or may end up having on particular agency decisions. “To the extent that presidential supervision of agencies remains hidden from public scrutiny, the President will have greater freedom to [assist] parochial interests.” 176 Calling for greater disclosure to the electorate is not to say that majoritarian preferences should dictate agency decision making. Increasing transparency regarding presidential influence on a particular agency decision may or may not make agency decision making simply a “handmaiden of majoritarianism,” as Bressman suggests. 177 Instead, it could facilitate a public dialogue where citizens are persuaded that the decision made, though not the first-cut “majoritarian preference,” is still the correct decision for the country. By comparison, submerging presidential preferences undermines electoral accountability for agency decisions and reduces the chances of a public dialogue on policy. One might respond that the public already knows that the President appoints agency heads and can remove them, and that White House offices review significant agency rules before they are issued. And the public knows the content of the agency’s decision. Shouldn’t that be sufficient to ensure democratic accountability through the electoral process? 178 That level of knowledge might suffice, but only if the public perceives federal agencies as indistinguishable from the President. Voters are sophisticated enough to know, however, that agencies represent large and sometimes unresponsive bureaucracies, a view sometimes promoted by Presidents themselves. Presidents certainly do not consistently foster the view that executive branch agencies are under their complete control. Instead, they have been known to blame the agencies for unpopular decisions and to try to distance themselves. 179 Bressman gives the example of the second Bush Administration distancing itself from the IRS, while at the same time quietly pressuring the agency to revise a proposed rule requiring domestic banks to reveal the identity of all depositors, including foreign ones. 180 Administrators may also “take the fall” for an unpopular decision that is influenced by the White House, as EPA Administrator Johnson appeared to do in denying the California greenhouse gas waiver. 181 And as mentioned earlier, President Obama has selectively taken credit for federal agency actions relating to automotive greenhouse gas emissions, with his OMB only grudgingly backing an EPA proposed rule in response to political controversy. 182 Similarly, President George W. Bush distanced himself from an EPA report concluding that global warming was anthropogenic, even though that report had been reviewed by White House offices prior to its release. In answer to questions from reporters, President Bush commented, “I read the report put out by the bureaucracy.” 183 More recently, when news reports suggested that the White House was pressing the EPA to “edit” its climate change findings, the White House spokesman stated that the agency alone “ ‘determines what analysis it wants to make available’ in its documents.” 184 Finally, take the rash of resignations at the EPA in the mid-1980s, including Administrator Gorsuch and Assistant Administrator Lavelle, arising out of allegations of serious misconduct and conflicts of interest within the agency. President Reagan succeeded in distancing himself from the agency’s problems by presenting the agency as acting more or less independently. 185 Despite issuing directives, 186 Presidents certainly have a significant incentive to keep influence on agency decisions low-key and to maintain “deniability” with respect to agency actions. This minimizes the risk that influence can be characterized later as improperly motivated, that debate within the executive branch can fuel litigation over the ultimate decision, or that the President will have a political price to pay for guessing wrong about what option best serves the public interest. And, of course, keeping a low profile for presidential influence also allows more successful presidential pressure that is the result of presidential capture. 187 All this amounts to reduced electoral accountability for actions taken by administrative agencies. 188 If presidential supervision is submerged, rather than declared publicly, it may also undercut a claimed advantage of presidential leadership—the ability of the President to be responsive to national views. Voters often do not know what they think, particularly about focused issues that are the subject of agency action. 189 It may take an event, a government action, or a public discussion to engage an individual voter with specifics so that she can form preferences. As I have described in an earlier work, controversy over the Clinton Administration’s “midnight rulemaking” relating to issues such as road building in national forests and the level of arsenic in drinking water prompted significant public discussion on those issues and probably helped voters crystallize their preferences regarding them. 190 While the electorate could also react to individual agency decisions, presidential actions are often more visible, and voters may also be more engaged, given their entitlement to help select or decide whether to retain a President.

### Econ

#### AND - even if wars occur, they won’t escalate.

Bennett & Nordstrom 2k [Department of Political Science Professors @ Penn state U, D. Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic problems in Enduring Rivalries” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Feb., p33-61]

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a **cheap, quick** **victory** that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states’ desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

#### 93 examples are on our side

**Miller 2k** [Morris Miller, Winter 2K. economist and adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration and former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank. Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 25.4]

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

### Solvency

#### Wind Power is “Inordinately Expensive”

The Blaze 12 (Jan 10, Environmental Writer Liz Klimas, Report: Hidden Expenses Associated with Wind Farming cancels out ‘Green’ Benefits, <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/report-hidden-expenses-associated-with-wind-farming-could-cancel-out-green-benefits/>)

Civitas, an independent think tank, recently published a report by British economist Ruth Lea — director of the manufacturing renewal project at Civitas and an economic adviser to the Arbuthnot Banking Group – that concludes the expense of wind farms and need for backup energy makes harvesting wind “inordinately expensive and ineffective at cutting emissions.” According to the U.K.’s Climate Change Act, signed in 2008, greenhouse gas emission goals set a 20 percent reduction by 2020 compared to 1990 levels and an 80 percent cut by 2050. Such drastic reductions fundamentally change the way many businesses operate and require adoption of renewable energy or carbon-cutting technology. Since generation of electricity alone accounted for nearly a third of the U.K.’s CO2 emissions in 2010, according to the report, this is clearly an area where the government is seeking to make improvements. The Telegraph reports that the U.K. plans to build as many as 32,000 wind turbines in the next two decades. This initiative is part of a goal set by EU’s Renewables Directive to have 15 percent of the energy produced in the U.K. come from renewables by 2020. The Lea report states that while wind power looks like a competitive option for alternative energy, additional costs associated are not being considered and may in fact negate the carbon-saving benefits: The costing of wind-power electricity generation is clearly very complex. But one conclusion can safely be drawn and that is that wind-power is expensive – especially offshore. Under these circumstances it seems unwise to be embarking on a huge programme of investment in wind generated electricity, especially when the country is facing grave economic challenges. This analysis also ignores the perceived environmental costs of wind-power, especially onshore wind turbines.

#### Wind is inefficient and unsightly

DailyMail 12 (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2100259/Wind-turbines-public-menace-wind-efficient-renewable-power-National-Trust-says.html> February, “Turbines are a 'public menace' and wind is the 'least efficient' renewable power, National Trust says”)

Wind turbines are a ‘public menace’, the chairman of the National Trust chairman has said. Sir Simon Jenkins dismissed wind as the ‘least efficient’ renewable power. The honest admission is surprising coming from the the head of the charity, as it champions green energy as part of its conservation work. ‘We are doing masses of renewables but wind is probably the least efficient and wrecks the countryside,’ he said. While the National Trust officially continues to support ‘a major increase in the UK’s renewable energy generation’, it is fighting several plans for wind farms, including one to erect a massive 417 wind turbines in the Bristol Channel. The trust is concerned about the impact of the 220m (721ft) turbines on the environment and on views of the coastline. Ed Davey boasted that Britain had 'a lot to be proud of' after the world's biggest offshore farm opened It is also disputing the Duke of Gloucester’s plans to build four 415ft turbines on his Barnwell Manor Estate in Northamptonshire. The trust remains committed to its target to cut energy use by 50 per cent by 2020, but Sir Simon told the Daily Telegraph this would largely be achieved through water power and biomass boilers, making the most of the acres of rivers and woodlands under its ownership

#### Energy output not worth the drawbacks

The Washington Times 8/9/12 (George Steeg, <http://p.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/aug/9/wind-turbine-hot-air/>, Letter to the Editor: Wind Turbine Hot Air)

Paul Driessen presents a grisly picture of the slaughter of eagles, whooping cranes and other “majestic sovereigns of the sky,” large and small (“Wind-energy tax credits fund bird murder,” Commentary, Tuesday). What Mr. Driessen omits is perspective on the paltry amount of electricity generated by what he aptly calls “bird Cuisinarts.” Total electricity from the existing and planned wind turbines in the six whooping crane flyway states will amount to only one-quarter of the output of one nuclear plant. Even worse, wind farms provide electricity at full-power output for only an average of eight hours a day, and output can drop to zero without warning. Full nuclear-power output, and the electricity from smaller coal- and gas-fired alternatives, is available 24 hours every day and never drops to zero. Since an intermittent megawatt generated by wind is no substitute for a dependable megawatt generated by coal, gas or nuclear power, and each wind megawatt must be backed up by a coal, gas or nuclear megawatt, why can’t we just stop with the wind turbines and save the birds?

#### Wind doesn’t live up to the hype

The Washington Times 8/6/12 (Paul Driessen, “Wind-energy tax credits fund bird murder,” “Eagles being sliced back toward extinction,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/aug/6/wind-energy-tax-credits-fund-bird-murder/)

Clean-energy devotees are proposing that the $2,200-per-megawatt wind energy production tax credit be extended as part of “all of the above” energy policies. The slogan falls flat, even when it’s expanded to “all of the above and below ground.” Instead, America needs an “all of the sensible” energy policies. If an energy option makes sense — technically, economically and environmentally — it should be implemented. If it flunks, it should be scrapped. Industrial wind energy fails every test. It requires perpetual subsidies to survive. By taking tax revenues from productive sectors of the economy to provide expensive, unreliable electricity, it kills two to four jobs for every “green” job it creates. Big Wind requires vast land and raw materials for turbines, backup power and transmission lines. China’s rare earth metals industry devastates agricultural and wildlife habitat areas and harms human health.
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### Elections

#### US- Russia war is the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### Turns case - Romney’s economic plan causes economic collapse --- kills the housing market and consumer spending

**Waldron**, 1/12/**2012** (Travis, Economists: Romney’s Economic Plan Fails to Deal With ‘Main Drags’ On U.S. Economy, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/12/403210/economists-romneys-draconian/)

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney’s (R) economic plan has become the centerpiece of his presidential campaign. Though his proposals are often vague, analyses of the plan shows that it would provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while raising taxes on low-income families. And though Romney claims to be concerned about the federal budget deficit, his plan would add more than $6 trillion in deficits over 10 years. Romney, who touts his experience as a job creator, has suggested laying off thousands of public sector workers. He wants to slash vital programs for the poor and middle-classes, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and gut Medicare and Social Security. His embrace of the radical Cut, Cap, and Balance plan pushed by House Republicans would, in effect, shrink the federal government to pre-Ronald Reagan era sizes. But for all his talk about the plan on the campaign trail, economists surveyed by Reuters say Romney’s plan likely wouldn’t deal with the main drags on the American economy, while the cuts to vital programs would be “utterly draconian“: These steps would shrink the federal government’s role more than even former president Ronald Reagan managed 30 years ago when he turned many social programs over to the states. That scenario concerns liberal economists. “If applied, these fiscal measures would be utterly draconian. The attacks on Medicare and Social Security would throw large portions of the population into poverty,” said Jamie Galbraith, business professor at the University of Texas in Austin. Mainstream economists worry more that neither Romney nor his Republican opponents are addressing the main drag on the U.S. economy – weak demand from American consumers still weighed down by debt. Among the “main drags” highlighted in the Reuters piece is the housing crisis, which has placed “a big drag on consumer spending which drives two thirds of the U.S. economy.” But the GOP candidates have offered little in the way of solutions for the crisis, and Romney’s own prescription involves letting the housing market hit rock bottom — further damaging millions of homeowners. “Markets work,” Romney told moderators at a debate in November when asked what he would do to address the housing crisis. According to former Wall Street economist Thomas Gallagher, addressing demand should be at the top of the list when it comes to speeding the recovery. Instead, Romney is focused on budget deficits and tax reform — the types of austerity measures that are pushing Europe toward another recession. Perhaps that’s why a survey of economics professors found that the Republican proposals were so bad, they wouldn’t pass an Econ 101 class.

#### Romney will roll back wind tax credits.

**The Hill**, 7/30/**2012** (Romney campaign: Let wind energy credit die this year, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/241107-romney-campaign-let-wind-energy-credit-die-this-year)

Mitt Romney’s campaign said Monday that he wants longstanding tax credits that help finance wind energy projects to expire at year’s end, providing a stark political contrast with President Obama, who is pushing Congress to renew the incentive. Campaign aides confirmed that Romney wants the quick demise of the credits, which will lapse in less than six months absent congressional action, ending uncertainty about how he wants to phase out the credits.

#### Obama re-election key to health care reform

Nather 11 (David – POLITICO, “Health care reform's fate could be determined by 2012 races”, 10/8, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/65426.html>)

Think the Supreme Court is the only place to watch for the future of health care reform? You might want to read a few polls first. As President Barack Obama’s reelection prospects fall, the health reform law’s chances of survival seem to fall, too. So far, the Republicans’ efforts to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act have been entirely symbolic; without control of the Senate or the White House, there’s not much they can actually do. But now, with Democrats on the defensive in the Senate and Obama’s poll numbers tanking — 43 percent of those surveyed in a recent POLITICO/George Washington University Battleground Poll said they definitely won’t vote for his reelection — the law’s opponents are beginning to think about repeal strategies that could get them to the finish line. The supporters aren’t panicking — but they’re paying attention. “The prospects of the Affordable Care Act hinge totally on the 2012 elections,” said Ron Pollack, executive director of the health care consumer group Families USA. “If President Obama is reelected — and I’m fairly confident he will be, but that’s for others to judge — then the Affordable Care Act is going to move forward, pure and simple.” That’s one scenario. But there are at least four others — each of which has major implications for the future of the health reform law and health care in America. 1. Obama loses, Republicans take the Senate by a lot: Health reform is toast This is the scenario with the most obvious result: If there’s a Republican president and the GOP wins a wide majority in the Senate — say, 57 seats — the health reform law is probably history. It would take 60 votes in the Senate to break a filibuster and pass a bill repealing the entire law — or, at least, the parts that haven’t gone into effect yet. But even if the Republicans don’t control that many votes, they might be close enough to pick up the needed crossover votes. That’s because, if they win the White House and such a large margin in the Senate, they’ll argue to the remaining Democrats that the election was a mandate to change course — and scrap the health care law. In reality, the public is closely divided over the law, and some polls find a minority favor outright repeal, as opposed to making changes in it. But repeal is a Republican priority, so expect them to push it with all the momentum they can muster. All of the Republican presidential candidates have committed to signing repeal into law. The best scenario for Republicans is that “Obama loses in a dramatic enough fashion that Democrats are afraid to stick with the law, and they get to 60,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the American Action Forum and a former adviser to Sen. John McCain’s 2008 presidential campaign. 2. Obama loses, Republicans take the Senate by a little: Health reform loses big chunks The more likely scenario — based on how the Senate races look at the moment — is that if the Republicans win the Senate, it would be by a thin margin. So a Republican majority of, say, 52 seats wouldn’t be able to get 60 votes to repeal the whole law. But there’s another tool they could use to wipe out big parts of the law with just 51 votes: a budget reconciliation bill. That strategy would be a lot more complicated, because it wouldn’t let Republicans repeal the whole law. Under budget rules, anything that passes through reconciliation — which can’t be filibustered — has to have a budget impact. In other words, it has to change spending levels or revenue in some way. Given the scope of the health law and its economic impact, that gives the Republicans lots of room to maneuver — but it’s not limitless. Democrats used reconciliation in 2010 to rewrite parts of the health care reform legislation before they passed the final version, but there were tweaks they couldn’t make that way. (The abortion coverage language, which anti-abortion Democrats wanted to make tougher, was the most notable example.) If a narrowly Republican Senate uses budget reconciliation, it could certainly repeal the expensive subsidies to help people buy insurance, and the scheduled expansion of Medicaid. It may well be able to get rid of the hated individual mandate — the requirement for nearly all Americans to get health insurance — unless the Supreme Court gets there first. Beyond that, though, it’s not clear what could get through. For example, could a Republican Senate get rid of the new rule, starting in 2014, banning insurance companies from turning down people with pre-existing health problems? Since that’s a rule that affects private insurers, not the federal government, it might be harder for lawmakers to argue that it has a direct budget impact. “You can clearly do away with the essence of health reform,” but “you never know exactly what the parliamentarian is going to do until he’s presented with a bill and says, ‘yes, you can do this’ and ‘no, you can’t do that,’” said Paul Van de Water, a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and a former analyst for the Congressional Budget Office. Holtz-Eakin said that uncertainty could limit the effectiveness of a budget reconciliation strategy. Even if a Republican House and Senate could repeal the central provisions of the health law and get a Republican president to sign the bill, “you can still be left with a vestige of insurance reform that wouldn’t make any sense,” he said. Republicans would have to figure out how to pay for the repeal — since the health care law creates enough savings through Medicare payment cuts and other provisions, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that it would actually cost money to repeal it. One option for Republicans would be to keep those Medicare cuts in place — as House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan’s budget did. But that would be a tough sell for Republicans, since they campaigned against the cuts in 2010 and could try it again next year. Still, Republicans are likely to look at budget reconciliation as a big step on the road to repeal, if that’s what they have to use. “It gets you a long way,” said Eric Ueland, a vice president at the Duberstein Group and a longtime Republican Senate aide who served as chief of staff to former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. There's also a newer repeal scenario emerging now, after Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's Thursday manuever to change the Senate rules. Since Reid was able to do that through a narrow, 51-48 vote to overrule the parliamentarian, there's talk on the Hill that Republicans could use the same kind of vote to force a last-minute amendment to repeal the entire health care law — and get it through with 51 votes. It's still speculative, but keep an eye on that scenario, too.

#### Healthcare boosts bioterror readiness --- checks disease outbreaks

Sklar 2 (Holly, Nationally Syndicated Columnist, Author, Policy Analyst, and Strategist, “Rolling the Dice on Our Nation’s Health”, Common Dreams, 12-19, <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/1219-07.htm>)

Imagine if the first people infected in a smallpox attack had no health insurance and delayed seeking care for their flu-like symptoms. The odds are high. Pick a number from one to six. Would you bet your life on a roll of the dice? Would you play Russian Roulette with one bullet in a six-chamber gun? One in six Americans under age 65 has no health insurance. The uninsured are more likely to delay seeking medical care, go to work sick for fear of losing their jobs, seek care at overcrowded emergency rooms and clinics, and be poorly diagnosed and treated. The longer smallpox--or another contagious disease--goes undiagnosed, the more it will spread, with the insured and uninsured infecting each other. Healthcare is literally a matter of life and death. Yet, more than 41 million Americans have no health insurance of any kind, public or private. The uninsured rate was 14.6 percent in 2001--up 13 percent since 1987. The rate is on the rise with increased healthcare costs, unemployment and cutbacks in Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). One in four people with household incomes less than $25,000 is uninsured. One in six full-time workers is uninsured, including half the full-time workers with incomes below the official poverty line. The share of workers covered by employment health plans drops from 81 percent in the top fifth of wage earners to 68 percent in the middle fifth to 33 percent in the lowest fifth, according to the Economic Policy Institute. As reports by the American College of Physicians, Kaiser Family Foundation and many others have shown, lack of health insurance is associated with lack of preventive care and substandard treatment inside and outside the hospital. The uninsured are at much higher risk for chronic diseaseand disability, and have a 25 percent greater chance of dying (adjusting for physical, economic and behavioral factors). To make matters worse, a health crisis is often an economic crisis. "Medical bills are a factor in nearly half of all personal bankruptcy filings," reports the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending per capita, but No. 34--tied with Malaysia--when it comes to child mortality rates under age five. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending, but the only major industrialized nation not to provide some form of universal coverage. We squander billions of dollars in the red tape of myriad healthcare eligibility regulations, forms and procedures, and second-guessing of doctors by insurance gatekeepers trained in cost cutting, not medicine. Americans go to Canada for cheaper prices on prescription drugs made by U.S. pharmaceutical companies with U.S. taxpayer subsidies. While millions go without healthcare, top health company executives rake in the dough. A report by Families USA found that the highest-paid health plan executives in ten companies received average compensation of $11.7 million in 2000, not counting unexercised stock options worth tens of millions more. The saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," couldn't be truer when it comes to healthcare. Yet, we provide universal coverage for seniors through Medicare, but not for children. We have economic disincentives for timely diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Universal healthcare is a humane and cost-effective solution to the growing healthcare crisis. Universal coverage won't come easy, but neither did Social Security or Medicare, which now serves one in seven Americans. Many proposals for universal healthcare build on the foundation of "Medicare for All," albeit an improved Medicare adequately serving seniors and younger people alike. Healthcare is as essential to equal opportunity as public education and as essential to public safety as police and fire protection. If your neighbor's house were burning, would you want 911 operators to ask for their fire insurance card number before sending--or not sending--fire trucks? Healthcare ranked second behind terrorism and national security as the most critical issue for the nation in the 2002 Health Confidence Surveyreleased by the Employee Benefit Research Institute. The government thinks the smallpox threat is serious enough to start inoculating militaryand medical personnelwith a highly risky vaccine.It's time to stop delaying universalhealthcare, which will save lives everyday while boosting our readiness for any bioterror attack.

#### Extinction

Ochs 2 (Richard, Member – Chemical Weapons Working Group, “Biological Weapons Must be Abolished Immediately, 6-9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### Obama is winning --- momentum

**Blake**, **9/20**/2012 (Aaron, Is the 2012 election tilting toward Democrats?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/is-the-2012-election-tilting-toward-democrats/>)

Either we’re at a turning point in the 2012 election, or a lot of pollsters are getting it wrong. The question for the past week-plus has been whether President Obama’s convention bounce and a series of stumbles for Mitt Romney have recast the 2012 race. Some national polls say yes, and a few say no. But more and more, the data at the state level point to some real movement in Democrats’ favor. At least for now. As we wrote Tuesday, Gallup polling shows that the bump Obama got from the Democratic convention two weeks ago has subsided. And another new poll, released Wednesday by the Associated Press and pollster GfK, shows basically the same picture, with 47 percent of likely voters supporting Obama and 46 percent backing Romney — a tie ballgame nationally. But almost every state-specific poll in the last few days has shown progress for Democrats — both at the presidential level and in the very important contest for the Senate — with some showing unprecedented leads for the blue side in the the most important states. Swing-state polls from CBS News, the New York Times and Quinnipiac University released Wednesday morning in three key states — Colorado, Virginia and Wisconsin — showed Obama either gaining since last month or, in the case of Virginia, holding his lead. And Fox News polls released Wednesday evening showed Obama with a solid lead in the three biggest swing states; he’s up by seven points each in Ohio and Virginia and five points in Florida. The results confirm polls from NBC News and Marist College in the same three states last week. A Washington Post poll released Tuesday confirms the movement in Virginia, with Obama up by an unprecedented eight points. And a Marquette University Law School poll released Wednesday supports the idea that the race in Wisconsin has shifted, with Obama leading by an astounding 14 points. Even if some of these margins seem a little big, just consider that even the best polls for Romney haven’t shown him with that kind of lead in these states — or really anything close to it. In fact, Nate Silver points out that, of the 16 live-interview swing state polls conducted in the last two weeks, Obama is leading in all of them except Colorado by at least four points.

#### Clean energy attacks will swing the election for Romney ---it outweighs other issues.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. <http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how_dirty_is_romney_prepared_to_get_to_win_election>)

Is Barack Obama sufficiently dirty to win re-election? Not according to presumptive Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who says the president is too spic and span. Calculating that clean energy is passé among Americans more concerned about jobs and their own pocketbooks, Romney is gambling that he can tip swing voters his way by embracing dirtier air and water if the tradeoff is more employment and economic growth. Romney's gamble is essentially a bet on the demonstrated disruptive potency of shale gas and shale oil, which over the last year or so have shaken up geopolitics from Russia to the Middle East and China. Now, Romney and the GOP leadership hope they will have the same impact on U.S. domestic politics, and sweep the former Massachusetts governor into the White House with a strong Republican majority in Congress. A flood of new oil and natural gas production in states such as North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas is changing the national and global economies. U.S. oil production is projected to reach 6.3 million barrels a day this year, the highest volume since 1997, the Energy Information Agency reported Tuesday. In a decade or so, U.S. oil supplies could help to shrink OPEC's influence as a global economic force. Meanwhile, a glut of cheap U.S. shale gas has challenged Russia's economic power in Europe and is contributing to a revolution in how the world powers itself. But Romney and the GOP assert that Obama is slowing the larger potential of the deluge, and is not up to the task of turning it into what they say ought to be a gigantic jobs machine. The president's critics say an unfettered fossil fuels industry could produce 1.4 million new jobs by 2030. They believe that American voters won't be too impressed with Obama's argument that he is leading a balanced energy-and-jobs approach that includes renewable fuels and electric cars. The GOP's oil-and-jobs campaign -- in April alone, 81 percent of U.S. political ads attacking Obama were on the subject of energy, according to Kantar Media, a firm that tracks political advertising -- is a risk that could backfire. Americans could decide that they prefer clean energy after all. Or, as half a dozen election analysts and political science professors told me, energy -- even if it seems crucial at this moment in time -- may not be a central election issue by November. Yet if the election is as close as the polls suggest, the energy ads could prove a pivotal factor. "Advertising is generally not decisive. Advertising matters at the margins. ... But ask Al Gore if the margin matters," said Ken Goldstein, president of the Campaign Media Analysis Group at Kantar Media. "This is looking like an election where the margin may matter." Romney is hardly the first major U.S. presidential candidate to embrace Big Oil. The politics of clean go back to Lady Bird Johnson's war on litter and Richard Nixon's embrace of environmentalism. But both presidents Bush came from the oil industry, and former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, the last GOP vice presidential nominee, gleefully led chants of "Drill, baby, drill" in 2008. Yet President George W. Bush also famously declared that "America is addicted to oil" in his 2006 State of the Union address, and initiated most of the energy programs for which Obama is currently under fire. And Palin's drumbeat in the end seemed to fall flat. The Republican efforts appear to go beyond any modern campaign in their brash embrace of what is dirty, and their scorn of what is not. And the times seem to favor them. In 2009, the GOP, backed by heavy industry lobbying, knocked back environmentalists on their heels by crushing global warming legislation. Other previously central issues -- Afghanistan, Iraq, health care -- are still debated in the campaign, but not as centrally nor as viscerally as energy, said Frank Maisano, an energy and political analyst at Bracewell & Giuliani, a Houston-based law firm. Obama advisors have said rightly that energy is only one component of a much broader American and global economy, but the GOP appears to have at least partially successfully injected the oil and gas boom as a defining feature of the economic discourse. In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times entitled "America's New Energy Reality," industry consultant Daniel Yergin remarked that while Obama's 2010 State of the Union address focused on clean-energy jobs, the president pivoted this year to talk as much about oil and natural gas. "His announcement that ‘American oil production is the highest it has been in eight years' turned out to be an applause line," Yergin noted

#### Obama is winning the majority of polls in Ohio.

**Silver, 9/18**/2012 (Nate, How to Solve the Swing-State Puzzle, New York Time Magazine, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/23/magazine/nate-silver-solves-the-swing-state-puzzle.html?pagewanted=all)

The Big Two: Ohio (32 percent chance of determining the Electoral College winner) and Florida (20 percent). This year, Obama’s polling has been stronger than many observers (myself included) expected in each state, both of which typically lean slightly Republican. In Ohio, which Obama won by 5 points in 2008, the president has held the lead in 16 polls conducted since June (Romney led in only 4). In Florida, which Obama won by 3 points in the last election, the numbers have been more even but still slightly favor the president (14 leads for Obama, 9 for Romney).\ The reasons behind Obama’s strong polling performance differ in each state. The auto industry’s recovery has helped drop Ohio’s unemployment rate from 8.6 percent when he took office to 7.2 percent now, making it one state where voters really are better off than they were four years ago. While studies show that national economic conditions figure more heavily into voters’ decisions, a state’s economic climate can matter in cases like this.

#### Obama is winning Virginia --- women are key.

**The Washington Post**, **9/19**/2012 (To claim Virginia, Obama’s hopes rest on women, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/to-claim-virginia-obamas-hopes-rest-on-women/2012/09/19/8413388a-026a-11e2-9b24-ff730c7f6312_story.html>)

In a presidential campaign where women’s issues have taken a more prominent role than many expected, the crucial swing state of Virginia is becoming the Grand Canyon of gender gaps. A new Washington Post survey indicates that President Obama holds a 19-percentage-point lead (58 to 39 percent) among female likely voters in the commonwealth yet is running six points behind Republican nominee Mitt Romney among men who are likely to vote (50 to 44 percent). That support from women is the reason the president now holds an eight-point advantage overall in Virginia. There has long been a disparity between women and men in their voting patterns — a phenomenon first identified and named the “gender gap” during Ronald Reagan’s presidency. This year, however, ginning up female support has become an imperative for Obama in his reelection bid. Across the electoral map, the Obama campaign is banking on women to offset an expected loss to Romney among men.

#### Plan kills blue collar support --- causes Obama to lose.

**Mead**, 6/6/**2012** (Walter Russell – avid fan of the television show the Price is Right and the movie Saving Private Ryan, Green Politics Hurting Obama in Swing States, The American Interest, p. http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/)

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

#### Energy is Obama’s vulnerability --- the plan is a lightning rod for criticism.

**Belogolova**, 5/17/**2012** (Olga – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517)

“The president has been navigating towards the economic center since November 2010 and a pro-production veneer will certainly help make that case (even if it doesn’t last),” said one Insider. That doesn’t mean Republicans will back off from attacking Obama on his energy policies. While improved relations between the White House and big oil have thrown a wrench into some of their plans, 93 percent of Insiders say Republicans have plenty of material left. Whether it’s the administration refusing to “drill, baby, drill,” delayng the Keystone XL pipeline, imposing tough environmental regulations, or backing a big loan to struggling solar company Solyndra, Republicans are not short on ammunition to fire at Obama on energy issues. “It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals." Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end. “Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

#### Even if voters support clean energy, they don’t want government spending.

**Freed et. al**, February **2012** (Josh – Third Way and Matt Bennett – Third Way, Al Quinlan – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, and Andrew Baumann – Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, Moving Clean Energy to the Center: Insights from Swing Voters in the Midwest and South, p. http://content.thirdway.org/publications/486/Third\_Way\_Report\_-\_Moving\_Clean\_Energy\_to\_the\_Center\_-\_Insights\_from\_Swing\_Voters\_in\_the\_Midwest\_and\_South.pdf)

While there is a strong desire to get America running on clean energy, there is a gap between what participants want and how they think the country can achieve it. Much of the public focus for clean energy advocates in recent years simply did not resonate with these participants. While voters did believe clean energy will spur economic growth—eventually—they did not see it creating a significant number of jobs today, particularly in manufacturing. In addition, climate change was simply not on voters’ minds—virtually none of the participants connected a focus on clean energy with addressing global warming. Finally, there was no faith that direct government spending would spur innovation or adoption of clean energy

#### Spending costs Obama the election --- kills independent support – takes out their one uniqueness card

**Caddell and Schoen**, 9/4/**2012** (Patrick – pollster for President Jimmy Carter, and Douglas – Douglas E. – founding partner and principle strategist for Penn, Schoen & Berland, Pollster of the Year in 1996 by the American Association of Politicial Consultants, and served as a pollster for President Bill Clinton, A Campaign in Need of a Clintonian Pivot, The Wall Street Journal, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390443847404577631150151855674.html?mod=WSJ\_Opinion\_LEADTop)

Democrats will have to win over swing voters and independents after their convention in Charlotte, N.C., this week if they hope to win in November. It's these voters—not the dyed-in-the wool supporters assembled in Charlotte—who win elections. The party's job won't be easy. Since the Aug. 11 announcement that Rep. Paul Ryan would be joining the GOP ticket, Mitt Romney's position vis-à-vis President Obama has risen steadily in the polls. On Aug. 9, Mr. Obama's lead in the RealClearPolitics average of available polling data was 4.5 points. That lead has since dropped by more than four points. As of Monday, the two candidates were tied at 46.4%. Swing voters in key battleground states have also moved in the direction of the Romney-Ryan ticket. According to the most recent Public Policy Polling (PPP), Mr. Romney now holds a 12-point lead over Mr. Obama in Missouri (53%-41%), and an Elon University/Charlotte Observer poll shows the Republican with a four-point lead (47%-43%) in North Carolina. President Obama now leads by just one point in the latest PPP Florida poll (48%-47%)—down from a four-point lead (50%-46%) in an Aug. 22-26 CNN poll. The most recent PPP polling in Iowa has Mr. Romney trailing Mr. Obama by just two percentage points (47%-45%), a marked improvement from PPP polling earlier this year, when Mr. Romney trailed the president by 10 points in May and five in July. Meanwhile, 55% of independents—who voted for Mr. Obama over John McCain 52%-44% in 2008—disapprove of the president's job performance, according to the latest Fox News poll. In the most recent ABC News/Washington Post poll, the Romney-Ryan ticket leads on key economic issues. Romney, crucially, has a seven-point lead among registered voters when asked who they trust more to handle the economy, 50%-43%. On the deficit his lead is 51%-38%; on taxes, 48%-43%; and on Medicare, 45%-42%. What voters are looking for—and particularly what swing voters, independents, and disillusioned Obama voters are looking for—is a new direction for America based on fiscal discipline, a balanced budget, and economic growth and leadership.

#### Even if Obama doesn’t get the blame, the plan still allows Romney to campaign off of it.

**Belogolova**, 5/17/**2012** (Olga – staff reporter for the National Journal, Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517)

Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end. “Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”
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### 1NC – Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Democrats dislike offshore gas drilling.

**Pew Research Center**, 6/14/**2010** (Public Remains of Two Minds on Energy Policy, p. <http://www.people-press.org/2010/06/14/public-remains-of-two-minds-on-energy-policy/>)

By contrast, pluralities of Democrats (41%) and independents (36%) support continuing existing drilling but banning new projects. Democrats (33%) are more likely than independents (19%) or Republicans (11%) to favor a total ban on new offshore oil and gas drilling.

#### Base turnout is key to the election --- voters are highly polarized now.

**Cillizza**, 8/19/**2012** (Chris – reporter for the Washington Post, writer for The Fix, Is the 2012 election more about base than undecideds?, The Washington Post, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2012-election-more-about-base-than-undecideds/2012/08/19/2cd2f98c-ea02-11e1-9ddc-340d5efb1e9c\_story.html)

“The only thing undecided in this election are the TV anchors’ ties on election night,” said Dan Hazelwood, a Republican direct-mail consultant. “Both sides believe there is little chance for a dramatic shift in opinion, so that leaves trench political warfare as the default strategy. That means identifying and turning out your own supporters.” Heaps of national polling would seem to affirm Hazelwood’s contention. Political polarization is at an all-time high, with even soft partisans already aligned behind either Obama or Romney. That has shrunk the middle of the electorate to single digits nationally. Simply put: There just aren’t that many people left for the campaigns to convince — no matter how much money (and it will be lots of money) the two sides spend between now and Nov. 6. Given that political reality, there is a strong case to be made that the two campaigns should spend most of their time/energy/ money not trying to find and persuade independents and undecideds but rather trying to identify and rally their (already united) bases. A base election — as opposed to an independents/undecideds/ persuadables election — is not unheard of. In fact, you need to go back only two elections to find one. In 2004, we had a president with middling approval ratings on the issue of the day (the war in Iraq) and an opposition party strongly energized to oust him. (Sound familiar?) Knowing that winning over the middle — or voters even loosely affiliated with Democrats — was going to be next to impossible, President George W. Bush and his campaign strategists instead focused their efforts on their own party base. Everything — from Bush’s voter-identification efforts to the heavy national security messaging in his television ads — was targeted not at convincing persuadable voters that he should be their choice but rather at reminding Republican base voters why he was their guy. It paid off. Although Bush lost independents to Sen. John F. Kerry of Massachusetts (he had won them against Al Gore in 2000), he improved his standing among self-identified Republicans by two points from 2000. That proved to be enough as Bush eked out a win with 286 electoral votes.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

Allison & Blackwill 11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.

### 1NC – Waivers CP

#### Text: The Environmental Protection Agency should grant regulatory waivers that exempt all parties from New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews. The EPA should summarize the decision in an annual agency publication in the Federal Register.

#### -- It competes –

#### The CP doesn’t reduce – “reductions” must be in quantity, not quality

**GEP 99** (Georgia Environmental Protection , http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/bank/forms/faqsheet.pdf)

The reductions **must be "quantifiable;"** i.e., the amount, rate and characteristics of the reduction must be measured or calculated through a reliable method and approved by the Environmental Protection Division;

#### The CP is a functionally different – it keeps the rule “on the books” and tailors it’s application – the plan creates a new rule – rulemaking is distinct from adjudication

Rossi 95 (Jim, Professor of Law – Vanderbilt University, “Making Policy through the Waiver of Regulations at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,” Administrative Law Review, 47 Admin L. Rev. 260, Hein Online)

A. RULEMAKING VERSUS ADJUDICATION Two distinctive methodologies are available to agencies in formulating law and policy: rulemaking and ad hoc adjudication. As defined in the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), a rule is a statement of general applicability and future effect that implements, interprets, or prescribes law or policy or the organization, procedures, and standards for practice before an agency.95 Rules arise from formal or informal rulemaking proceedings before the issuing administrative agency. Rules create law in the form of statements that are binding on those persons or entities to whom they are addressed, regardless whether those persons or entities participated in the rulemaking proceeding that generated the rule. Rules generally bind the agency in future cases, although, as this article suggests, this is not always the case, nor should it be. An adjudicative order, on the other hand, is an agency statement of particular applicability determining the rights of, or applying law or policy to, specific individuals or entities on the basis of their special circumstances.96 Such orders generally arise as the result of an adjudicative proceeding involving persons who have asserted an interest sufficient to meet the agency's intervention standards.97 An individualized adjudicative proceeding allows the agency to tailor application of its law or policy to the specific time, place, and context of persons affected. An adjudicative order generally adopts principles or rules of law on an ad hoc basis as necessary to solve the specific case before the agency. The impact of adjudicative orders, however, is often broader than the specific case at hand because they may serve as precedent in similar future cases. As a general matter, most commentators have argued that agencies should adopt and elaborate law and policy by rulemaking rather than ad hoc adjudica- tion.98 By overlooking the particularities of time, place, and context, rules have the inherent values of predictability, stability, uniformity, and control. Yet, it is these very values about which adjudication is most skeptical. In addition to the inherent values of rules, rulemaking is generally regarded as a preferable decisionmaking methodology for several process-based reasons.99

#### -- It solves the whole case better

Glicksman and Shapiro 4 (Robert L., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, and Sidney A., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, “Improving Regulation through Incremental Adjustment,” Kansas Law Review, 52 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1179, Hein Online)

Reform of environmental and other regulation has been a popular topic for academics, think-tanks, and interested parties for the last two decades. Claiming that existing regulation is excessive and irrational, critics have successfully convinced Congress and the White House to implement a plethora of procedural requirements to analyze a proposed regulation before it is promulgated.1 In our recent book, Risk Regulation at Risk,2 we argued that the previous initiatives address the possibility of regulatory failure on the wrong end of the regulatory policy implementation process. Current efforts to rationalize environmental and other health and safety regulation at the "front end" of the regulatory process are doomed to fail because of moral, methodological, and informational limitations.3 We suggested that one way of improving regulation would be to rely on incremental adjustments in regulation on the "back end" of the regulatory process.4 One important advantage of proceeding in this manner is that regulatory policy is adjusted in light of its actual impact, as compared to the significant guesswork that is required to use front-end analysis. In this manner, a back-end adjustment process is consistent with the pragmatic approach to public policy that we advocated in the book.5 This article addresses in more detail the potential of two types of back-end processes: (1) deadline extensions and (2) waivers, exceptions, and variances.6 Our analysis proceeds in three steps. Part II describes the almost exclusive focus of regulatory reformers on the front end of the process. Part III offers a close examination of five federal statutes that provide opportunities for the two types of adjustments we are studying. The results confirm our earlier assertion that Congress has authorized agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occu- pational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Interior Department to make these types of back-end adjustments available in a variety of contexts and for a variety of reasons.7 Our analysis reveals that Congress has established six different grounds for back-end adjustment, and we assess the potential for each of these grounds to improve regulatory policy. Although we recommend the imposition of conditions on the issuance of some of these back-end adjustments, we find that these adjustments are generally consistent with the precautionary tilt of the statutes in which they are located because they still require the regulated entity to do the best it can to protect people and the environment. Where such protective mechanisms are absent, we urge that the statutes be amended to include them. Part IV analyzes the procedures by which requests for back-end adjustments are currently processed. We find that agencies consider most applications for back-end adjustments using informal procedures that include public notice and solicitation of public comments, although in a few instances, more formal procedures apply. We favor the informal approach because it is an efficient way for agencies to respond to the issues raised by requests for back-end adjustments and because more elaborate procedures are not necessary to promote rational decision- making, given the nature of the issues likely to be raised in back-end adjustment proceedings. We are concerned, however, about the extent to which effective public participation will occur under these procedures. We therefore endorse two steps to enhance the transparency of back-end adjustment decision-making: the establishment of electronic reading rooms and the issuance by agencies of annual reports on back-end adjustments.8 We argue that these two mechanisms will facilitate involvement by public interest groups and interested citizens by allowing them to prioritize the adjustment proceedings in which they wish to become involved. The result is likely to be enhanced agency accountability and reduced opportunities for agency abuse of the back-end adjustment process.

### 1NC – Carbon-Tax CP

#### The United States federal government should implement a 15-year tax of $15 per ton of carbon dioxide emissions on electricity generation in the United States.

#### -- Solves the case

WG 11 (Wilkinson Group, “Natural Gas Big Winner From Carbon Tax – Reputex Research Report,” 9-11-11, <http://www.wilkinson-group.com.au/featured-news/natural-gas-big-winner-from-carbon-tax-reputex-research-report/>)

MELBOURNE, 27th September, 2011 – RepuTex, a leading carbon analytics firm, today released research into the impact of the proposed carbon tax on the Australian power industry from 2011 to 2020. The research found that natural gas generators will be the big winners with generation projected to increase by 40% by 2020. Over the same period, RepuTex predict that Australian power industry emissions will drop by 9% (equal to a 5% reduction from 2000 levels) and generation from brown and black coal is expected to reduce by 40% and 20% respectively by 2020. A comprehensive research report of RepuTex’s findings will be made available in a forthcoming research report with Standard & Poor’s. Initial findings were made available today at the Powering Australia conference in Melbourne. According to RepuTex Global Director of Research, John Metzler, the carbon price mechanism will make natural gas pricing more competitive and will increase power generation from cleaner fuels. “Domestic coal prices will gradually fall into line with international pricing, pushing up the long run marginal cost (LRMC) of brown and black coal, and making gas more attractive. RepuTex projects that gas output will grow from 14% at current levels, to 43% of total NEM generation by 2020.

### 1NC – Manufacturing

#### No demand shift – industrial demand down due to offshoring, manufacturing industry needs low wages

Tverberg 12 (Gail, Editor of The Oil Drum, Fellow of the Casualty Actuarial Society and a Member of the American Academy of Actuaries. She also has a Masters Degree in Mathematics from the University of Illinois, Chicago, 3-23-12, “Why US natural gas prices are so low – Are changes needed?,” Our Finite World, <http://ourfiniteworld.com/2012/03/23/why-us-natural-gas-prices-are-so-low-are-changes-needed/>)

2. Little growth in historical uses. One of the underlying reasons why there is a mismatch between supply and demand is the fact that since 1997, US natural gas consumption has remained close to flat, regardless of price (Figure 4, below). With very low prices in 2011, consumption rose by 2.2% in 2011 compared to 2010. Natural gas prices recently have been low enough to compete with coal prices. Even at these low price levels, there has been little increase in industrial demand, and no effect on residential and commercial usage (for heating of buildings, hot water, and cooking). Industrial demand used to be the largest source of natural gas use, but this has been trending downward. Part of this downward trend is likely related to industries moving overseas for reasons related to wages. (Part may be related to spiking natural gas prices, as well.) Residential and commercial use has not been growing because furnaces have been becoming more efficient, and because more attention is being paid to insulation and other conservation measures.

#### Aff doesn’t solve manufacturing – Trade deficit

Atkinson 12 (Robert D. Atkinson, “Worse Than the Great Depression: What Experts Are Missing About American Manufacturing Decline,” http://www2.itif.org/2012-american-manufacturing-decline.pdf

In the 2000s, U.S. manufacturing suffered its worst performance in American history in terms of jobs. Not only did America lose 5.7 million manufacturing jobs, but the decline as a share of total manufacturing jobs (33 percent) exceeded the rate of loss in the Great Depression. 1 Despite this unprecedented negative performance, most economists, pundits and elected officials are remarkably blasé about what has transpired. Manufacturing, they argue, has simply become incredibly productive. While tough on workers who are laid off, job losses indicate superior performance. All that is needed, if anything, are better programs to help laid-off workers. This report argues that this dominant view on the loss of manufacturing jobs is fundamentally mistaken. Manufacturing lost jobs because manufacturing lost output, and it lost output because its ability to compete in global markets—some manipulated by egregious foreign mercantilist policies, others supported by better national competiveness policies, like lower corporate tax rates—declined significantly. In 2010, 13 of the 19 U.S. manufacturing sectors (employing 55 percent of manufacturing workers) were producing less than they there were in 2000 in terms of inflation-adjusted output. 2 Moreover, we assert that the government’s official calculation of manufacturing output growth, and by definition productivity, is significantly overstated. Overall, U.S. manufacturing output actually fell by 11 percent during a period when GDP increased by 17 percent. 3 The alarm bells are largely silent for two reasons: government statistics significantly overstate the change in U.S. manufacturing output, and most economists and pundits do not extend their analysis beyond one macro-level number (change in real manufacturing value added relative to GDP). But the conventional wisdom that U.S. manufacturing job loss is simply a result of productivity-driven restructuring (akin to how U.S. agriculture lost jobs but is still healthy) is wrong, or at least not the whole story. This report contends that the loss of U.S. manufacturing jobs is a function of slow growth in output (and, in most sectors, actual loss of output) caused by a steep increase in the manufactured goods trade deficit.

#### Manufacturing not key to the economy

Wessel 12 (David Wessel, economics editor of The Wall Street, “Manufacturing Industry Gained Momentum In 2011,” 1-19-12, <http://www.npr.org/2012/01/19/145437593/are-more-u-s-manufacturing-jobs-being-created>)

WESSEL: Well, that's a good question. So basically, factories have added more than 300,000 jobs in the past two years, and that's pretty good news - certainly better than losing jobs. But it would take two million more jobs to get manufacturing back to where it was in 2007 before the recession. Factories are managing to produce more without hiring a lot more workers, because they're getting more productive; technology, reorganization, making people work harder, making them work smarter. It's all made for a remarkable surge of productivity. Factories get 40 percent more output out of every out of work today, compared to what they got 10 years ago. MONTAGNE: Still though, if sales keep growing, would factories not hire more? Maybe not as many workers as they had before, but more, and couldn't that be one part of the answer, at least, to the jobs problem? WESSEL: Well, it would definitely be one part, but it's a small part. For all the romance about manufacturing, we are no longer a manufacturing economy when it comes to jobs. Only nine percent of the jobs in America today are in manufacturing. It just isn't big enough to put Americans back to work. Even if factory employment doubled, which isn't going to happen, that wouldn't be enough new jobs to put all the 13 million unemployed people back to work. So yes, it's a plus. But no, it's not enough to solve our unemployment problem.

#### No timeframe --- manufacturing decline is slow, takes decades to have an impact --- disads come first

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war

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

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

#### No Asian war - informal processes secure and maintain East Asian peace

**Weissmann, 09** --- senior fellow at the Swedish School of Advanced Asia Pacific Studies (Mikael Weissmann, “Understanding the East Asian Peace: Some Findings on the Role of Informal Processes,” Nordic Asia Research Community, November 2, 2009, http://barha.asiaportal.info/blogs/in-focus/2009/november/understanding-east-asian-peace-some-findings-role-informal-processes-mi)

The findings concerning China’s role in keeping peace in the Taiwan Strait, the South China Sea, and on the Korean Peninsula confirm the underlying hypothesis that various informal processes and related mechanisms can help explain the relative peace. Virtually all of the identified processes and related mechanisms have been informal rather than formal. It should be noted that it is not necessarily the same types of processes that have been of importance in each and every case. In different ways these informal processes have demonstrated that the relative lack of formalised security structures and/or mechanisms have not prevented the region from moving towards a stable peace. **Informal processes have been sufficient both to prevent tension and disputes from escalating into war and for moving East Asia towards a stable peace.**

#### Low prices bad:

**1.) Warming –**

#### A. Low prices cause flaring - leads to warming

Henkel 12 (Karl, reporter at The Detroit News, degree from Wayne State University, “Natural gas industry in a crash (and burn),” 4-18-12, <http://www.vindy.com/news/2012/apr/18/crash-and-burn/>)

The nice weather doesn’t seem to be going anywhere, and neither do cheap gas prices. The latter is having an impact on the oil-and-gas industry, which for the past decade has explored and extracted from gas-rich shale plays in Texas and Pennsylvania, to name two. Just three years ago, natural gas was $10 per 1,000 cubic feet, which allowed drillers a comfortable profit margin on their investments, which in unconventional shale plays can reach $10 million per horizontal well. But today, natural-gas prices are below $2 per 1,000 cubic feet for the first time in a decade. Gone is the prospect of gas-only exploration. The operating gas-rig count nationwide was 624 last week, the lowest weekly figure in a decade, according to Houston oil-and gas-services company Baker Hughes. Gone, too, is the gaping profit margin. Energy analysts estimate that $5 per 1,000 cubic feet is the profitability point for most drillers; any price less than that, coupled with a deficient way of transporting or storing, makes for an unfavorable business model. “There are no hard-and-fast rules on that,” said Dan Whitten, spokesman for Americas Natural Gas Alliance. “What you’re seeing is some companies are making those decisions, and I think some of that is areas where there are only dry gas potential.” Low natural-gas prices have changed the strategy for drillers in various ways. First, companies such as Oklahoma City-based Chesapeake Energy Corp., a large mineral-rights holder in Ohio, has decided to back out of natural-gas plays such as the Barnett Shale in Texas and the Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania. The company’s rig count in the Barnett, which was 43 in 2008, is just six this year. Meanwhile, the company hopes to have 40 rigs in the Utica Shale by 2015. But drillers must also consider what they want to do with natural gas from current wells. Storage is the most obvious option, but because of the aforementioned mild weather, there’s a surplus of natural gas, and underground storage space is now at a premium. Drillers can “dial back” natural-gas production at well heads, but not nearly to the extent that it could alleviate the gas surplus. That brings in another option: flaring, the process in which gas is elevated and burned. The process has been used for operations reasons for years, but never to the extent it is used today. In North Dakota’s oil-rich Bakken Shale, it is estimated that as much as one-third of all produced natural gas is flared. Natural gas normally accompanies oil in the production and extraction process, which means that even if drillers target oil- and wet-gas-heavy shale plays, natural-gas production still will occur. That is the case in the Utica Shale, where the most heavily oil-producing well in Ohio also produced 1.5 million MCF of natural gas, albeit in just about six months’ time. Chesapeake says it is prepared for Utica Shale exploration and low natural-gas prices. “The purpose of flaring is to safely consume any produced gas before it has reached sufficient conditions to enter a sales pipeline,” said Pete Kenworthy, Chesapeake spokesman. “After the well is connected to the pipeline, if market circumstances warrant, we can wait to turn the well online. In similar conditions, we can also cut back on production.” Environmentalists have criticized natural-gas flaring as an even worse hazard than the actual extraction process, which is done by fracking, or blasting a mix of water, chemicals and sand thousands of feet below the ground to open shale rock formations. “It seems we should slow down the drilling until natural-gas prices rise so that it becomes a smart business model,” said Vanessa Pesec, president of the Network for Oil and Gas Accountability. “[Flaring] contributes to organic compounds in the air that will affect everyone’s health and greenhouse gases,” she added.

**B. Extinction**

Deibel 7 [Terry L. Professor of IR at National War College, 2007 “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today]

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fun damentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”;“Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

#### 2.) Uranium

#### -- Low Prices kill Uranium Market

Cowie 12 (Dr. Alex Cowie, Editor, Money Morning, “How Low Natural Gas Prices Are Causing Energy Havoc,” 8-1-12, <http://countingpips.com/forex-news/2012/08/how-low-natural-gas-prices-are-causing-energy-havoc/>)

Uranium is now in the cross hairs. ‘Permanently cheap’ natural gas is giving the economics of nuclear energy a run for its money too. The uranium spot price held above $52/ lb between last September and this May. But in the last few months, the uranium price has been slipping, and is back down to $49 / lb, which is a worrying sign. The CEO of General Electric, Mr Immelt, also had a few words to say about uranium. His company is a major manufacturer of nuclear equipment. He recently said (my emphasis in bold): ‘It’s just hard to justify nuclear. Really hard. Gas is so cheap and at some point, really, economics rule … So I think some combination of gas, and either wind or solar … that’s where we see most countries around the world going.”

#### -- Hurts Kazakhstan’s industry

McDermott 11 (Roger, Senior Fellow, Foreign Military Studies Office, Fort Leavenworth, “Kazakhstan: Countering nuclear proliferation, Action to develop a nuclear and terrorist-free world,” in Kazakhstan 2011: Twenty Years of Peace and Creation, *First: The Forum for Global Decision Makers*, 2011, <http://www.firstmagazine.com/Publishing/SpecialReportsDetail.aspx?RegionId=4&SpecialReportId=96>)

Kazakhstan’s ambitions are likely to be realized if uranium prices stay high and Kazatomprom is successful in further expanding its international partnerships. Kazatomprom’s most immediate task is to secure customers for its final nuclear fuel product--fuel assemblies, an extra fuel fabrication stage which Kazatomprom plans to start carrying out domestically. Having a nearly complete nuclear fuel cycle, save for enrichment, will ensure a stable cash flow for Kazatomprom and limit its dependence on the fluctuating market price of raw uranium. In the meantime, increased uranium sales will help alleviate the country’s overdependence on oil exports and help modernize its nuclear sector. If Kazakhstan does become the world’s leading uranium and nuclear fuel supplier, the ramifications for the country both in terms of increased gross domestic product and status on the world stage will be profound.

#### -- Prevents diversification of Kazakhstan’s economy

Pleitgen 12 (Frederick, CNN, “Kazakhstan hopes uranium, oil and gas will fuel its future,” 7-18-12,

<http://articles.cnn.com/2012-07-18/asia/world_asia_kazakhstan-natural-resources-economy_1_vladimir-shkolnik-kazakhstan-uranium>)

Kazakhstan's mineral wealth will be a major source of income for decades to come, but it won't last forever. The country is trying to use it wisely to transition to a broader economic base while developing the natural resources industries to the maximum. Last year Kazakhstan was the world's top producer of uranium, accounting for over a third of global production. The industry's rapid expansion, plus the good quality of the uranium and the comparatively cheap method of mining it have combined to give Kazakhstan an advantage over other big exporters like Australia and Canada. With continued investment, Vladimir Shkolnik, the head of Kazakhstan's national atomic energy company, Kazatomprom, is keen to maintain that position. "We are hoping to keep our leadership position in the uranium field," he says. "We have dozens of facilities and hundreds of mines and we think we will remain a world leader in the uranium sector." Kazakhstan's government is also trying to encourage more foreign investment. Since independence in 1991, around $150 billion of foreign investment has flowed into the country; $18 billion dollars last year alone, according to the government. Companies like GE and Eurocopter have been attracted to the country, entering partnerships with national companies that have helped bring training and new skills to the local workforce. While money is flowing from the country's natural resources industry, the government is using some of its revenue to boost other sectors, like IT and engineering. The aim is to make the economy more resilient when commodities prices fall and better prepared for the day when the gush of oil and gas reduce to a trickle. "Of course revenues from raw materials are still by far the largest share of the country's budget," says energy analyst, Murat Karymsakov. "But in recent years the president (of Kazakhstan) has announced and put into place a plan for industrial and technological development to diversify the economy."

#### -- Destroys stability

Hamm 12 (Nathan, founder and Principal Analyst for Registan, MA in Central Asian Studies from the University of Washington, “Kazakhstan’s Stability, Central Asia’s Stability,” 1-31-12, <http://registan.net/2012/01/31/kazakhstans-stability-central-asias-stability/>)

I’m paraphrasing, but on the first two items, Dr. Roberts argues that the thoroughly Soviet education and background of Kazakhstan’s leadership leaves it out of touch and unable to adequately respond to the public. The government’s response to labor strikes, including the violence in Zhanaozen, he says, show that the government was not prepared to deal with dissatisfaction over unmet economic expectations. Dr. Roberts says that these challenges are not extreme nor likely to cause widespread unrest in the near term, but that the stagnancy of the political system means that the government lacks mechanisms to deal with large socio-economic changes. [Note: Alima wrote about the crisis of unmet expectations at length recently.] This is good, succinct analysis of the situation that puts risks to Kazakhstan’s stability in good context. The risks are there, the government is ill-prepared to deal with them at present, but it’s unlikely that it will be overwhelmed by them soon. These risks, however, aren’t present only in Kazakhstan. They exist in similar forms and combinations throughout Central Asia. Growing segments of society throughout the region are bringing (or attempting to…) Islam into the public square, where it is responded to with shock and terror by secular officials. National economies are failing to meet the expectations, and in many areas, even the basic needs, of the public. And though nationalism is not so clearly a problem the way it is Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in the rest of Central Asia, there are small signs that society is challenging the state’s monopoly on defining what it means to be Uzbek, Tajik, Kyrgyz, etc. In talking about risks to stability, there is often a tendency to focus on presidential succession, the specter of fundamentalism and political Islam, and a more recent tendency to talk about replication of the Arab Spring. Recent history should make it abundantly clear though, that analysts, experts, and observers are taken by surprise in the region. Game-planning what happens after Karimov dies or a resurgence of the IMU activity in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan might be worthless because they assume state and society lack the mechanisms to respond to and manage succession or terrorist groups. The greatest risks to stability throughout the region are medium- to long-term risks arising from the three aforementioned factors and the oppositional relationship between state and society. Devising a list of indicators and warnings based on the three factors Dr. Roberts identifies — rising public religiosity, increasing nationalism, and under-performance in the economy — are more likely not only to lead to better anticipation of the trajectory of stability in Central Asia but also to provide a better idea of when serious risks to stability are likely to arise.

#### -- Spreads throughout the region

Assenova 8 (Margarita Assenova, IND Director; Natalie Zajicova, Program Officer (IND); Janusz Bugajski, CSIS NEDP Director; Ilona Teleki, Deputy Director and Fellow (CSIS); Besian Bocka, Program Coordinator and Research Assistant (CSIS), “Kazakhstan’s Strategic Significance,” 2008, CSIS-IND Taskforce Policy Brief team, European Dialogue, <http://eurodialogue.org/Kazakhstan-Strategic-Significance>)

The decision by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to award Kazakhstan the chairmanship of the organization for 2010 underscores a growing recognition of the country’s regional and continental importance. Kazakhstan is a strategic linchpin in the vast Central Asian-Caspian Basin zone, a region rich in energy resources and a potential gateway for commerce and communications between Europe and Asia. However, it is also an area that faces an assortment of troubling security challenges. Ensuring a stable and secure Central Asia is important for the international interests of the United States and its European allies for several prescient reasons: • Asian Security: Because of its proximity to Russia, China, Iran, and the South Asian sub-continent, Kazakhstan’s security and stability is an increasingly vital interest to all major powers. Kazakhstan’s tenure as chair of the OSCE will become an opportunity for greater multilateral cooperation in achieving this objective while strengthening the role and prestige of the OSCE throughout Central Asia.

#### -- Nuclear war

Ahrari 1 (M. Ehsan, Professor of National Security and Strategy of the Joint and Combined Warfighting School at the Armed Forces Staff College, August 2001, “Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan and the New Great Game,” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub112.pdf)

South and Central Asia constitute a part of the world where a well-designed American strategy might well help avoid crises or catastrophe. The U.S. military would provide only one component of such a strategy, and a secondary one at that, but has an important role to play through engagement activities and regional confidence building. Insecurity has led the states of the region to seek weapons of mass destruction, missiles and conventional arms. It has also led them toward policies which undercut the security of their neighbors. If such activities continue, the result could be increased terrorism, humanitarian disasters, continued low-level conflict and potentially even major regional war or a thermonuclear exchange. A shift away from this pattern could allow the states of the region to become solid economic and political partners for the United States, thus representing a gain for all concerned.

#### 3.) Solar PV

#### A. Low gas prices kill it

Desmond 12 (James Christopher, Attorney at Law in Savannah, GA, J.D. at State University of New York at Buffalo - Law School, “Solar Economics & Politics In Real Time,” *Free Market Solar Power*, 8-22-12, <https://sites.google.com/site/freemarketsolarpower/home>)

Executive Summary: In the face of uncertainty over America's energy future and electricity prices (see also this), this "web-book" discusses grid-tied, Solar Photovoltaic (PV) power in consumer-economic terms, and whether it makes sense to subsidize it with tax- and rate-payer money. The discussion pivots on this point: Small-scale PV is still too expensive to make it in the free market without subsidies. And, as this article illuminates, those subsidies ("From 2007 to 2010, federal subsidies jumped to $14.7 billion from $5.1 billion"), are drying up. See also this piece on the debatable impact of subsidies. But are they a good idea in the first place? Many still advocate them in light of long-standing "brown power subsidies" (250 kinds, in fact, also click here, here, and here) and subsidies drove most of the 2011 solar market gains, totalling 1,855 megawatts (MW) of photovoltaic (PV) capacity for 2011 -- a year that set a record $257 billion in renewables investment. But they also, predictably, helped engender a projected industry-collapse and thus, as noted by the WSJ, "dark times." Helped because there are other causes, including cheap gas-powered electricity -- which perhaps will be Solar PV's the biggest nemesis (money quote: "Natural-gas-fired electricity now costs about 84 percent less than solar, and it cuts carbon-dioxide emissions compared to conventional coal by 30 percent to 50 percent"), and it looks like cheap natural gas will be here for a while (see also this analysis, as well as this, plus this piece, showing how it all affects the state of Georgia's "electricity politics").

#### B. Creates vulnerability to terrorism and natural disasters

Desmond 12 (James Christopher, Attorney at Law in Savannah, GA, J.D. at State University of New York at Buffalo - Law School, “Solar Economics & Politics In Real Time,” *Free Market Solar Power*, 8-22-12, <https://sites.google.com/site/freemarketsolarpower/home>)

Why residential Solar PV instead of those massive, utility-scale or even world-scale PV systems that you read about? Because distributed energy generation, in contrast to centralized, utility-scale energy generation, breeds unique benefits: \* It enables distributed energy independence (my refrigerated food won't spoil when the utility company's grid fails). "Distributed" means spread among individual owners (Joe), not monopolistic, concentrated wealth entities that can cop billions in subsidies and spread lobbying cash to politicians who give them turf-protecting legislation. \* It fosters distributed, cross-pollinating intelligence and upward-cascading technological enhancements: Billions of PC users were free to, and in fact developed, countless software/hardware innovations because no central source prevented smart users from innovating/improving PCs, which brought us $500 Billion in prosperity. The same phenomenon will accelerate higher-efficiency innovations with Solar PVs. Once "arrayed," 100 million "Joe Six Packs" will all be financially incentivized to relentlessly tweak their solar arrays to eke even more wealth out of them, especially if reverse-meter rates (more on that below) are kept competitive. Just look at the impact of just one fairly simple re-design of a wood stove will have on 3 billion people. Recall how splendidly fast PCs (and now i-Pads and other "i-minis") developed with hundreds of millions of users using/studying/tweaking them and their counterpart, the internet (just one example: over 350,000 apps written for the i-Phone, which has only existed since 2007). \* As will be further detailed below, it will harmoniously blend with existing utility grids because the average user will want to erect only enough of an array to cover his home's typical power needs, and only marginally bleed over excess energy into the local grid (and cop a reverse-meter credit for it). Compare that to the massive energy influx T. Boone Pickens's wind plan contemplated, which necessitated epic power grid reconfigurations (and he and his investors would control a mass load of power, while what is proposed here is "chicken in every pot" level, homeowner-controlled power). Relatedly, and good news for utility-scale Solar PV if this is true, this investment analysis says even big Solar PV projects can be better blended than wind and Concentrated Solar Thermal. This same concept is discussed for small wind farms, which not only alleviates transmission difficulties arising from large farms, but smooths net electricity flow since "the wind is almost always blowing somewhere." \* It will help form a second blend layer, that of peak load to base load (it will supply much of the "peak" amount of electricity a community demands, for example, on a hot sunny day, when the power company must buy or supply (at a more costly rate) it over the normal, "base load" demand letter -- as explained here and here. See also this analysis. \* It will generate distributed (not concentrated) wealth. Lots of it. Directly into Joe's pocket. Thousands, millions and then one hundred million Joes pocketing newly created (direct from the sun) wealth (free energy, reverse-meter payments) every day. That's wealth that Joe pockets, not some small group of utility owners/controllers. And unlike most forms of wealth (example: you've got to expend energy and create pollution to extract and burn coal to create electricity, then get money -- wealth -- from it), this is pure, cost-free new wealth (not government-printed money that feeds "economic multiplier" cycles in economists' heads). \* It also will deconcentrate electrical power generation, and thus deprive terrorists/tsunamis of targets and monopolists of concentrated-power-wealth manipulability. Indeed, it already is spreading to the 2.0 billion people who live off the grid, including some of the most desperate. As Seba says, "[h]alf a billion people in 500,000 villages in India alone are not connected to the grid. Two billion people around the world get their energy from kerosene or diesel at rates up to 10 times today’s PV cost." That market alone will spur greater economies of scale in Solar PV manufacturing -- to meet that demand. \* The self-consumed part of Solar PV energy obviously suffers no transmission loss, which can reach as high as 20% (hence, transmission alone packs a built-in energy waste). And, distributed "rooftop Solar PV" may well reduce the need for very expensive grid upgrades. It's been said that up to $11 billion in $55 billion in grid upgrading over the next 10 years could be avoided in Australia. Also, central power generation (big coal and nuke plants) loses 20% or more of its electricity just in its transmission to customers. If those same customers generate "distributed" energy and feed their local grid less transmission loss can result. \* It will be pre-positioned to fully exploit economically/ecologically feasible energy storage (envisioned here and discussed here) should anyone ever get around to inventing it. \* It can be arranged, when erected on a mass-commodity level scale (millions of homes), into a horizontal-management smart grid, if not a micro-grid, so that if clouds depress electricity generation on one side of town, and high-sun onthe other produces intense bursts of electricity, the smart-grid (or so techno-forecasters claim) can smooth the peaks and valleys to ensure a virtual base-load style electrical flow. This will help address the variable power, lack of temporary electrical storage problem that undermines Solar PV today (for more on this concept, click here, then here, and here). Utilities themselves can publish maps to show optimum blending with their grids. The White House is advancing its own smart grid initiative, by the way, and people are now conjuring up hybrid brown/green power combinations to stabilize output and claim base load status. Even vehicle-to-grid (V2G) technologists are charging into this area.

#### C. Terrorist attack on the grid kills heg

Merica 12 (Dan, reporter for CNN, “DoD official: Vulnerability of U.S. electrical grid is a dire concern,” CNN, 7-27-12, <http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/07/27/dod-official-vulnerability-of-u-s-electrical-grid-is-a-dire-concern/>)

Speaking candidly at the Aspen Security Forum, one defense department official expressed great concern about the possibility of a terrorist attack on the U.S. electric grid that would cause a “long term, large scale outage.” Paul Stockton, assistant secretary for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs at the Department of Defense, said such an attack would affect critical defense infrastructure at home and abroad – a thought that Stockton said was keeping him up at night. “The DOD depends on infrastructure in order to be able to operate abroad. And to make those operations function, we depend on the electric grid,” Stockton said. The concern, Stockton continued, was that America’s adversaries would avoid attacking “the pointy end of the spear,” meaning combat troops, and would instead look for homeland, possibly non-military, targets. “Our adversaries, state and non-state, are not stupid. They are clever and adaptive,” Stockton said. “There is a risk that they will adopt a profoundly asymmetric strategy, reach around and attack us here at home, the critical infrastructure that is not owned by the Department of Defense.”

#### D. Global nuclear war

Khalilzad 11 (Zalmay, Counselor – Center for Strategic and International Studies, Former U.S. Permanent Representative – United Nations, Former U.S. Ambassador – Iraq, “The Economy and National Security”, National Review, 2-8, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad)

The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

#### Lots of factors prevent great power conflict without hegemony

**Fettweis 10** (Christopher J. Professor of Political Science at Tulane, Dangerous Times-The International Politics of Great Power Peace, pg. 175-6)

If the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the US military presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of war – nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms – necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were American to become more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it currently exists. More importantly,the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world be virtually risk free.

#### Chemical industry demand declining despite supply increases

Fulp 11 (Mickey, Certified Professional Geologist with a B.Sc. Earth Sciences with honor from the University of Tulsa, and M.Sc. Geology from the University of New Mexico, “What's Up (or Down) with the Nat Gas Market?,” 7-12-11, The Energy Report, <http://www.theenergyreport.com/pub/na/10247>)

Domestic demand for natural gas comes from four general uses: Residential and commercial: 22%; space heating and cooking. Industrial: 38%; fuel for the pulp and paper, metal, chemical, petroleum refining and food-processing industries; feedstock for plastic, chemical and fertilizer production. These uses are projected to decline as the economy moves toward less energy-intensive manufacturing processes.

**Turn - price increase key to industry survival**

**Hutchinson 12** (Robert, Managing Director of the Rocky Mountain Institute, “Booms and Busts, Tulips and Gas,” 6-7-12, <http://blog.rmi.org/blog_booms_busts_tulips_and_gas>)

There is no doubt that unconventional natural gas resources such as shale gas and tight gas, liberated by horizontal drilling, hydraulic fracturing (fracking) and other technologies, are fundamentally changing the U.S. natural gas supply equation and, over time, maybe that of the rest of the world. We are in a boom yet **spot prices are absurdly low**; below costs in many fields with limited associated liquids (which trade based on oil prices). Many firms say they would not be drilling if they had any choice. So, what’s the deal? Why a boom when the owners of the natural gas supply are not making money (from gas)? A look back to the Netherlands in the early 1600s offers some lessons. Back then, wealthy merchants liked tulips. They were singularly bright colored decorations for their showy houses, in the generally grey world of water and cloud that is the Netherlands. Tulip bulbs saw a significant price spike, at least in the “spot” or “options” portions of the exchange and side deal markets that were set up at the time. The trade—perhaps it was even betting—was widespread enough to attract lawmakers, attempting to structure the markets, which included many players with no intent of taking delivery. Analysts now debate whether this was a full-fledged speculative boom—a national frenzy of trading absurd amounts for single, rare bulbs—or a more rational situation, paying high prices for the unusual (diseased, in fact) bulbs that produced multiple colors but were difficult and slow to propagate—pricey breeding stock, as it were. Fast forward to today, where there are some interesting linkages between tulips and unconventional natural gas. Like the tulip situation, when we look at natural gas it’s important to take into account what is rare—and not rare. Knowledge of fracking is temporarily rare; learning takes time and effort and is fraught with failures, just like in the early years of propagating a handful of fragile tulip bulbs. But as in the tulip case, as the supply and knowledge spreads, the rarity decreases, even if bid up by foreigners eager to take it home. When those wanting into the fracking game—by buying companies with leases and expertise under conditions that encourage continued drilling and production even when not economic—dwindle, then the “knowledge and position grab” stage of getting in on the early special “tulips deal” is over. What happens, then, when next stage, “real” economics take over? For gas, it’s a bit complicated, because many of the shale fields have enough liquids to ensure that, at current high oil prices, the gas can temporarily be treated as an afterthought. The liquids pay for the well. Flaring, seldom seen onshore, is back in some fields, as many wells are not yet connected to gas gathering systems and liquids are hauled by truck. This will prolong the supply boom a bit, but it's still not “real” economics. Rather, it’s picking off the richest (wettest) plays first, knowing that paying the piper and figuring out how to make money with fewer or less valuable liquids is still to come. Business plans focusing on this strategy abound, so this phase may continue for a while. But in due course, the liquids game, like the knowledge grab game, ends too. Real economics will happen. And **gas prices will go up**. No one knows when and how much—yet another **overshoot,** or a more steady market due to the large supply (at decent prices).

### 1NC – Energy Leverage

#### Russia will remain dominant in the European market

Ryan 12 (Margaret, US Gas Regulation columnist at Interfax, Natural Gas Daily; Partner at Dynamic Risk LLC, “Oil-linked Natural Gas Pricing Under Continued Pressure in Europe,” 8-28-12, <http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/28/oil-linked-natural-gas-pricing-under-continued-pressure-in-europ/?icid=apb2#page2>)

Europe is supplied by a combination of North Sea gas, where fields are in decline; pipeline gas from Russia; and LNG from Africa and the Middle East. Natural gas has long been priced on a basket of refined products, which usually rise or fall with the price of crude oil. Recent high crude prices have pushed natural gas prices unusually high, and major distributors who can't pass on the prices are losing significant money, said Howard Rogers, Senior Research Fellow, Oxford Institute for Energy Studies. That's led to customer rebellion, just as the recession has sapped gas and electricity demand. "Germany is the combat zone,"said James Jensen of Jensen Associates, with powerful utilities E.On and RWE wrestling down gas contracts with Russia's Gazprom. "Russia is trying to hold the line on the oil linkage," Jensen said, but is having to accept some concessions, as is Norway's Statoil which markets North Sea gas. Jensen said northern Europe is moving to competitive hub pricing, and southern Europe may follow. Bros said 58% of natural gas was still oil-indexed in OECD Europe in 2011, but he expects that by 2014, less than 50% will be, increasing pressure to shift all trading to indexation on hub market prices. "Confidence in the hubs is improving," said Rogers, pointing to growing liquidity at the UK's National Balancing Point and the Dutch TTF hubs. A major unknown for potential US LNG exports is Russia's response, said Rogers. Even with a change in pricing basis, Russia will remain dominant, supplying a quarter of Europe's gas. Russia could choose to dump gas in Europe and undercut the LNG market, depressing prices when US supplies arrive, said Rogers, or it could cut back deliveries and try to prop up its price. Bros warned that gas consumption in the last couple of years has been consistently below previous usage, with Gazprom holding 11 billion cubic meters of gas that customers contracted for but on which they couldn't take delivery. Bros said demand looks likely to stay low, since the big growth in natural gas use in the past decade, and the biggest contractions now, are in Greece, Portugal, Spain and Italy, the nations worst hit by the ongoing economic crisis.

#### Interdependence prevents Russian bargaining with natural gas

Strouse 9 (Kevin R. Strouse, M.A. in Security Studies from Georgetown University, “Russian Natural Gas: Enabler of Uncooperative Foreign Policy,” 11-18-9, <http://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/553592/strouseKevin.pdf?sequence=1>)

Still, from the European perspective, there is an upside resulting from the global financial crisis. As European economies have stopped growing, demand for Russian natural gas also has dipped and prices in 2008 were roughly at the same level as they were in 2005. 103 Additionally, the Kremlin invested disproportionately in natural gas and oil to the detriment of its other sectors. 104 As the rising price of natural gas led to a relative rise in value of the ruble, Russian domestic manufacturing became less profitable because its goods were relatively too expensive on the world market— essentially a form of the Dutch Disease. 105 This has two implications. For one, Russia is now reliant on its natural gas (and oil) sector for its economic health, just as European consumers are reliant on Russia’s natural gas. This potentially improves Europe’s bargaining position in future negotiations. Second, Russia’s weakened economy could at least temporarily reduce its capacity to use its gas to project its interests abroad. Russia may be less willing to cut off natural gas supplies to neighboring countries because temporarily losing that revenue will be more painful when the price of gas is low and its economy is struggling. 106

#### Expansion inevitable – Russian geography

**Stratfor 8** (“The Russian Resurgence and the New-Old Front”, 9-15,

http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20080915\_russian\_resurgence\_and\_new\_old\_front)

Russia is attempting to reforge its Cold War-era influence in its near abroad. This is not simply an issue of nostalgia, but a perfectly logical and predictable reaction to the Russian environment. Russia lacks easily definable, easily defendable borders. There is no redoubt to which the Russians can withdraw, and the only security they know comes from establishing buffers — buffers which tend to be lost in times of crisis. The alternative is for Russia to simply trust other states to leave it alone. Considering Russia’s history of occupations, from the Mongol horde to Napoleonic France to Hitler’s Germany, it is not difficult to surmise why the Russians tend to choose a more activist set of policies.

#### Nuclear terrorism is a joke

Mueller and Stewart 12 [John Mueller is Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “The Terrorism Delusion”, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 81–110, Chetan]

In the eleven years since the September 11 attacks, no terrorist has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb in the United States, and except for the four explosions in the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone in the United States since September 11 has been with gunfire—inflicting a total of perhaps sixteen deaths over the period (cases 4, 26, 32).11 This limited capacity is impressive because, at one time, small-scale terrorists in the United States were quite successful in setting off bombs. Noting that the scale of the September 11 attacks has “tended to obliterate America’s memory of pre-9/11 terrorism,” Brian Jenkins reminds us (and we clearly do need reminding) that the 1970s witnessed sixty to seventy terrorist incidents, mostly bombings, on U.S. soil every year.12 The situation seems scarcely different in Europe and other Western locales. Michael Kenney, who has interviewed dozens of government officials and intelligence agents and analyzed court documents, has found that, in sharp contrast with the boilerplate characterizations favored by the DHS and with the imperatives listed by Dalmia, Islamist militants in those locations are operationally unsophisticated, short on know-how, prone to making mistakes, poor at planning, and limited in their capacity to learn.13 Another study documents the difficulties of network coordination that continually threaten the terrorists’ operational unity, trust, cohesion, and ability to act collectively.14 In addition, although some of the plotters in the cases targeting the United States harbored visions of toppling large buildings, destroying airports, setting off dirty bombs, or bringing down the Brooklyn Bridge (cases 2, 8, 12, 19, 23, 30, 42), all were nothing more than wild fantasies, far beyond the plotters’ capacities however much they may have been encouraged in some instances by FBI operatives. Indeed, in many of the cases, target selection is effectively a random process, lacking guile and careful planning. Often, it seems, targets have been chosen almost capriciously and simply for their convenience. For example, a would-be bomber targeted a mall in Rockford, Illinois, because it was nearby (case 21). Terrorist plotters in Los Angeles in 2005 drew up a list of targets that were all within a 20-mile radius of their shared apartment, some of which did not even exist (case 15). In Norway, a neo-Nazi terrorist on his way to bomb a synagogue took a tram going the wrong way and dynamited a mosque instead.15 Although the efforts of would-be terrorists have often seemed pathetic, even comical or absurd, the comedy remains a dark one. Left to their own devices, at least a few of these often inept and almost always self-deluded individuals could eventually have committed some serious, if small-scale, damage.16

#### -- Iran circumvents US gas leverage – sanctions ineffective

Kashfi 12 (Mansour, “Middle East,” Asia Times, 6-7-12, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/NF07Ak02.html)

Despite all of this, and still believing it is in the game, Iran has a new plan for transporting natural gas to Europe. On July 24, 2011, Javad Owji, deputy oil minister and chairman of the Iranian National Gas Co, told the local media that "Iran's gas exports to Europe are sustainable and enjoy a secure future." He continued that Iran has the capability to produce 600 million cubic meters (mcm) of gas daily, and by launching the South Pars gas field and completing the 24 projected phases in the future, Iran will be able to produce 1.2 bcm and to export up to 250 mcm daily. The following day a memorandum of understanding was signed between the deputy Iranian oil minister, Iraqi Oil Minister Abdul Kareem Luaibi, and Syrian Oil Minister Sufian Alao in the southern Iranian port of Assalouyeh, Iran's gas hub, for the construction of a pipeline dubbed as the "Islamic Gas Pipeline" to deliver Iran's natural gas to Lebanon after passing through Iraq and Syria, and then submerging beneath the Mediterranean before surfacing in Greece, the EU's first transit country. Owji emphasized that the construction of this pipeline stretching for several thousand kilometers will take three to five years once an investment "around $10 billion" is secured. He further added that this agreement is indicative that the West's sanctions on Iran have been totally ineffective. Iranian Mehr News Agency, on August 10, 2011, reported that Owji told reporters in Tehran: "Seven international investors have announced their readiness to finance, design, and construct the Islamic pipeline that will transport 110 million cm of Iranian natural gas to Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and European countries per day." Owji added that talks were underway to begin construction of the multibillion-dollar project by March 2012.

**-- Iran won’t be aggressive – too many checks in the system**

**Boroujerdi 7** (Mehrzad, Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Middle Eastern Studies Program, “Iranian Nuclear Miasma”, Syracuse Law Review, 57 Syracuse L. Rev. 619, Lexis)

The potential for groupthink miscalculations is also **thwarted** by the existence of multiple consensus-based decision bodies within the overall multilayered structure. 18 While this complex process can sometimes make Iranian policy confusing and contradictory, it does not necessarily lend itself to high risk behavior. Even if one agent makes a hasty decision or issues an aggressive policy statement, it may be **immediately contradicted** by another authority. 19 Individual leaders also have difficulty muting [\*623] criticism within the regime and forcing all agents to agree on one course of action. While miscalculations and hasty behavior may be the rule at the micro-level, at the macro-level hasty action is **checked by** the **competing nodes of power**. While this structure could admittedly be problematic with regard to the nuclear program depending on what form of command and control system to control accidents and illicit transfer is established, it makes the prospect of Iran engaging in a boldly offensive or miscalculated action **less realistic**.

#### -- No impact to Iran prolif – zero risk of war

Sadr 5 (Ehsaneh, Dept of Government at the University of Maryland, Middle East Policy, Summer 2005)

In an article on U.S. options for a post- Cold War nuclear policy, Charles Glaser criticizes the work of foreign-policy analysts who “focus on a single criterion for evaluating U.S. security – the damage United States society would suffer in a war – but overlook other criteria for measuring U.S. security, specifically those criteria that measure the likelihood of war.”61 The same criticism might be leveled at Israeli security analysts whose preoccupation with the devastation a nuclear Iran could inflict upon the Jewish nation clouds their evaluation of the ways in which the acquisition of nuclear weapons affects the likelihood that Iran would initiate hostilities in the first place. The above analysis indicates that a nuclearized Iran is extremely unlikely to pose an existential threat to Israel. The doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction holds in the Iranian context: Iran’s clerical rulers, anxious to protect their own power, citizens and civilization, will not launch a war that will lead to their own destruction. Iran’s rulers are extremely unlikely to pass nuclear material on to terrorist actors whose loyalty they cannot ensure. They are also unlikely to step up conventional or terrorist harassment of Israel for fear of the escalation of hostilities to nuclear warfare. The impact of Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons upon Israel’s regional interests is less problematic than one might think. Although the regime-change option would be off the table, it is not clear that it has ever been a feasible alternative given current geopolitical realities. Any increase in domestic political support for the Iranian regime is likely to be temporary. Iran may indeed be empowered to pursue its own regional interests, but such pursuit is not necessarily bad for Israeli interests. Finally, it will be many years before Iran’s weapons stockpile begins to approach Israel’s and the latter is compelled to engage in an expensive arms race. Indeed, there is reason to believe that Iran’s access to nuclear weapons may increase the prospects for regional stability and even Middle East peace. Given the horrendous consequences of an accidental nuclear war, it will be imperative that Iran and Israel develop some sort of ability to communicate with one another directly. It is not outside the realm of possibility that the institutionalization of such communications may be the first step in the normalization of relations between the two countries and the future integration of Israel into its neighborhood.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### No increase in cost or significant drop in production from EPA rules

Heidorn 12 (Richard, analyst for Bloomberg Government, MBA at Temple University - Fox School of Business and Management, “Fracking Emissions Rules: Re-estimating the Costs,” 7-19-12, <http://about.bgov.com/2012/07/19/fracking-emissions-rules-re-estimating-the-costs/>)

The Environmental Protection Agency on April 17 issued regulations on natural gas drilling that it says will not only improve air quality but also increase producer profits. The regulations, which will take full effect in 2015, require producers to capture about 90 percent of the volatile organic compounds and methane that can escape into the air as a result of natural gas production using hydraulic fracturing, or fracking. EPA says the rule will cost producers about $170 million a year, but that cost will be more than offset by the sales of the captured methane and natural gas liquids, resulting in a net gain of about $15 million a year. The industry, on the other hand, projects net annual compliance cost at more than $2.5 billion. The Bloomberg Government Study, titled “Fracking Emission Rules: EPA, Industry Miss Mark On Costs, Consequences” (subscription required) analyzes available data on the number of wells affected by the rule, compliance costs per well, the volume of fuel captured and the price for which it can be sold. The study finds that the regulation is neither the profit driver EPA claims nor the billion-dollar burden industry has portrayed. The study finds: • The regulations will increase producer costs by $316 million to $511 million a year, or less than 1 percent of producer revenues. • Drillers are already capturing emissions in geological formations where the volume of methane and liquids makes the capture cost effective. For some wells covered by the new rules, the cost of capture may exceed the incremental revenue from captured fuel. • Producers voluntarily capturing emissions or operating in states that already require capture will face little or no change to their operations aside from reporting requirements. Other producers may reduce drilling for new wells as they divert capital now spent on production to complying with the regulations. • The regulations may generate annual revenue of about $383 million for well service providers and more than $125 million in sales for equipment manufacturers.

#### Compliance easy and cheap – no impact on production

Gowrishankar 12 (Vignesh, PhD in solar cells from Stanford, “EPA's regulations would not be a burden on the natural gas industry, says Bloomberg Government,” 8-1-12, National Resources Defense Council,

<http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/vgowrishankar/epas_regulations_would_not_be.html>)

Southwestern Energy, the eighth largest natural gas producer in the US, can perform green completions at an additional cost of precisely $0. That’s right, with their deep experience and honed business practices, they need to spend no more on undertaking green completions than just venting the gas into the atmosphere. Of course, they reap all the additional revenue from the captured methane. In an informal setting, a Southwestern representative remarked that if a company cannot make money off green completions, it is not doing it right. Southwestern’s Mark Boling has been quoted as saying, “API’s experience has not been our experience”. Taking a step back: The capital cost of green completion equipment set is about $500,000 (API estimates it to be about $467,000), and the equipment lasts at least 5 years. It strains credulity to think that a level-headed market participant would pay as much as $80,000 every 15 days to lease equipment, when it could very well buy or build its own equipment for just six times as much and operate it for five years. The difference between the former and the latter could add up to several million dollars wasted on leasing equipment. Moreover, there have been no reports of firms actually paying green completion costs approaching $80,000. Most reports are closer to or under EPA’s $33,000 per green completion. And if Southwestern’s experiences are anything to go by, even these reported costs may go down over time. Accordingly, we think that the cost of green completions would be closer to EPA’s estimates than those provided by BGov. As such, we continue to believe that compliance with EPA regulations will be cost-effective and likely profitable. Notwithstanding this discord, NRDC does strongly agree with some of the overarching conclusions of the BGov report. The BGov report acknowledges that the estimated net compliance costs would not be a burden on industry. While it could affect natural gas drilling, the report is quick to point out that the net compliance costs would be about 0.5 – 0.7 percent of total industry revenue. Our recent publication titled “Leaking Profits”, actually provided numerous examples of how some of the measures required in the EPA regulations could be profitable, not a net cost. Regardless, NRDC agrees that, at the very least, the regulations would not be a burden on industry. The report further acknowledges that the price of natural gas and natural gas liquids is the dominant driver affecting production. As such, the report recognizes that it is difficult to parse out the impact of any potential small increase in compliance costs on natural gas production. In fact, the report notes that in Colorado and Wyoming drilling permits increased even after green completions were made mandatory in 2009 and 2010.

## Round 4 2NC vs. Northwestern MP

### Link to Prices

#### EPA rules will increase gas prices

ARI 12 (Advanced Resources International Inc. For the American Petroleum Institute, February 2012

“Estimate of Impacts of EPA Proposals to Reduce Air Emissions from Hydraulic Fracturing Operations,”

<http://www.api.org/~/media/Files/Policy/Hydraulic_Fracturing/NSPS-OG-ARI-Impacts-of-EPA-Air-Rules-Final-Report.ashx>)

For this assessment, the Reference Case crude oil and natural gas price forecasts from the Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) Annual Energy Outlook 2011 (AEO 2011) were assumed. In these forecasts, crude oil prices are forecast to rise from $86.23 per barrel in 2012 to $115.15 per barrel by 2025 (2009 dollars). Average wellhead natural gas prices are forecast to rise from $4.09 per Mcf in 2012 to $5.43 per Mcf in 2025. The price forecasts assumed in this assessment are summarized in Table 2. However, it is important to note that EIA’s price forecasts are used throughout this analysis even if REC equipment availability limits unconventional resource development and production, which might impact natural gas prices. Also important to note is that this analysis only assessed the impact on unconventional resource development (tight gas, CBM and shale wells). To the extent a REC requirement also 11 applies to “conventional” wells that are hydraulically fractured, the phase-in requirement and impacts are underestimated.

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

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

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

#### Steady rise in prices coming now

Conti 12 (John J., Assistant Administrator of Energy Analysis, United States Energy Information Administration, “Annual Energy Outlook 2012,” June 2012, <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/pdf/0383(2012).pdf)>

U.S. natural gas prices are determined largely by supply and demand conditions in North American markets. At current (2012) price levels, natural gas prices are below average replacement cost. However, over time natural gas prices rise with the cost of developing incremental production capacity (Figure 103). After 2017, natural gas prices rise in the AEO2012 Reference case more rapidly than crude oil prices, but oil prices remain at least three times higher than natural gas prices through the end of the projection (Figure 104). As of January 1, 2010, total proved and unproved natural gas resources are estimated at 2,203 trillion cubic feet. Development costs for natural gas wells are expected to grow slowly. Henry Hub spot prices for natural gas rise by 2.1 percent per year from 2010 through 2035 in the Reference case, to an annual average of $7.37 per million Btu (2010 dollars) in 2035.

### Overview

#### Low prices adv turns their energy leverage because it’s about supply

#### 1.) Gas Glut --

#### A. Market Overshoot – glut causes low prices, kills industry investment and development, devastating long-term supply. That’s Hutchinson.

#### B. Long-Term Effect – low prices devastate future supply of gas, glut now – starve later

Shackouls 3 (Bobby S., Chair of the National Petroleum Council, “Balancing Natural Gas Policy,” September 2003,

<http://www.npc.org/reports/dtg-final.pdf>)

Both the NGPA and PIFUA were repealed because they produced unintended consequences that distorted the market and created inefficiencies. The legacy of these experiments is that regulated prices will rarely work to keep markets balanced because they will invariably send the wrong price signals to producers and consumers, and result in supply shortages or surpluses. An initial regulatory act often leads to a series of regulatory acts to correct the adverse consequences of the previous actions. For example, the low controlled prices of the 1960s to 1970s decreased exploration and drilling activity to the point of causing a supply shortage. Instead of lifting price controls and allowing the free market forces to balance the market, the federal government instead set policy that would decrease demand to match the lower supplies. This action reduced drilling activity, requiring an additional regulation to fix that problem.

#### C. Exploration – drilling in restricted areas is prohibitively expensive, and a drop in the bucket

Brown 10 (Stephen P.A. Brown, Steven A. Gabriel, and Ruud Egging, Resources for the Future, National Energy Policy Institute, “Abundant Shale Gas Resources: Some Implications for Energy Policy,” April 2010,

<http://nepinstitute.org/get/RFF_Reports/Background-Papers/RFF-NEPI-Brownetal-ShaleGas.pdf>)

For the United States, current estimates of recoverable natural gas resources are 1,760– 2,100 trillion cubic feet. Of this amount, about 162 trillion cubic feet is beneath federal lands on which drilling has been restricted or off limits. These restricted areas are found in Alaska, the Rocky Mountains, the Gulf Coast, and Appalachia. In addition, another 92 trillion cubic feet of offshore natural gas resources are unavailable for development, including 86 trillion cubic feet in the federal outer continental shelf (OCS) moratoria regions. The OCS numbers are subject to considerable uncertainty because estimates for some of the areas were made 25–40 years ago (NPC 2007). The estimates could be increased with new exploration and assessments taking into account modern drilling and extraction techniques. In general, one would expect that increased access to these areas formerly excluded from exploration and development would boost U.S. natural gas supplies. Such an effect is likely to be stronger in the scenarios with higher natural gas prices because exploration and production costs are generally higher in the moratoria lands. Consequently, one might expect that increased access to moratoria lands would reduce some of the uncertainty about U.S. natural gas supplies.

#### 3.) Flaring – Extend Henkel 12 – low prices incentivize flaring – that’s wastes gas and cause warming because it releases the greenhouse gas into the atmosphere

#### B. Massive losses of gas– ending flaring is key to sustainable supply

Clayton 12 (Mark, Staff Writer at the Christian Science Monitor, “Thanks to North Dakota, US waste of natural gas grows rapidly,” 7-13-12, <http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2012/0713/Thanks-to-North-Dakota-US-waste-of-natural-gas-grows-rapidly>)

The United States is flaring so much natural gas into the atmosphere - burning it as oil-field waste rather than extracting energy from it in power plants - that it now leads the world in the growth rate at which it is trashing that energy source. Evidence of the trend can be seen flickering in the night across western North Dakota, where new oil drilling in the Bakken shale formation there has helped propel a surge in US flaring since 2007. As is often the case, many companies find it cheaper to burn off gas that emerges in new oil fields, rather than build pipelines and facilities to collect it. But that common practice has created a big problem globally. About 5 trillion cubic feet (b.c.f.) of natural gas were flared or vented without burning worldwide last year. That huge amount of wasted energy is roughly equal to a quarter of all natural gas consumed in the US annually, the World Bank reports. Flaring also dumped 360 million tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere over the same period, equal to the exhaust of 70 million cars. Even so, flaring, which produces carbon dioxide emissions, is less harmful than venting natural gas directly to the atmosphere. That's because natural gas is mostly methane, about 25 times more potent than CO2 in trapping atmospheric heat. From space, the light of gas flares blazing in the night is tracked by orbiting satellites that relay the data to analysts at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). From there, analyzed data goes to the World Bank, which since 2002 has campaigned to get nations to reduce flaring and quit wasting gas. As a result, over the last decade most of the top 20 flaring nations have begun curbing the wasteful practice. While Russia leads the world in flaring - 37 b.c.f. burned last year - that number represents a 28 percent drop from 2007. Nigeria, the second largest flaring nation, as well as a dozen others also have cut back on flaring. But in the US, flaring has grown rapidly over the past five years - soaring from 78 bcf) in 2007 to 251 b.c.f. in 2011 - a 223 percent increase. That rate of growth is far faster than all other big flaring nations, new World Bank data shows. That also has led to another dubious distinction for the US - thrusting it from a virtual tie for 14th place among the world's top 20 flaring nations by volume in 2007 into fifth place last year. In North Dakota, flaring is "due to insufficient natural gas pipeline capacity and processing facilities in the Bakken shale region," the Energy Information Administration (EIA) reported in November. "Over 35 percent of North Dakota's natural gas production so far in 2011 has been flared or otherwise not marketed." That percentage of flared gas in North Dakota is far higher than the national average. Less than 1 percent of natural gas produced in the US overall was vented or flared in 2009, the EIA found. North Dakota officials say the state's flaring is responsible for about a quarter of the US total. But researchers are certain about the increase. "The increase in US gas flaring is from the Bakken oil field in North Dakota," Chris Elvidge, a NOAA researcher who has analyzed the satellite flaring data writes in an e-mail interview. "It's possible that current low prices for natural gas may be contributing to the decision of the companies operating in North Dakota to flare the gas off rather than invest in the infrastructure to capture it and bring it to market."

#### C. Future Demand - flared gas alone covers demand

Hackett 11 (James T., adjunct professor at Rice University, MBA from Harvard, Executive Chairman of the Board of Anadarko Petroleum Corporation and Chair of the National Petroleum Council, “Prudent Development: Realizing the Potential of North America’s Abundant Natural Gas and Oil Resources,” 9-15-11, <http://www.analysisgroup.com/uploadedFiles/News_and_Events/News/September2011_TierneyEarle_Report_PrudentGasDevelopment.pdf>)

There is a wide range in the estimates of future demand for natural gas. The most aggressive estimate of total natural gas demand, including transportation, is 133 Bcf/d by 2035, an 85% increase from 2010 natural gas requirements of 72 Bcf/d. 23 The low-end estimate of total natural gas demand for 2035 is 72 Bcf/d (Figure ES-10). It appears that even a 2035 potential demand requirement of up to 133 Bcf/d could be supplied. And based on the 2011 MIT gas study, The Future of Natural Gas, this high potential demand could be supplied at a current estimated wellhead production cost range in 2007 dollars of $4.00 to $8.00 per million Btu (MMBtu), as shown by comparing the information in Figure ES-10 and Figure ES-3, and based on current expectations of cost performance and assuming adequate access to resources for development. 24 This wellhead development cost should not be read as an expected market price, since many factors determine the price to the consumer in competitive markets.

### Warming Impact: 2NC

#### Magnitude --- warming will become rapid, kill billions, and cause extinction

#### Its try-or-die because extinction is inevitable in the status quo --- and outweighs survivable wars

**End** **Times 6** (New York End Times, Non-Partisan News Filter Monitoring World Events Pertaining to Extinction, “The Extinction Scale”, 10-16, http://newyorkendtimes.com/extinctionscale.asp)

We rate Global Climate Change as a greater threat for human extinction in this century. Most scientists forecast disruptions and dislocations, if current trends persist. The extinction danger is more likely if we alter an environmental process that causes harmful effects and leads to conditions that make the planet uninhabitable to humans. Considering that there is so much that is unknown about global systems, we consider climate change to be the greatest danger to human extinction. However, there is no evidence of imminent danger. Nuclear war at some point in this century might happen. It is unlikely to cause human extinction though. While several countries have nuclear weapons, there are few with the firepower to annihilate the world. For those nations it would be suicidal to exercise that option. The pattern is that the more destructive technology a nation has, the more it tends towards rational behavior. Sophisticated precision weapons then become better tactical options. The bigger danger comes from nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists with the help of a rogue state, such as North Korea. The size of such an explosion would not be sufficient to threaten humanity as a whole. Instead it could trigger a major war or even world war. Under this scenario human extinction would only be possible if other threats were present, such as disease and climate change. We monitor war separately. However we also need to incorporate the dangers here.

#### Fastest --- we’re reaching tipping point --- warming will be quick

### Warming Link: 2NC

#### Low prices cause warming -

#### 1.) Flaring

#### The aff increases flaring -

Gloystein 12 (Henning Gloystein and Alessandra Prentice, Reuters, “Natural Gas Flaring Rises Globally, Fueled By U.S. Shale Boom,” 5-3-12, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/03/natural-gas-flaring-rises-globally_n_1474838.html>)

LONDON, May 2 (Reuters) - The U.S. shale energy boom is fuelling a rise in the burning of waste gas after years of decline, a World Bank source told Reuters ahead of the release of new data, giving environmentalists more ammunition against the industry. Global gas flaring crept up by around 2 billion cubic metres (bcm) in 2011, the first rise since 2008, preliminary data from the World Bank shows. The increase is mostly due to the rise in shale oil exploration in North Dakota, propelling the United States into the top 10 gas flaring countries along with Russia, Nigeria and Iraq. The preliminary data - which will be released in detail later in May - shows that global gas flaring crept up to around 140 billion cubic meters (bcm) in 2011, up from 138 bcm the previous year. Flaring is used to eliminate gas at mineral exploration sites, and is released via pressure relief valves to ease the strain on equipment. "The challenge in North Dakota is that there is a lot of initial exploration and production going on, and often some flaring is necessary at that stage," the source at the World Bank's Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership (GGFR) said. "We are hopeful that when the full data is released, both policymakers and companies in North Dakota will pay more attention to this issue and take the necessary steps to minimize flaring." The data will draw further criticism to the industry, which some activists already condemn on environmental grounds. "Environmental regulations to stop flaring are taking a real kick in the teeth because the financial crisis has put the emphasis on increasing competitiveness, while anything that is seen as diminishing competitiveness is not getting any political traction," Charlie Kronick, senior climate campaigner at Greenpeace, said.

#### -- The aff locks us into natural gas for decades – causes warming

Inman 12 (Mason, reporter for National Geographic, specializes in reporting climate change and energy, “Shale Gas: A Boon That Could Stunt Alternatives, Study Says,” 1-7-12, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/01/120117-shale-gas-boom-impact-on-renewables/>)

"Given current U.S. policies, abundant and relatively cheap natural gas puts all other energy sources at a competitive disadvantage," he said. "It is particularly important for decision-makers to . . . usher in more renewable energy by creating incentives to help this industry thrive," including policies to increase innovation and encourage investment in electric grids. The infrastructure people build today—power plants fired by coal or natural gas, or solar panels or wind turbines—will likely last for decades, Bradbury said. "The longer it takes for the [United States] to pass climate policy," he added, "the more likely it is that we will see . . . gas-related infrastructure become effectively locked in to our energy system for decades." The MIT study noted that natural gas is often thought of as a "bridge" to a low-carbon future. But the study also emphasizes that there is also a risk of "stunting" other technologies for reducing carbon emissions. "While taking advantage of this gift in the short run, treating gas as a 'bridge' to a low-carbon future," the study said, "it is crucial not to allow the greater ease of the near-term task to erode efforts to prepare a landing at the other end of the bridge."

#### 2.) CCS

#### A. Low prices kill it

Inman 12 (Mason, reporter for National Geographic, specializes in reporting climate change and energy, “Shale Gas: A Boon That Could Stunt Alternatives, Study Says,” 1-7-12, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/01/120117-shale-gas-boom-impact-on-renewables/>)

Shale gas has transformed the U.S. energy landscape in the past several years—but it may crowd out renewable energy and other ways of cutting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, a new study warns. A team of researchers at Massachusetts Institute of Technology used economic modeling to show that new abundant natural gas is likely to have a far more complex impact on the energy scene than is generally assumed. If climate policy continues to play out in the United States with a relatively weak set of measures to control emissions, the new gas source will lead to lower gas and electricity prices, and total energy use will be higher in 2050. Absent the shale supply, the United States could have expected to see GHG emissions 2 percent below 2005 levels by 2050 under this relatively weak policy. But the lower gas prices under the current shale gas outlook will stimulate economic growth, leading GHG emissions to increase by 13 percent over 2005. And the shale gas will retard the growth of renewable energy's share of electricity, and push off the development of carbon capture and storage technology, needed to meet more ambitious policy targets, by as long as two decades. "Shale gas is a great advantage to the U.S. in the short term, for the next few decades," said MIT economist Henry Jacoby, lead author of the new study. "But it is so attractive that it threatens other energy sources we ultimately will need."

#### B. Key to stop warming

Guzman 9 (Doris de Guzman, ICIS – world’s largest petrochemical market information provider, “Capturing carbon's potential”, 1/15, <http://www.icis.com/Articles/2009/01/15/9184929/chemicals-to-capture-ccs-potential.html>)

CARBON CAPTURE and sequestration (CCS) technology might still be at an experimental and development stage, but several companies, including those in the chemical industry, are lining up to take advantage of its opportunities. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which provides climate-change information, identified CCS as the most promising technology for the rapid reduction of global emissions. Carbon dioxide (CO2 ) is said to be capturable in significant quantities from five main pollution sources, namely ammonia production power generation from fossil fuels industrial production facilities, such as cement, coal-to-chemicals, and steel plants energy processing, such as coal and gas-to-liquids operations and well heads at gas fields. The IPCC estimated that CCS can reduce global emissions by up to 55% by 2100, according to Graeme Sweeney, executive vice president of future fuels and CO2 at Anglo-Dutch oil and chemical major Shell. "Major volumes of oil, gas and coal are still needed to meet rising global demand for energy in the coming decades. Left unmitigated, the cumulative global carbon footprint will be dire for people and the planet. Only CCS has the potential to cut the resulting CO2 emissions at the speed and scale required," says Sweeney. The Paris, France-based International Energy Agency (IEA) reported in its Energy Technology Perspectives 2008 report that CCS would need to contribute nearly one-fifth of the necessary emissions reductions to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2050 if its cost is reasonable. "CCS is therefore essential to the achievement of deep emission cuts," said Nobuo Tanaka, IEA director, in a recent statement. "If we do not successfully demonstrate CCS soon, it will raise costs significantly for other climate-mitigation options."

#### C. 90 percent of emissions

Jia 7 (Anne, science-writing intern at Stanford News Service, “Researchers examine carbon capture and storage to combat global warming,” Stanford Report, 6-13-12, <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2007/june13/carbon-061307.html>)

Carbon capture has the potential to reduce more than 90 percent of an individual plant's carbon emissions, said Lynn Orr, director of GCEP and professor of energy resources engineering. Stationary facilities that burn fossil fuels—such as power plants or cement factories—would be candidates for the technology, he said. Capturing carbon dioxide from small, mobile sources, such as cars, would be more difficult, Orr said. But with power plants comprising 40 percent of the world's fossil fuel-derived carbon emissions, he added, the potential for reductions is significant. Not only can a lot of carbon dioxide be captured, but the Earth's capacity to store it is also vast, he added. Estimates of worldwide storage capacity range from 2 trillion to 10 trillion tons of carbon dioxide, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its report on carbon capture and storage. Global emissions in 2004 totaled 27 billion tons, according to the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration. If all human-induced emissions were sequestered, enough capacity would exist to accommodate more than 100 years' worth of emissions, according to Benson, coordinating lead author of the IPCC chapter on underground geological storage.

### Uranium Turns

#### Cheap gas kills uranium market – it’s price is slipping – that’s Cowie 12

#### Kazakhstan loses those sales – decrease in GDP – that’s McDermott 11

#### It also prevents diversification of Kazakhstan’s economy because they’re reliant on their minerals to jump start other industries – that’s Pleitgen 12

#### Economic downfall in Kazakhstan spread instability through labor strikes – that’s Hamm

#### It spreads through the region because Kazakhstan is a strategic linchpin in cental asia because of its position – that’s **Assenova**

#### Central Asia is a unique spot for extinction because of its historical hostility and aggression with weapons of mass destruction – that’s Ahrari

### Sino-Japan: 2NC

#### Kazakh key to diversify REM market

Blank 12 (Stephen, Eurasian Daily Monitor, “Kazakhstan Completes Major Uranium and Rare Earths Deals with Japan,” Eurasia Daily Monitor Volume: 9 Issue: 144, 7-30-12, <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39705&cHash=4e68ec740b98fe390061af8ca1769b6c>)

Similarly Kazakhstan is poised for a huge expansion in the rare earths sector, again particularly with Japan. The Central Asian republic is continuing Japan’s existing deals with Sumitomo and Toshiba to extract metals like molybdenum, rhenium and beryllium – all rare earths used in advanced weapons and technologies. Japan and Kazakhstan will also jointly build a plant in the northern Kazakhstani city of Stepnogorsk, which will isolate dysprosium, a rare earth metal used in electric and hybrid car engines. The plant is set to export 30 tons of dysprosium to Japan annually, which may increase by next year to 50 tons annually – roughly ten percent of Japan’s yearly demand. But Kazakhstan also recently signed a strategic partnership agreement worth 3 billion euros ($3.7 billion) with Germany to prospect for and develop rare earths and other minerals, and this is on top of expanding Kazakhstani-German trade of 6.3 billion euros ($8.5 billion) in 2011 (http://www.edgekz.com/kazakhstan-poised-for-rare-earth-boom.html). France too is jointly developing rare earths with Kazakhstan in a deal that looks forward to joint production. Just as in the case of uranium, demand for these rare earths is expected to grow substantially in the coming years, allowing Kazakhstan to reap a bonanza from deals with major importers and growing economies.

#### Key to prevent Sino-Japanese conflict

Blank 12 (Stephen, Eurasian Daily Monitor, “Kazakhstan Completes Major Uranium and Rare Earths Deals with Japan,” Eurasia Daily Monitor Volume: 9 Issue: 144, 7-30-12, <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=39705&cHash=4e68ec740b98fe390061af8ca1769b6c>)

For Japan, too, these deals are of importance. Like other consumers of either nuclear energy or rare earths, Japan considers it of the utmost significance to have multiple, diverse and secure sources of access to prevent overdependence upon one or two producers. The case of rare earths is thus of vital importance. In 2010, China, which then possessed about 97 percent of global stocks of rare earths – commodities that are vital to advanced technological products, including weapons – imposed export tariffs and huge price increases in those goods against Japan in retaliation for a violent encounter with Japan’s Navy in the East China Sea (see China Brief, November 8, 2010). In essence, China waged a campaign of economic warfare against Japan, demonstrating Beijing’s newfound confidence vis-à-vis its neighbors after 2008.

#### China/Japan war goes nuclear – draws in the US

**Samuels 99** (Richard, Professor of International Relations – MIT, The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present, and Future, p. 6-7)

The same forces that lead China and Japan into an adversarial relationship in the first place might well push them to the brink of war. From a U.S. perspective, this would be disastrous, for several reasons: -War between two of America’s largest trading partners would be devastating to the U.S. economy -U.S. involvement would be difficult to avoid in a war between a former ally and a former enemy -War between a nuclear power and a threshold nuclear power would push the envelope in new and disconcerting ways -War between the two would be (another) humanitarian disaster -Nuclearization in Japan would press both Koreas to do the same, and perhaps pressure other Asian nations to follow suite. Even if China and Japan did not go to war, a Cold War between the two great powers could impose high costs on the region, and indeed the globe, if the last simmering conflict between two giants on the world scene has taught us anything. At a minimum, the remarkable (and hard-earned) domestic politics stability in Japan would further unravel, creating even greater uncertainties for its foreign policy and its evolving role as provider of global public goods.

### Turns Europe NRG: 2NC

#### Stable Kazakhstan key to solve European energy reliance on Russia

Assenova 8 (Margarita Assenova, IND Director; Natalie Zajicova, Program Officer (IND); Janusz Bugajski, CSIS NEDP Director; Ilona Teleki, Deputy Director and Fellow (CSIS); Besian Bocka, Program Coordinator and Research Assistant (CSIS), “Kazakhstan’s Strategic Significance,” 2008, CSIS-IND Taskforce Policy Brief team, European Dialogue, <http://eurodialogue.org/Kazakhstan-Strategic-Significance>)

The decision by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to award Kazakhstan the chairmanship of the organization for 2010 underscores a growing recognition of the country’s regional and continental importance. Kazakhstan is a strategic linchpin in the vast Central Asian-Caspian Basin zone, a region rich in energy resources and a potential gateway for commerce and communications between Europe and Asia. However, it is also an area that faces an assortment of troubling security challenges. Ensuring a stable and secure Central Asia is important for the international interests of the United States and its European allies for several prescient reasons: • Afghanistan: Central Asia is a key staging area for U.S. and NATO military operations in Afghanistan against Taliban insurgents and Al Qaeda militants. Central Asia is a crucial conduit for U.S. and NATO troops and supplies into Afghanistan. U.S. officials recently reached new agreements with Russia, Kazakhstan, and other Central Asian countries to allow Afghan bound non-military supplies through their territories. • Trans-National Terrorism: The Taliban resurgence in Afghanistan stimulates cross-border terrorism that may endanger the stability of several Central Asian neighbors and undermine Western interests. Central Asian states have been the victims of Afghanistan-based transnational terrorism. These states, including Kazakhstan, can support international efforts to counter regional terrorist networks. • Organized Crime and Drug Trafficking: Central Asia is an important transit region for narcotics trafficking between Afghanistan and the countries of Europe and Asia. Joint initiatives that will enable the Kazakh government to control and monitor borders more effectively, intercept smuggling operations, and eradicate criminal networks will buttress international security and curtail funding to cross-border terrorist groups. • Energy Security: Central Asia has the potential to be a vital energy source for Europe. The region contains a vast storehouse of oil and natural gas, which Europe urgently needs in order to lessen its reliance on Russian and Middle Eastern energy supplies. Disputes between Russia and several energy transit states, such as Ukraine, have increased Europe’s interest in developing direct supply lines between Europe and the Caspian countries.

#### Kazakhstan solves European energy needs

Assenova 8 (Margarita Assenova, IND Director; Natalie Zajicova, Program Officer (IND); Janusz Bugajski, CSIS NEDP Director; Ilona Teleki, Deputy Director and Fellow (CSIS); Besian Bocka, Program Coordinator and Research Assistant (CSIS), “Kazakhstan’s Strategic Significance,” 2008, CSIS-IND Taskforce Policy Brief team, European Dialogue, <http://eurodialogue.org/Kazakhstan-Strategic-Significance>)

Energy Security Kazakhstan is a major producer and exporter of crude oil, projected to export three million barrels of oil per day, or 150 million tons per year, by 2015. Kazakhstan also possesses substantial natural gas reserves and some of the world’s largest reserves of uranium.The three energy-rich states of Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan) understand that their political independence and energy security requires diversifying their energy customers and avoiding reliance on any single power or transit route. Currently, Russia is the main transit route for energy exports from Central Asia. Kazakhstan supports building oil and gas pipelines that would channel its energy resources directly to Europe and China. The Kazakh energy industry favors a direct energy connection with Azerbaijan across the Caspian Sea that would help supply the European market.

### Iran Prolif: 2NC

#### Low prices independently stop Kazakhstan’s siting as a nuclear fuel bank

McDermott 11 (Roger, Senior Fellow, Foreign Military Studies Office, Fort Leavenworth, “Kazakhstan: Countering nuclear proliferation, Action to develop a nuclear and terrorist-free world,” in Kazakhstan 2011: Twenty Years of Peace and Creation, *First: The Forum for Global Decision Makers*, 2011, <http://www.firstmagazine.com/Publishing/SpecialReportsDetail.aspx?RegionId=4&SpecialReportId=96>)

Uranium production Kazakhstan’s nuclear interests lie in providing the world with uranium, and has been an important source for more than fifty years. Kazatomprom, the national atomic company set up in 1997 and owned by the government, controls all uranium exploration and mining as well as other nuclear-related activities, including importing and exporting nuclear materials. It announced in 2008 that it aims to supply 30 per cent of the world’s uranium by 2015, and through joint ventures: 12 per cent of the uranium conversion market, 6 per cent of enrichment, and 30 per cent of the fuel fabrication market. As revenue generated by the uranium industry increases, money is being invested back into further improving the physical protection of domestic plants, internal control measures, the safeguarding of radioactive material, and the training of nuclear industry workers in the ethics of non-proliferation. Since the Soviet collapse, significant improvements have been achieved in all aspects of nuclear safety and security at Kazakh nuclear sites and facilities, mostly with the help of US-funded non-proliferation assistance programs. Due to cooperation with the IAEA, the most sensitive facility – the Ulba Metallurgical Plant at UstKamenogorsk – has the highest level of safeguards in Central Asia, which brings it close to Western standards. Although according to analysts, more resources should be channelled into nuclear security culture and non-proliferation education. By participating in the Nuclear Threat Initiative’s (NTI) proposed international fuel bank, the IUEC, and the US-sponsored Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP), Kazakhstan can contribute to limiting proliferation of full fuel-cycle technologies. It has been has suggested that Kazakhstan could become a site for such a bank because of its nuclear infrastructure, strong non-proliferation record, and large Muslim population, making Kazakhstan perhaps a more appealing host from the perspective of nonWestern countries. Russia’s IUEC is complimentary to GNEP, which seeks to expand the use of nuclear energy while decreasing the risk of proliferation and addressing the challenge of nuclear waste disposal. Kazakhstan’s ambitions are likely to be realized if uranium prices stay high and Kazatomprom is successful in further expanding its international partnerships. Kazatomprom’s most immediate task is to secure customers for its final nuclear fuel product--fuel assemblies, an extra fuel fabrication stage which Kazatomprom plans to start carrying out domestically. Having a nearly complete nuclear fuel cycle, save for enrichment, will ensure a stable cash flow for Kazatomprom and limit its dependence on the fluctuating market price of raw uranium. In the meantime, increased uranium sales will help alleviate the country’s overdependence on oil exports and help modernize its nuclear sector. If Kazakhstan does become the world’s leading uranium and nuclear fuel supplier, the ramifications for the country both in terms of increased gross domestic product and status on the world stage will be profound.

#### Impact is Iranian proliferation

Telegraph 11 (“Kazakhstan: A Key Partner On Non-Proliferation,” 2-1-11, Origin: Embassy Astana, Passed to the Telegraph by WikiLeaks, Classification: SECRET, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/wikileaks-files/nuclear-wikileaks/8297124/KAZAKHSTAN-A-KEY-PARTNER-ON-NON-PROLIFERATION.html>)

1. (SBU) SUMMARY: Kazakhstan is a full and supportive partner of the United States on countering proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Kazakhstan actively participates in many international counter-proliferation organizations. Recently, it sought to enhance its role in non-proliferation, requesting to join the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), volunteering to host a nuclear fuel-bank, and developing its uranium and nuclear industries. Kazakhstan's leaders consistently reiterate that non-proliferation, especially through the Cooperative Threat Reduction Agreement (CTR), is a fundamental pillar of U.S.-Kazakhstani relations. The United States and Kazakhstan have decommissioned reactors, secured borders, and built safe scientific laboratories. In 2009, Kazakhstan ratified the extension of the CTR Agreement, resolved issues related to customs and taxes on technical assistance, provided a first tranche of funding for the spent-fuel project, and moved ahead of schedule on securing the Semipalatinsk Test Site. Now, Kazakhstan must allocate additional funding for the spent-fuel transfer program and strengthen border protection and legal controls to prevent proliferation. END SUMMARY. HIGH-LEVEL COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT 2. (SBU) In every possible forum, high-level Kazakhstani officials praise non-proliferation as a cornerstone of our bilateral relationship (reftels A-C). On June 18, Nazarbayev organized a massive memorial event on the 20th anniversary of the last nuclear test at Semipalatinsk (ref B) at which he thanked the U.S. and Russian governments -- represented by their Ambassadors -- for their assistance in the field of non-proliferation. Nazarbayev also urged adoption of a new universal non-proliferation treaty, proposed a prohibition on any improvements to existing nuclear arsenals, and advocated the United Nations designate August 29 -- the date on which he closed the test-site in 1991 -- as World Non-Nuclear Day. Kazakhstani officials have subsequently aggressively sought support from other nations, particularly the U.S. and Japan, for this proposal. ACTIVE PARTICPATION IN NON-PRO ORGANIZATIONS 3. (SBU) Kazakhstan actively participates in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Nuclear Suppliers' Group (NSG), the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism (GICNT). Kazakhstan hosted the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism's senior-level Plenary Meeting in June 2007, conducted two working-level exercises in 2008 (ref D), and is considering hosting additional activities in 2010. Within the NSG, Kazakhstan supported U.S. government initiatives on civil nuclear cooperation with India and enhancement of controls on transfers of enrichment and reprocessing (ENR) equipment and technology. It has signed the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), the International Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missiles (ICCBM), and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). In 2001, ASTANA 00001541 002 OF 004 Kazakhstan ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and has hosted four exercises, most recently a large verification exercise in 2008. Kazakhstan also led efforts to establish the Central Asian Nuclear Free Zone in 2006. In February 2009, Kazakhstan expressed its strong interest in joining the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). QUIETLY SUPPORTIVE ON IRAN 4. (S) Critical due to its large volume of uranium production and geographic location (reftels E-F), Kazakhstan consistently supports U.S. non-proliferation initiatives -- especially in relation to Iran, North Korea, and Syria. President Nazarbayev told Under Secretary Burns in Astana in July, that he has privately urged Iran's President Ahmadinejad to negotiate with the United States about its nuclear program (Ref O). State's ISN Office told PolOff that Kazakhstan has provided especially strong support for the implementation of UN Security Council resolutions on Iran over the last year. NUCLEAR FUEL-BANK PROPOSAL 5. (SBU) During Iranian President Ahmadinejad's April 6-7 visit to Kazakhstan, Nazarbayev asserted Iran's right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and announced Kazakhstan's offer to host an international nuclear fuel bank -- an offer that Iran appeared to welcome (ref A). (COMMENT: Nazarbayev, an expert at balancing foreign policy priorities, also emphasized support for the President's non-proliferation policy and initiative to negotiate with Iran, during a joint press conference with Ahmadinejad. END COMMENT.) Yerzhan Kazykhanov, Kazakhstan's Permanent Representative to International Organizations in Vienna, outlined Nazarbayev's fuel-bank proposal during the June 18 IAEA Board of Governors' meetings. Vice President of Kazakhstan's National Nuclear Company, Kazatomprom, Sergei Yashin, said Vladimir Shkolnik, Kazatomprom's Director, planned to present a comprehensive nuclear strategy to Nazarbayev in June. Post has requested more information about the fuel bank, but has not received any official response.

#### c/a nuke war

### Prices T/ Manufacturing

#### Turn – Low prices kill Coal

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

ML: We tend to follow more of the met coal market. The weakness in the natural gas price, particularly in the U.S., has hurt thermal coal producers, especially in Appalachia, where there are somewhat higher costs. We think the thermal coal market will see some recovery over the next couple of years because it's not just the U.S. that uses thermal coal. Far more thermal coal is used in China than in the U.S. The high-cost producers have been affected the most as thermal prices have been hit as much as 20–30% in the last three to four months. That's made a difference to the bottom lines and investment analysts' view of that sector.

#### Destroys manufacturing

PEL 10 (Pennsylvania Economy League, “The Economic Impact of the Coal Industry in Pennsylvania,” April 2010,

<http://www.alleghenyconference.org/PDFs/PELMisc/EconomicImpactOfCoalIndustryInPa0410.pdf>)

In May 2009, Alpha Natural Resources announced plans to merge with Foundation Coal. The merger was completed at the end of July 2009. The combined company retains the Alpha name and headquarters in Abingdon, VA. With affiliate coal production capacity of more than 90 million tons a year, Alpha is the nation's leading supplier and exporter of metallurgical coal used in the steel-making process and is a major supplier of thermal coal to electric utilities and manufacturing industries across the country. The company, through its affiliates, employs approximately 6,200 people and operates more than 60 mines and 14 coal preparation facilities in the regions of Northern and Central Appalachia and the Powder River Basin.

## Round 4 1NR vs. Northwestern MP

### 1NR - Impact

#### DA outweighs – No impact defense means any risk of the DA should be preferred. Romney will ruin US-Russia relatiosn because he takes a hardline stance towards Putin and won’t cooperate on NMD or other missile defense issues – causes relations collapse and war turns their Russia expansionism arg

#### US- Russia war is the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### And turns Iran - Romney will pre-emptively strike Iran

Christian 12 [RC Christian, “Israel Preemptive War on Iran this Spring”, March 7th, 2012, <http://coupmedia.org/terror-threats/israel-preemtive-war-on-iran-this-spring-0703>, Chetan]

On Super Tuesday, mainstream **GOP candidates pledged their loyalty to** the foreign policy propaganda of **Israel and** AIPAC, as they strived to surpass each other in **belligerent talks regarding Iran. Romney**, Santorum and Gingrich **promised to support an** **Israeli attack** some analysts predict will occur in June, reported Infowars. “If Iran doesn’t get rid of nuclear facilities, we will tear them down ourselves,” said Rick Santorum and continued with Iran presents an “existential threat to freedom loving people throughout the world.” Attacking Iran regarding its unsubstantiated nuclear weapons program has always been part of flashpoint of Santorum presidential campaign. **He even called for a “preemptive strike” on Iran** last year. Presidential Candidate Gingrich told AIPAC he thinks that Iran has crossed a “red line” with its nuclear program and was “deepening their commitment to nuclear weapons while we talk,” again reiterating the subject of a forthcoming war with Iran, irrespective of the intelligence analysis coming from US and allied intelligence services. “**I will provide all available intelligence** to the Israeli government, **ensure that they have the equipment necessary**, and reassure them, that if an Israeli prime minister decides that he has to avoid the threat of a second Holocaust through pre-emptive measures, that I would require no advance notice,” he said. Mitt Romney also promised that if he becomes president he will support Israel “in all conditions and that he would end Obama’s “procrastination” regarding US foreign policy on Iran. “**I will make sure Iran knows of the very real peril that awaits if it becomes nuclear,” Romney declared.**

.

### Energy Policies Key

#### Energy attacks will matter in a close election.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

Yet if the election is as close as the polls suggest, the energy ads could prove a pivotal factor. "Advertising is generally not decisive. Advertising matters at the margins. ... But ask Al Gore if the margin matters," said Ken Goldstein, president of the Campaign Media Analysis Group at Kantar Media. "This is looking like an election where the margin may matter."

#### Energy outweighs other issues --- it’s fiercely debated and a central question.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

The Republican efforts appear to go beyond any modern campaign in their brash embrace of what is dirty, and their scorn of what is not. And the times seem to favor them. In 2009, the GOP, backed by heavy industry lobbying, knocked back environmentalists on their heels by crushing global warming legislation. Other previously central issues -- Afghanistan, Iraq, health care -- are still debated in the campaign, but not as centrally nor as viscerally as energy, said Frank Maisano, an energy and political analyst at Bracewell & Giuliani, a Houston-based law firm. Obama advisors have said rightly that energy is only one component of a much broader American and global economy, but the GOP appears to have at least partially successfully injected the oil and gas boom as a defining feature of the economic discourse. In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times entitled "America's New Energy Reality," industry consultant Daniel Yergin remarked that while Obama's 2010 State of the Union address focused on clean-energy jobs, the president pivoted this year to talk as much about oil and natural gas. "His announcement that ‘American oil production is the highest it has been in eight years' turned out to be an applause line," Yergin noted.

#### Energy issues kills Obama in key swing states.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies."

### 1NR – Link

#### Extend Jones – nat gas drilling is WAY unpopular with democrats because they want to transition to green energy

#### Answer 2AC args

#### Fracking is massively unpopular --- the public wants regulations.

**Weiss**, 5/24/**2012** (Daniel – senior fellow and director of Climate Strategy at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, Americans Say ‘Yes’ to Clean Energy, ‘No’ To Fracking Without Safeguards, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/24/489756/americans-say-yes-to-clean-energy-no-to-fracking-without-safeguards/)

Fossil fuel interests are spending millions of dollars advertising and lobbying to convince Congress to leave hydraulic fracturing unregulated — despite its production of large amounts of air, water, and climate pollution. So far, it appears Big Oil has made little progress convincing the public to support their position. Respondents were asked: Hydraulic fracturing or “fracking” is a process used to develop deposits of natural gas recently discovered in many regions of America. Environmentalists and some residents living near drilling operations worry that fracking can contaminate drinking water sources and worsen climate change. The oil and natural gas industry maintains the process is safe and can create jobs and promote energy independence. Which of the following comes closest to your view of what the federal government should do on this issue? One of six respondents wanted to “ban fracking altogether because it’s not safe for the environment.” A majority supported an “increase in regulation of fracking to protect the environment, but NOT ban it.” A total of sixty eight percent wanted either a ban or more safeguards from fracking. Only one quarter of poll subjects wanted to “reduce regulation of fracking to encourage more natural gas production.” Some 68 percent of independents wanted to ban or regulate fracking. A clear majority of Republicans wanted either a ban or more regulation. Only 41 percent of GOPers wanted to reduce regulation.

#### Dems hate fracking.

**Natural Gas Week**, 4/30/**2012** (Natural Gas Development High on Voters’ Minds, p. Lexis-Nexis)

"As with opinions about many other energy policies, there is a wide partisan gap in views of fracking: 73% of Republicans who have heard of fracking favor it, compared with 54% of independents and just 33% of Democrats," the center said in an analysis published last month.

#### Fracking is a wedge issue --- it splits the Democratic base.

**Geraghty**, 3/19/**2012** (Jim, Fracking: The Wedge Issue of 2012?, National Review, p. http://www.nationalreview.com/campaign-spot/293864/fracking-wedge-issue-2012)

The Pew Research Center reports that support for offshore oil drilling is back up to the levels seen before the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, but the more politically significant point might be in their findings on public attitudes towards the hydraulic fracturing method of extracting natural gas, or “fracking.” Pew finds: Support for allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling in U.S. waters, which plummeted during the 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill, has recovered to pre-spill levels. Nearly two-thirds (65%) favor allowing increased offshore drilling, up from 57% a year ago and 44% in June 2010, during the Gulf spill. Currently, more than twice as many favor than oppose increased offshore drilling (65% vs. 31%). In June 2010, only 44% favored more offshore drilling while 52% were opposed. The balance of opinion today is almost identical to what it was in February 2010, two months before the Gulf oil disaster (63% favor, 31% oppose). Unsurprisingly, some Americans aren’t familiar with fracking, but among those who are, support is fairly widespread. It’s an issue that pits Republicans, independents, and conservative and moderate Democrats on one side, against liberal Democrats on the other. Among those who have heard about fracking, there is more support than opposition. About half (52%) favor fracking, while 35% are opposed to the process. As with opinions about many other energy policies there is a wide partisan gap in views of fracking: 73% of Republicans who have heard of fracking favor it, compared with 54% of independents and just 33% of Democrats . . . Republicans who have heard at least a little about fracking are far more likely than Democrats to favor the process (73% vs. 33%), and there is little difference in opinion among Republicans. But among Democrats who are aware of fracking, there is a wide ideological gap. Conservative and moderate Democrats are split about evenly — 39% favor fracking while 43% are opposed. By contrast, liberal Democrats oppose fracking by a 64% to 26% margin. Fully 89% of Republicans favor allowing more offshore oil and gas drilling while only half of Democrats agree. A majority of independents (64%) support increased drilling off the U.S. coast. It’s a perfect wedge issue to separate Democratic officeholders from their liberal base.

Extend Cillizia here – who can win the election is who can reign in their base

### Condo Good

1. **Critical thinking**—forces 2AC to have good argument selection, and predict block strategy—makes better decision-makers who can quickly analyze arguments and their interaction, prioritize goals, and predict responses

.

1. **Information Processing—**forces debaters to analyze the plan from multiple perspectives and pick the best option—the alternative is defending bankrupt policies over the status quo, which destroys progressive politics.
2. **Reasonability**—theory is only a check making debate impossible—even if debate could be better isn’t a reason we should lose—theory trades off with substance and disincentivzes research causing aff laziness **- and the two CPs didn’t contradict**

**Interp – two condo that don’t contradict**

### 1NR – Uniqueness

#### Obama will win the election --- a consensus of polls and the Five Thirty Eight forecast prove. That’s the 1NC Silver 9/20 evidence. Prefer our evidence because it’s predictive and cites multiple battleground polls that Obama has pulled ahead in.

Their morris ev says that if you adjust polls to 2004 turnouts than Romney is winning –

1. No shit because people liked bush more than Kerry
2. Silver takes into account LIKELY voters not just registered

#### Obama is winning --- momentum

**Blake**, **9/20**/2012 (Aaron, Is the 2012 election tilting toward Democrats?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/is-the-2012-election-tilting-toward-democrats/>)

Either we’re at a turning point in the 2012 election, or a lot of pollsters are getting it wrong. The question for the past week-plus has been whether President Obama’s convention bounce and a series of stumbles for Mitt Romney have recast the 2012 race. Some national polls say yes, and a few say no. But more and more, the data at the state level point to some real movement in Democrats’ favor. At least for now. As we wrote Tuesday, Gallup polling shows that the bump Obama got from the Democratic convention two weeks ago has subsided. And another new poll, released Wednesday by the Associated Press and pollster GfK, shows basically the same picture, with 47 percent of likely voters supporting Obama and 46 percent backing Romney — a tie ballgame nationally. But almost every state-specific poll in the last few days has shown progress for Democrats — both at the presidential level and in the very important contest for the Senate — with some showing unprecedented leads for the blue side in the the most important states. Swing-state polls from CBS News, the New York Times and Quinnipiac University released Wednesday morning in three key states — Colorado, Virginia and Wisconsin — showed Obama either gaining since last month or, in the case of Virginia, holding his lead. And Fox News polls released Wednesday evening showed Obama with a solid lead in the three biggest swing states; he’s up by seven points each in Ohio and Virginia and five points in Florida. The results confirm polls from NBC News and Marist College in the same three states last week. A Washington Post poll released Tuesday confirms the movement in Virginia, with Obama up by an unprecedented eight points. And a Marquette University Law School poll released Wednesday supports the idea that the race in Wisconsin has shifted, with Obama leading by an astounding 14 points. Even if some of these margins seem a little big, just consider that even the best polls for Romney haven’t shown him with that kind of lead in these states — or really anything close to it. In fact, Nate Silver points out that, of the 16 live-interview swing state polls conducted in the last two weeks, Obama is leading in all of them except Colorado by at least four points.

#### Doesn’t outweight eh link because the plan fractures the dem base

### 1NR – Solvency

#### No uncertainty for companies – this is their 1AC author

Gerard 12 (Jack, a degree in political science and J.D. from George Washington University, formerly worked with the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, President and CEO of the American Petroleum Institute, “Supporting Common-Sense Regulation,” 6-19-12, energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/06/epas-cleanair-rules-defend-del.php)

A look at recent EPA decisions and pronouncements suggests an agency looking for guidance in the areas framed by this week’s National Journal question. The approach we need for the intersection of industrial activity, public health and environmental protection is, to borrow a phrase, all of the above. We need an approach based on sound science that also factors in the costs of compliance compared to the achieved benefits, effects on jobs and the overall economic impacts of Washington rule-making. I write this representing an industry that has improved its own efficiency while helping the country use less energy. The U.S. uses about half as much energy for every dollar of GDP as it did in 1980. Meanwhile, our industry has spent more than $239 billion since 1990 to improve the performance of its products, facilities and operations. The result has been a steady reduction in pollution. That said, the oil and natural gas industry supports common-sense environmental regulation. EPA’s current incremental approach, which often comes with a price tag that dwarfs estimated benefits, needs to be replaced with one that’s not unnecessarily burdensome or counter-productive. EPA seems to have understood this principle in some cases recently. In others, it hasn’t. For example, EPA and the administration appropriately recognized concerns raised by industry and others and pulled back a proposed new standard for ozone. By some estimates the proposal would’ve put 85 percent of the country in non-compliance. Millions of jobs might have been in jeopardy, and the economy could have faced $1 trillion a year in costs. EPA also recognized concerns about a proposed rule on emissions resulting from oil and natural gas development, agreeing to allow companies until 2015 to develop the equipment needed for compliance and to train workers to use it. But in other areas legitimate concern about the cost effectiveness of proposals seemingly has been dismissed. Our industry urged EPA to consider keeping the current standard on fine-particle soot that had lowered concentrations 27 percent between 2000 and 2010 – evidence that this pollution problem is being addressed, that air quality is improving. But the agency released a more stringent standard last week based, we believe, on faulty data and without sufficient correlating benefit. As written it could discourage investment in areas that fail to meet the standard, costing jobs and economic opportunity. The scenario is similar when it comes to EPA’s push for E15 gasoline, which could damage the engines of millions of vehicles now on our roads, and its aggressive mandate to refiners on cellulosic biofuels, basically requiring them to use a fuel that doesn’t exist. In this context it’s not hard to understand why some are concerned about EPA’s forthcoming Utility MACT Rule on emissions from coal-fired power plants and industrial boilers. The larger point is the signal government is sending to industry and investors with the current approach: inconsistency and uncertainty. Both profoundly hinder economic activity and job creation. Coupled with a sense that legitimate cost-benefit analysis isn’t being uniformly conducted, the seeming disconnect between the regulators and the regulated isn’t surprising. Our industry supports environmental protection and is constantly striving to improve the safety and efficiency of its operations. But without a common-sense regulatory approach that sees the entire picture, America will continue to create problems for itself in terms of fostering economic growth, creating jobs and, in the case of our industry, generating the energy we need for better lives now and in the future.

#### **Companies have until 2015 to comply**

ACC 12 (Association of Corporate Counsel, “Final NSPS rule,” 8-16-12, Vorys Sater Seymour and Pease LLP

<http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=097e50f0-e71e-483d-ba72-828df6b8d8d4>)

After publication in today’s Federal Register, U.S. EPA’s final air emission rules became effective for oil and gas production and natural gas transmission and storage facilities. The rules implement New Source Performance Standards (“NSPS”) for volatile organic compounds (“VOC”) and sulfur dioxide (“SO2”), and National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”). The new NSPS require that fractured and refractured gas wells use reduced emission completions (“RECs”) or completion combustion devices such as flaring until January 1, 2015. After January 1, 2015, owner/operators must use RECs and a completion combustion device together.

#### Even the American Petroleum Institute agrees that is enough time – no risk of production loss

Bloomberg 12 (Jim Efstathiou Jr., “Drillers Say Costs Manageable From Pending Gas Emissions Rule,” 4-17-12,

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-04-17/drillers-say-costs-manageable-from-pending-gas-emissions-rule.html>)

The rule would take effect about 60 days after it is issued. The American Petroleum Institute says it will take up to three years to manufacture equipment needed to comply and train people to use it. Benjamin Salisbury, a senior energy policy analyst at FBR Capital Markets Corp. in Arlington, Virginia, said he expects the EPA to delay the effective date of the rule to prevent any “short-term dislocations.” “We have every reason to believe that the Obama administration wants to ensure that they maintain a vibrant natural gas industry,” Salisbury said in an interview. “Assuming that EPA grants adequate phase-in time, then our read is that this is something that should be manageable for the industry.” An Obama administration plan to cut air pollution from natural-gas wells that was delayed after a flurry of last-minute comments won’t slow the gas boom sweeping the U.S., some drillers and industry analysts said. Southwestern Energy Co. (SWN) and Devon Energy Corp. (DVN) say they already use systems to capture methane and other fumes at wells, the key requirement of a rule that may be issued as early as today. Drilling hasn’t slowed in Colorado or Wyoming where technology to capture emissions has been required by the state since 2009 and 2010, Christine Tezak, senior policy analyst at Robert W. Baird & Co. in McLean, Virginia, wrote in a March 16 research note.

#### All their evidence describes the proposed rule, not the actual rule it gives companies more than enough time

AP 12 (Associated Press, “EPA to slash air pollution from natural gas wells,” 4-18-12, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/04/18/ap-newsbreak-epa-to-reduce-gas-drilling-pollution/>)

WASHINGTON – The Obama administration on Wednesday set the first-ever national standards to control air pollution from gas wells that are drilled using a method called hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, but not without making concessions to the oil and gas industry. President Barack Obama in his State of the Union address strongly backed natural gas drilling as a clean energy source, and recently announced an executive order calling for coordination of federal regulation to ease burdens on producers. But he has come under criticism by the industry and Republicans for policies they say discourage energy development. Top EPA officials said Wednesday that the new regulations would ensure pollution is controlled without slowing natural gas production. "By ensuring the capture of gases that were previously released to pollute our air and threaten our climate, these updated standards will protect our health, but also lead to more product for fuel suppliers to bring to market," said EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson in a statement. Much of the air pollution from fracked gas wells is vented when the well transitions from drilling to actual production, a three- to 10-day process which is referred to as "completion." An earlier version of the rule limiting air pollution from gas wells would have required companies to install pollution-reducing equipment immediately after the rule was finalized. Drillers now will be given more than two years to employ technology to reduce emissions of smog- and soot-forming pollutants during that stage. The Environmental Protection Agency will require drillers to burn off gas in the meantime, an alternative that can release smog-forming nitrogen oxides, but will still slash overall emissions. Industry groups had pushed hard for the delay, saying the equipment to reduce pollution at the wellhead during completion was not readily available. About 25,000 wells a year are being fracked, a process where water, chemicals and sand are injected at high pressure underground to release trapped natural gas. Besides the new standards for oil and gas wells, the EPA also on Wednesday updated existing rules for natural gas processing plants, storage tanks and transmission lines that will reduce amounts of cancer-causing air pollution, such as benzene, and also reduce methane — the main ingredient in natural gas, but also one of the most potent global warming gases. There were other changes made since the EPA proposed the rule last July under a court order that stemmed from a lawsuit brought by environmental groups. Wells drilled in low-pressure areas, such as coalbed methane reserves, would be exempt because they release less pollution during completion. And companies that choose to re-fracture wells using the pollution-reducing equipment prior to the January 2015 deadline would not be covered by other parts of the regulation. Since companies could capture the natural gas and sell it, the EPA estimates that they would save about $11-$19 million a year starting in 2015. The American Petroleum Institute, the main lobbying group for the oil and gas industry, said that much of the industry was already doing that. "We don't need (the EPA) to come and tell our members we will save you money," said Howard Feldman, the institute's director of regulatory and scientific affairs. "Their business is natural gas. They get it that they are trying to capture as much gas as they can."

## Round 5 1NC vs. Wake DL

### **T**

#### **Interpretation –** “financial incentives” are funding for investors to develop a project – that excludes nonfinancial incentives like procurement

**Czinkota et al, 9 -** Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University (Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books)

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. **Fiscal incentives** are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. **Financial incentives** offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. **Nonfinancial incentives** include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

#### **Violation – procurements are purchases that don’t motivate action – they just buy a technology that already exists**

Nelson 93 (Edward W., Chairman – Payment Subcommittee in OPTN/UNOS Ethics Committee, “Financial Incentives for Organ Donation,” Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network, 6-30, http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/resources/bioethics.asp?index=4)

Definition of Financial Incentives A definition of terms is necessary prior to a discussion of the concept of financial incentives for organ donation. First, financial incentives, as discussed here, do not mean additional monies spent for public or professional education or recognition and counseling of organ donor families. Because the concept of financial incentives fundamentally changes the process of organ procurement, it has been argued that the term "donor" is no longer applicable and would need to be replaced by a term such as 'vendor." The term "rewarded gifting" has been suggested and has been justly criticized as an oxymoron by those opposed to financial incentives and a despicable euphemism by those who promote this concept. Of greatest practical significance is the distinction between "incentive" and "payment" since a system of financial incentives may indeed be a viable option if, as interpreted by law, "incentives" do not amount to "purchases" and "donors" are therefore not transformed into 'vendors."

#### Prefer our interpretation –

#### A. Limits – they allow any aff that makes some technology more economically viable. Procurement can be applied to every technology and every industry – that explodes neg burden.

#### B. Neg ground – procurement moves the debate away from “how to motivate action” to just “doing the action” – this guts negative arguments about solvency, DA links, and CP competition based off private sector inducement.

#### The procurement CP should be neg ground – the restrictions part of the topic is already huge, and advantages are diverse. Allowing procurement creates unpredictable advantages around military technology – limiting the mechanism is key to even the playing field.

### Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Nuclear power incentives are massively unpopular --- the public does not want to foot the cost.

**Sheppard**, 3/23/**2011** (Kate – staff reporter at Mother Jones’ Washington bureau, Public Opinion on Nuclear Goes Critical, Mother Jones, p. <http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/03/nuclear-power-public-opinion-poll>)

It's probably not too surprising, given the constant attention it's been getting in the press recently, but the Japanese nuclear crisis has turned more Americans off to nuclear power. Two new polls released Tuesday found that 58 percent of those polled said they are now less supportive of expanding nuclear power here in the US. The poll, conducted by ORC International on behalf of the Civil Society Institute (CSI), found that two-thirds of respondents said they would protest the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of their homes. Fifty-three percent said they support "a moratorium on new nuclear reactor construction in the United States" and would prefer energy efficiency and renewables. (It's worth noting, though, that among those that already supported of nuclear power, 24 percent now said they are actually more supportive now.) The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press also released a new poll on Tuesday that found nuclear support had taken a nose-dive. As for funding these new nuclear plants, 73 percent in the CSI poll said they don't think taxpayers should "take on the risk for the construction of new nuclear power reactors" with federal loan guarantees. The Obama administration has made expanding the loan guarantees a major part of its energy agenda, but there have been plenty of concerns about forcing taxpayers to foot the bill if something goes wrong. When Gallup last polled Americans on nuclear power in 2009, it found support at a new high—59 percent of the public favored it. It had been years since a nuclear accident was all over the news. But as I noted last week, the last major nuclear power accident in the US was enough to turn Americans off from it for a generation. I ventured then that this latest situation in Japan may have a similar effect. Given that the latest polls were conducted in the aftermath of a nuclear disaster, it's unclear what their conclusions mean for the future of nuclear power. What will be interesting is the longer-term influence on public opinion once Japan's nuclear emergency fades from the news.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

Allison & Blackwill 11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.

### DOD Tradeoff DA

#### The nuclear arsenal will be modernized now – but risks cuts from the defense budget

Washington Post, 9/15/12 (Dana Priest, “Aging U.S. nuclear arsenal slated for costly and long-delayed modernization,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-nuclear-arsenal-is-ready-for-overhaul/2012/09/15/428237de-f830-11e1-8253-3f495ae70650_story.html>)

The U.S. nuclear arsenal, the most powerful but indiscriminate class of weapons ever created, is set to undergo the costliest overhaul in its history, even as the military faces spending cuts to its conventional arms programs at a time of fiscal crisis.¶ For two decades, U.S. administrations have confronted the decrepit, neglected state of the aging nuclear weapons complex. Yet officials have repeatedly put off sinking huge sums into projects that receive little public recognition, driving up the costs even further.¶ Now, as the nation struggles to emerge from the worst recession of the postwar era and Congress faces an end-of-year deadline to avoid $1.2 trillion in automatic cuts to the federal budget over 10 years, the Obama administration is overseeing the gargantuan task of modernizing the nuclear arsenal to keep it safe and reliable.

#### The aff causes defense budget tradeoffs

Snider, 12 – reporter for E&E (Annie, 2/23. “Military’s alt energy programs draw Republicans’ ire,” <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/02/23/2>)

The idea that the administration is using DOD as a more politically palatable vehicle for renewable energy investments is now reverberating across Capitol Hill, even as Pentagon officials flatly deny the allegations.¶ At a budget hearing last week, Navy Secretary Ray Mabus, the department's most high-profile alternative energy advocate, took volley after volley from Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee. They said that his priorities were misplaced, argued that spending on clean energy was taking money out of more important missions and hinted at a link between the Pentagon's green efforts and the prominence of former Silicon Valley clean-tech investors within the Obama administration.¶ "You're not the secretary of the energy, you're the secretary of the Navy," said Rep. Randy Forbes (R-Va.), who leads the subcommittee with jurisdiction over military energy and environment issues.¶ Prime among the lawmakers' complaints was that the military is paying a higher price for some forms of alternative energy at a time when DOD proposes cutting weapons programs and reducing forces in order to meet budget mandates.

#### Nuclear modernization will be the first to be cut – it’s on the chopping block – that destroys deterrence

Trachtenberg, 11 – president and CEO of Shortwaver Consulting, LLC, former principal deputy assistant secretary of defense (international security policy), acting deputy assistant secretary of defense (forces policy), and head of the policy staff of the House Armed Services Committee (David J, 10/1. “Nuclear Fallback.” ,” [http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/279610/nuclear-fallback-david-j-trachtenberg#](http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/279610/nuclear-fallback-david-j-trachtenberg))

Political turmoil in the Middle East, Iran’s drive for nuclear weapons, and the buildup of China’s military are only a few of the worrisome trends that point to a prolonged period of global instability. Against this backdrop, the U.S. defense budget and the military capabilities it buys are being dramatically reduced in ways that will hinder our ability to shape or respond to these developments.¶ Over the next decade, defense spending will drop by anywhere from $450 billion to more than $1 trillion. The full extent of the cuts, and the national-security implications they foreshadow, are now in the hands of a congressional “supercommittee” charged with slashing overall federal spending. But cuts of this magnitude will translate into less military capability, a likely “dumbing down” of U.S. military strategy, a more problematic margin of military advantage over potential adversaries, and greater strategic risk. They are also likely to diminish America’s ability to advance U.S. policy objectives and secure a stable world order.¶ Not surprisingly, long-overdue investments in our aging and deteriorating nuclear capabilities and infrastructure — essential to maintaining a reliable and effective nuclear deterrent — are now on the chopping block as the military services seek to protect “usable” non-nuclear systems at the expense of “unusable” nuclear ones.¶ But the world remains a dangerous place, with nations and groups seeking nuclear weapons as a counter to U.S. military preponderance, a deterrent to U.S. action in regions vital to American national-security interests, a bargaining chip for political leverage, or a counter to regional threats. Nuclear weapons remain the great equalizer in world affairs, granting those that possess them greater influence over American policies and actions. Consequently, an effective and robust U.S. nuclear deterrent remains as important as ever.

#### Deterrence is vital to prevent WMD attacks and preserve global stability

Mark **Schneider**, July **2008**. Senior Analyst with the National Institute for Public Policy, Ph.D in history at the University of Southern California and JD from George Washington University, former senior officer in the DoD in positions relating to arms control and nuclear weapons policy. “The Future of the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent,” Comparative Strategy 27.4, Ebsco.

Today, the United States, the world's only superpower with global responsibilities, is the only nuclear weapons state that is seriously debating (admittedly largely inside the beltway) about whether the United States should retain a nuclear deterrent. By contrast, the British Labour Government has decided to retain and modernize its nuclear deterrent. In every other nuclear weapons state—Russia, China, France, India, Pakistan, and allegedly Israel—there is general acceptance of the need for a nuclear deterrent and its modernization. Amazingly, the United States is the only nuclear-armed nation that is not modernizing its nuclear deterrent. Distinguished former leaders such a George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger, and Sam Nunn, despite the manifest failure of arms control to constrain the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threat, call for “A world free of Nuclear Weapons” because “… the United States can address almost all of its military objectives by non-nuclear means.”1 This view ignores the monumental verification problems involved and the military implication of different types of WMD—chemical and biological (CBW) attack, including the advanced agents now available to potential enemies of the United States and our allies. A U.S. nuclear deterrent is necessary to address existing threats to the very survival of the U.S., its allies, and its armed forces if they are subject to an attack using WMD. As former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and former Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch wrote in The Wall Street Journal, “However, the goal, even the aspirational goal, of eliminating all nuclear weapons is counterproductive. It will not advance substantive progress on nonproliferation; and it risks compromising the value that nuclear weapons continue to contribute, through deterrence, to U.S. security and international stability.”2 Why can't the United States deter WMD (nuclear, chemical, biological) attack with conventional weapons? The short answer is that conventional weapons can't deter a WMD attack because of their minuscule destructiveness compared with WMD, which are thousands to millions of times as lethal as conventional weapons. Existing WMD can kill millions to hundreds of millions of people in an hour, and there are national leaders who would use them against us if all they had to fear was a conventional response. The threat of nuclear electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack, as assessed by a Congressional Commission in 2004, is so severe that one or at most a handful of EMP attacks could demolish industrial civilization in the United States.3 The view that conventional weapons can replace nuclear weapons in deterrence or warfighting against a state using WMD is not technically supportable. Precision-guided conventional weapons are fine substitutes for non-precision weapons, but they do not remotely possess the lethality of WMD warheads. Moreover, their effectiveness in some cases can be seriously degraded by counter-measures and they clearly are not effective against most hard and deeply buried facilities that are associated with WMD threats and national leadership protection. If deterrence of WMD attack fails, conventional weapons are unlikely to terminate adversary WMD attacks upon us and our allies or to deter escalation. Are there actual existing threats to the survival of the United States? The answer is unquestionably “yes.” Both Russia and China have the nuclear potential to destroy the United States (and our allies) and are modernizing their forces with the objective of targeting the United States.4 China is also increasing the number of its nuclear weapons.5 Russia is moving away from democracy, and China remains a Communist dictatorship. A number of hostile dictatorships—North Korea, Iran, and possibly Syria—have or are developing longer-range missiles, as well as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.6 They already have the ability to launch devastating WMD attacks against our allies and our forward deployed forces, and in time may acquire capabilities against the United States. Iran will probably have nuclear weapons within approximately 2 to 5 years.7 The United States already faces a chemical and biological weapons threat despite arms control prohibitions. Due to arms control, we do not have an in-kind deterrent. Both Iranian and Syria acquisition of nuclear weapons could be affected by sales from North Korea, which have been reported in the press.8

### BRC CP

#### The Department of Energy should create a blue ribbon commission to conduct a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis of initiating power-purchase agreements of Small Modular Reactors in the United States.The commission should include a range of stakeholders and experts. The commission should recommend that the United States federal government initiate power-purchase agreements of Small Modular Reactors in the United States.

#### The CP solves and is a prerequisite to the plan

Parthemore and Rogers, 10 – Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), where she directed the Natural Security Program; and Bacevich Fellow at CNAS (Christine and Will, 5/20. “PARTHEMORE & ROGERS: NUCLEAR REACTORS ON MILITARY BASES MAY BE RISKY.” http://www.cnas.org/node/4502)

Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns. We recommend that this examination should be initially led by a blue ribbon commission, led by the Department of Energy and including relevant DOD officials who have been examining this option. A blue ribbon commission, by conducting a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis and examining the interests of all key stakeholders, is a **necessary first step** in determining the viability of small nuclear reactors for federal facilities, and especially for military bases. This commission would need to include a range of stakeholders and experts qualified — and trusted by the public — to design national policies that will address and balance these concerns (even if that entails not going down the path of installing nuclear reactors on military bases at a large scale). Academics, regulators, nuclear scientists, proliferation and waste safety experts, state officials, and the governmental and nongovernmental policy communities should all be represented. It should seek to consider the full expanse of relevant concerns, including what technologies or models are most appropriate, what locations would be ideal or off-limits, where the energy security needs are the highest (for example, at combatant command locations), and along what timeline nuclear generation would even come online. The question of a proper policy approach to the issue of locating small nuclear reactors on bases is heating up, especially as energy and climate change are increasingly important topics of public debate. It is time to set the stage for a national conversation on the most appropriate path for this technology. Ensuring national security interests and a cleaner energy future demands no less.

#### CP avoids politics

Rogers, 10 – the Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (Will, 7/29. “DOE and DOD to Explore Nuclear Power on Military Bases Question.” http://www.cnas.org/blogs/naturalsecurity/2010/07/doe-and-dod-explore-nuclear-power-military-bases-question.html)

In an op-ed to Roll Call, Christine and I recommended that the Department of Energy lead a blue ribbon commission charged with conducting a thorough and transparent assessment of integrating nuclear reactors on military bases. The commission, we advocated, would have to include relevant representatives from DOD, academics, regulators, nuclear scientists, proliferation and waste safety experts, state officials, and the governmental and nongovernmental policy communities. And while it’s unclear to what extent the senior-level Executive Committee will examine the issue of siting nuclear reactors on bases, it’s worth repeating that siting nuclear reactors on base is a sensitive issue, one worth approaching cautiously and including all relevant stakeholders from across government –including the federal, state and local level – public utilities commissions, academe, the scientific community and the private sector.

### 1NC – Military Capabilities

#### 1. Lots of factors prevent great power conflict without hegemony

**Fettweis 10** (Christopher J. Professor of Political Science at Tulane, Dangerous Times-The International Politics of Great Power Peace, pg. 175-6)

If the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the US military presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of war – nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms – necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were American to become more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it currently exists. More importantly,the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world be virtually risk free.

#### 2. Statisically unipolarity is THE most conflict prone system

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

**Wohlforth claims not only that the unipole can stave off challenges and preclude major power rivalries, but also that it is able to prevent conflicts among other states** and create incentives for them to side with it. 39 The unipole’s advantage is so great that it can settle any quarrel in which it intervenes. **As Wohlforth writes, “For as long as unipolarity obtains....second-tier states are less likely to engage in conflict-prone rivalries** for security or prestige. Once the sole pole takes sides, there can be little doubt about which party will prevail.” 40 This is the core logic of Wohlforth’s argument that unipolarity is peaceful. But what specifically does his argument say about each of the six possible kinds of war I identified in the previous section? Clearly, great power war is impossible in a unipolar world. In Wohlforth’s famous formulation: “Two states measured up in 1990. One is gone. No new pole has appeared: 2 1 1.” 41 Furthermore, by arguing that unipolarity precludes hegemonic rivalries, Wohlforth makes no room for wars between the sole great power and major powers. These are, according to him, the two main reasons why a unipolar world is peaceful. Unipolarity, he writes, “means the absence of two big problems that bedeviled the statesmen of past epochs: hegemonic rivalry and balance-of-power politics among major powers.” 42 I agree with Wohlforth on these two points, but they are only part of the picture. Granted, the absence of great power wars is an important contribution toward peace, but great power competition—and the conflict it might engender—would signal the emergence of one or more peer competitors to the unipole, and thus indicate that a transition to a bipolar or multipolar system was already under way. In this sense, great power conflict should be discussed within the context of unipolar durability, not unipolar peace. Indeed, including this subject in discussions of unipolar peacefulness parallels the mistakes made in the debate about the Cold War bipolar system. Then, arguments about how the two superpowers were unlikely to fight each other were often taken to mean that the system was peaceful. This thinking ignored the possibility of wars between a superpower and a lesser state, as well as armed conflicts among two or more lesser states, often acting as great power proxies. 43 In addition, **Wohlforth claims that wars among major powers are unlikely**, because the unipole will prevent conflict from erupting among important states. He writes, “The sole pole’s power advantages matter only to the degree that it is engaged, and it is most likely to be engaged in politics among the other major powers. 44 I agree that if the unipole were to pursue a strategy of defensive dominance, major power wars would be unlikely. Yet, there is no compelling reason to expect that it will always follow such a course. Should the unipole decide to disengage, as Wohlforth implies, major power wars would be possible. At the same time, Wohlforth argues that the unipole’s power preponderance makes the expected costs of balancing prohibitive, leading minor powers to bandwagon. This is his explanation for the absence of wars between the sole great power and minor powers. But, as I show, the costs of balancing relative to bandwagoning vary among minor powers. So Wohlforth’s argument underplays the likelihood of this type of war. Finally, Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. **Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers,** or among the latter. As Wohlforth explains, his argument “applies with less force to potential security competition between regional powers, or between a second-tier state and a lesser power with which the system leader lacks close ties.” 45 Despite this caveat, Wohlforth does not fully explore the consequences of potential conflict between major and minor powers or among the latter for his view that unipolarity leads to peace. **How well**, then, **does the argument that unipolar systems are peaceful account for the first two decades of unipolarity** since the end of the Cold War? Table 1 presents a list of great powers divided into three periods: 1816 to 1945, multipolarity; 1946 to 1989, bipolarity; and since 1990, unipolarity. 46 Table 2 presents summary data about the incidence of war during each of these periods. **Unipolarity is the most conflict prone of all the systems, according to** at least **two important criteria: the percentage of years that great powers spend at war and the incidence of war involving great powers**. In multipolarity, 18 percent of great power years were spent at war. In bipolarity, the ratio is 16 percent. **In unipolarity**, however, **a remarkable 59 percent of great power years** until now **were spent at war**. This is by far the highest percentage in all three systems. Furthermore, **during** periods of **multipolarity and bipolarity, the probability that war** involving a great power **would break out in any given year was, respectively, 4.2 percent and 3.4 percent. Under unipolarity, it is 18.2 percent**—or more than four times higher. 47 **These figures provide no evidence that unipolarity is peaceful**. 48 In sum, the argument that unipolarity makes for peace is heavily weighted toward interactions among the most powerful states in the system. This should come as no surprise given that Wohlforth makes a structural argument: peace flows from the unipolar structure of international politics, not from any particular characteristic of the unipole. 49 Structural **analyses of the international system are usually centered on interactions between great powers**. 50 As Waltz writes, “The theory, like the story, of international politics is written in terms of the great powers of an era.” 51 In the sections that follow, however, I show that **in the case of unipolarity, an investigation of its peacefulness must consider** potential **causes of conflict beyond interactions between the most important states in the system.**

US hegemony will guarantee US-Sino conflict with flashpoints across Asia

Layne 12 [Christopher Layne is the Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, “The Global Power Shift from West to East”, April 25th, 2012, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/the-global-power-shift-west-east-6796>, Chetan]

Certainly, the Chinese have not forgotten. Now **Beijing aims to dominate its own** East and Southeast Asian **backyard,** just as a rising America sought to dominate the Western Hemisphere a century and a half ago. **The United States and China now are competing for supremacy in East and Southeast Asia**. Washington has been the incumbent hegemon there since World War II, and many in the American foreign-policy establishment view China’s quest for regional hegemony as a threat that must be resisted. **This contest for regional dominance is fueling escalating tensions and possibly could lead to war**. In geopolitics, **two great powers cannot simultaneously be hegemonic in the same region. Unless one of them abandons its aspirations, there is a high probability of hostilities. Flashpoints that could spark a Sino-American conflict include the** **unstable Korean Peninsula; the disputed status of Taiwan; competition for control of oil and other natural resources; and the burgeoning naval rivalry between the two powers.**

Extinction

Straits Times – 2k [“Regional Fallout: No one gains in war over Taiwan,” June 25, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis]

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

#### Turn – military SMRs cause blowback and gut our nonproliferation agenda

Smith 11 (Terrence P., Program Coordinator and Research Assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy – CSIS, “An Idea I Can Do Without: “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations”,” Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2-16, http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations)

What are the alternatives to small nuclear reactors (assuming we want to maintain a large oversees military presence)? The NDU report makes the point that the DoD has already been experimenting with “an array of initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable and alternative fuels.” But, according to the report, “unfortunately, even with massive investment and ingenuity, these initiatives will be insufficient to solve DOD’s reliance on the civilian grid or its need for convoys in forward areas.” While, to my knowledge, the DoD has not seen any huge relief from what I would call its token attempts at ‘going green,’ it hardly writes off the possibility of alternative energy supplies short of going nuclear. The report repeatedly emphasizes the point that “DOD’s “’first mover’ pursuit of small reactors could have a profound influence on the development of the industry,” and cautions that “if DOD does not support the U.S. small reactor industry, the industry could be dominated by foreign companies.” The U.S. nonproliferation agenda, if there is one, stands in opposition to this line of thinking. Pursuing a nuclear technology out of the fear that others will get it (or have it), is what fueled the Cold War and much of the proliferation we have seen and are seeing today. It is a mentality I think we should avoid. I do not mean to say this report ignores the risks. In fact they explicitly say, “We acknowledge that there are many uncertainties and risks associated with these reactors.” For example it says, Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully considering the social and environmental consequences of dispersing reactors. The report also points out that “from a financial perspective, small reactors represent substantial losses in economies of scale.” These issues, which were briefly mentioned, hardly seem like small potatoes. The reports answer to the issues raised: “making reliable projections about these reactors’ economic and technical performance while they are still on paper is a significant challenge,” and “Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple.” On the other hand, the report argues, “failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD.” “First, small reactors may fail to be commercialized in the United States; second, the designs that get locked in by the private market may not be optimal for DOD’s needs; and third, expertise on small reactors may become concentrated in foreign countries.” Yes these are important issue for a business stand, but I don’t find them to be the primary concern. The reactors are purely for energy purposes, but in a world that seems to be growing tired of U.S. military intervention, the idea of ensuring our ability to do so through the proliferation of mobile nuclear reactors will hardly quell any hostile sentiment. In addition, it can only add fire to the “nuclear = good” flame. So, while even under best case scenario, the reactors are completely proliferation proof and pose no direct threat to the nonproliferation cause (ignoring the spreading of nuclear tech and knowledge in general), I have a tough time seeing how it helps. The report concludes that the DoD “should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors.” Since the 1970s, the report says, “in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well.” For now, the plans for small nuclear reactors are “unfortunately,” for the most part, “caught between the drawing board and production.”My point is, maybe that is where they should stay.

#### American ‘retrenchment’ must happen now – downsizing US power would not cause transition wars or undercut alliances – reduction in overseas commitments would increase strategic flexibility and allow for long-term sustainability

MacDonald and Parent 11 [Joesph M. Parent is the Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Miami, Paul K. MacDonald is the Assistant Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College, “The Wisdom of Retrenchment”, Foreign Affairs; Nov/Dec2011, Vol. 90 Issue 6, p32-47, 16p, 3, Chetan]

**DESPITE THE erosion of U.S**. military and economic **dominance, many** observers **warn that a rapid departure from the current approach to foreign policy would be disastrous.** The historian Robert **Kagan cautions that "a reduction in defense spending** . . . **would unnerve American allies and undercut** efforts to gain greater **cooperation.**" The journalist Robert Kaplan even more apocalyptically warns that "lessening [the United States'] engagement with the world would have devastating consequences for humanity." But **these defenders of the status quo confuse retrenchment with** appeasement or **isolationism. A** prudent **reduction of the** United States' **overseas commitments would not prevent the country from countering dangerous threats and engaging with** friends and **allies.** Indeed, **such reductions would grant the country greater** strategic **flexibility and free resources to promote long-term growth.** A somewhat more compelling concern raised by opponents of retrenchment is that the policy might undermine deterrence. **Reducing the defense budget** or repositioning forces **would make the U**nited **S**tates **look weak and embolden upstarts, they argue**. "The very signaling of such an aloof intention may encourage regional bullies," Kaplan worries. **This anxiety is rooted in the assumption that the best barrier to adventurism** by adversaries **is forward defenses**--the deployment of military assets in large bases near enemy borders, which serve as tripwires or, to some eyes, a Great Wall of America. There are many problems with this position. For starters, **the policies that have gotten the U**nited **S**tates **in trouble** in recent years **have been activist, not** passive or **defensive. The U.S**.-led **invasion of Iraq alienated important** U.S. **allies**, such as Germany and Turkey, **and increased Iran's regional power. NATO's expansion** eastward **has** strained the alliance and **intensified Russia's ambitions** in Georgia and Ukraine. More generally, **U.S. forward deployments are no longer the main barrier to great-power land grabs**. Taking and holding territory is more expensive than it once was, and great powers have little incentive or interest in expanding further. **The U**nited **S**tates' chief **allies have developed the wherewithal to defend their** territorial **boundaries and deter restive neighbors**. Of course, **retrenchment might tempt reckless rivals** to pursue unexpected or incautious policies, as states sometimes do. Should that occur, **however, U.S. superiority in conventional arms and** its **power-projection capabilities would assure the option of quick U.S. intervention.** Outcomes of that sort would be costly, but the risks of retrenchment must be compared to the risks of the status quo. **In difficult financial circumstances, the United States must prioritize**. **The biggest menace to a superpower is not the possibility of** belated entry into a **regional crisis; it is** the temptation **of imperial overstretch. That is exactly the trap into which opponents of the United States**, such as al Qaeda, **want it to fall. Nor is there** good **evidence that reducing** Washington's **overseas commitments would lead friends and rivals to question its credibility**.Despite some glum prophecies, the withdrawal of U.S. armed forces from Western Europe after the Cold War neither doomed NATO nor discredited the United States. Similar **reductions in** U.S. military **forces** and the forces' repositioning **in South Korea have improved the** sometimes tense **relationship between Washington and Seoul. Calls for Japan to assume a greater defense burden have** likewise **resulted in deeper integration of U.S. and Japanese forces. Faith in forward defenses is a holdover from the Cold War, rooted in visions of implacable adversaries and falling dominoes. It is ill suited to contemporary world politics**, where balancing coalitions are notably absent and ideological disputes remarkably mild.

### 1NC – Nuclear Capabilities

Economic decline doesn’t cause war

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

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

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Cooper 9 (Mark, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT¶ VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf)

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of ¶ reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This ¶ paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as ¶ follows: ¶ • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about ¶ one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the ¶ 1990s. ¶ • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as ¶ high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. ¶ • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained ¶ environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst ¶ option from the point of view of the consumer and society. ¶ • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, ¶ biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently ¶ more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next ¶ decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are ¶ projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. ¶ • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and ¶ renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from ¶ nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. ¶ • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost ¶ efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the ¶ reactors. ¶ Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), ¶ incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and ¶ add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### That turns manufacturing

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Nuclear terrorism is a joke

Mueller and Stewart 12 [John Mueller is Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, “The Terrorism Delusion”, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 81–110, Chetan]

In the eleven years since the September 11 attacks, no terrorist has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb in the United States, and except for the four explosions in the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone in the United States since September 11 has been with gunfire—inflicting a total of perhaps sixteen deaths over the period (cases 4, 26, 32).11 This limited capacity is impressive because, at one time, small-scale terrorists in the United States were quite successful in setting off bombs. Noting that the scale of the September 11 attacks has “tended to obliterate America’s memory of pre-9/11 terrorism,” Brian Jenkins reminds us (and we clearly do need reminding) that the 1970s witnessed sixty to seventy terrorist incidents, mostly bombings, on U.S. soil every year.12 The situation seems scarcely different in Europe and other Western locales. Michael Kenney, who has interviewed dozens of government officials and intelligence agents and analyzed court documents, has found that, in sharp contrast with the boilerplate characterizations favored by the DHS and with the imperatives listed by Dalmia, Islamist militants in those locations are operationally unsophisticated, short on know-how, prone to making mistakes, poor at planning, and limited in their capacity to learn.13 Another study documents the difficulties of network coordination that continually threaten the terrorists’ operational unity, trust, cohesion, and ability to act collectively.14 In addition, although some of the plotters in the cases targeting the United States harbored visions of toppling large buildings, destroying airports, setting off dirty bombs, or bringing down the Brooklyn Bridge (cases 2, 8, 12, 19, 23, 30, 42), all were nothing more than wild fantasies, far beyond the plotters’ capacities however much they may have been encouraged in some instances by FBI operatives. Indeed, in many of the cases, target selection is effectively a random process, lacking guile and careful planning. Often, it seems, targets have been chosen almost capriciously and simply for their convenience. For example, a would-be bomber targeted a mall in Rockford, Illinois, because it was nearby (case 21). Terrorist plotters in Los Angeles in 2005 drew up a list of targets that were all within a 20-mile radius of their shared apartment, some of which did not even exist (case 15). In Norway, a neo-Nazi terrorist on his way to bomb a synagogue took a tram going the wrong way and dynamited a mosque instead.15 Although the efforts of would-be terrorists have often seemed pathetic, even comical or absurd, the comedy remains a dark one. Left to their own devices, at least a few of these often inept and almost always self-deluded individuals could eventually have committed some serious, if small-scale, damage.16

#### -- Nuclear reactor terrorism unlikely – no capability or motive

**Ferguson and Potter 4** (Charles, Science-in-Residence – Monterey Institute of International Studies, and William, Professor and Director of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies – Monterey Institute of International Studies, The Four Faces of Nuclear Terrorism, p. 192-193)

Despite these benefits to the attackers, causing a significant radioactive release from a nuclear installation would be a **daunting challenge**, requiring considerable **technical, organizational, and financial resources**. Technical skills would be needed to identify relevant buildings and equipment within what are typically **large and complex** industrial installations; to identify and implement the actions needed to cause a radioactive release; and to **defeat all backup safety systems**. Organizational requirements would also be **very substantial**. A ground assault on a nuclear facility would require a sizeable number of assailants, probably divided into teams, a cadre roughly comparable to the 19-man group that executed the 9/11 attacks. Since **all** U.S. **nuclear reactor** facilities, except research reactors, **are protected by armed guard forces**, the assaulting group also would need military-style training to mount a successful attack. Appropriate plan personnel would have to be identified and strategies devised and implemented to gain insider support through ideological indoctrination, bribery, or coercion. Aerial attacks on nuclear facilities would require equally **sophisticated** planning. If a group of terrorists were to succeed in gaining control of an aircraft, they would also have to be capable of **precisely targeting vital** plant safety **systems**, such as the reactor's containment structure, or the spent fuel pools in order to generate substantial off-site release of radioactivity. **Significant financial resources** would be needed to meet the foregoing technical and organizational requirements. However, the group would not necessarily require the multinational capabilities necessary for nuclear weapon and IND plots involving the transportation of a nuclear weapon or fissile material from locations abroad to the United States. A relatively small number of terrorist organizations are likely to possess the motivations and capabilities to mount an attack on a nuclear facility. The 9/11 attacks are a strong reminder, however, that these abilities could be within the grasp of a well-organized and well-trained terrorist group.

#### Dysfunctional waste management means they can’t solve

**Moniz, 11** – Cecil and Ida Green Distinguished Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems and Director of the Energy Initiative at MIT, served as Undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Energy in 1997-2001 (Ernest, December. “Why We Still Need Nuclear Power.” Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6, EBSCO.)

The United States' dysfunctional nuclear waste management system has an unfortunate international side effect: it limits the options for preventing other countries from using nuclear power infrastructure to produce nuclear weapons. If countries such as Iran are able to enrich uranium to make new reactor fuel and separate out the plutonium to recover its energy value, they then have access to the relevant technology and material for a weapons program. Safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency are intended to make sure that civilian programs do not spill over into military ones, but the agency has only a limited ability to address clandestine programs.

#### No nuclear terrorism – acquisition impossible – prefer recent evidence

**Krepon 9** (Michael, Co-Founder – Henry L. Stimson Center and Diplomat Scholar – University of Virginia, “The Mushroom Cloud That Wasn’t”, Foreign Affairs, May / June, Lexis)

At the height of the Cold War, almost no one was bold enough or foolish enough to predict the Soviet Union's collapse, let alone without the eruption of a nuclear exchange between the two superpowers. One of the few who prophesied its demise, George Kennan, was deeply worried about a nuclear cataclysm. Kennan, a former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union and the father of containment policy, warned repeatedly that unwise U.S. nuclear policies could lead to Armageddon. The Cold War is now history, but warnings of an impending nuclear catastrophe are still very much alive. Anxieties today stem not from the threat of a surprise Soviet missile attack but from the fear of Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and terrorist groups seeking to carry out catastrophic attacks against soft targets in the United States. And yet, not a single death has occurred as a result of nuclear terrorism. Since 9/11, there have been more than 36,000 terrorist attacks, resulting in approximately 57,000 fatalities and 99,000 casualties. A terrible, mass-casualty attack using nuclear or biological weapons could occur at any time, and much more can be done to keep the United States safe. As the attacks that have occurred have repeatedly demonstrated, terrorists do not need weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to cause grievous harm; they can do so using hijacked airplanes, fertilizer, automatic weapons, and grenades. But the situation is far from bleak. It is not easy for terrorist groups to acquire the skills and materials necessary to construct a nuclear weapon. Meanwhile, Washington and Moscow have reduced their nuclear arsenals by 34,000 weapons over the past two decades, nuclear testing is now rare, the list of countries with worrisome nuclear programs is very short by historical standards, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council now have less to fight about -- and more reasons to cooperate in preventing worst-case scenarios from occurring -- than ever before.

### 1NC - Solvency

#### Military SMRs rely on foreign grids that are fragile – takes out solvency

Smith 11 (Terrence P., Program Coordinator and Research Assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy – CSIS, “An Idea I Can Do Without: “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations”,” Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2-16, http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations)

Nowhere in these key points is there even a hint of, “Hey this is not necessarily the best thing since sliced bread.” My initial response to each of these “key points”: (1) Takes the assumption it is a good idea and pushes a pursuit of the capability soon and hard to maintain a competitive technological edge, before examining the wisdom of the idea to begin with; (2) Just because DoD is interested in it, does not make it a good idea; (3) Arguing that they are better than larger reactors is not an argument for them being a good idea; (4) See my first point, but add in military advantage. The report describes DoD’s interest in the reactors as stemming from two “critical vulnerabilities”: 1) “the dependence of U.S. military bases on the fragile civilian electrical grid,” and 2) “the challenge of safely and reliably supplying energy to troops in forward operating locations.” The proposed solution: small nuclear reactors that (in many of the proposed plans) are “self-contained and highly mobile.” This would allow the military to use them in forward bases and pack ‘em up and move ‘em out when we are done. But in an era where the U.S. is engaged in global fights with our bases often placed in unfriendly neighborhoods, the idea of driving around nuclear reactors and material (particularly through areas that have “ a fragile civilian electrical grid”) hardly seems like the idea of the century to me. The report counters that “some” designs promise to be “virtually impervious to accidents” and have design characteristics that “might” allow them to be proliferation-resistant. The plans that use low-enriched uranium, sealed reactor cores, ect., do make them a safer option that some current designs of larger nuclear reactors, but, again, if we are going to be trucking these things around the world, when it comes to nuclear material a “might” doesn’t sit well with me.

#### No solvency—no expertise

Parthemore and Rogers 10 (Christine and Will, Bacevich Fellow – CNAS, “Nuclear Reactors on Military Bases May Be Risky,” Center for a New American Security, 5-20, http://www.cnas.org/node/4502)

The media have reported that Tennessee Sen. Lamar Alexander (R) is proposing a joint Department of Energy/Department of Defense demonstration project to examine the use of small reactors on federal sites. For some Department of Energy sites, such as Oak Ridge National Lab in Alexander’s home state — a site certainly accustomed to housing nuclear technology — demonstrating new nuclear reactor technology is largely a no-brainer. However, using nuclear reactors to power the nation’s defense installations warrants deeper consideration. Proponents of boosting this carbon-free energy source on military bases argue that these installations have unique capacities that would ease concerns over its use, namely more gates and more armed guards already on base 24/7. Likewise, the U.S. military services have unique energy security needs. Consistent energy supplies are a critical component of America’s ability to train at home and to operate globally. Energy is so important that some analysts are even exploring “islanding” the energy systems on some military installations to reduce vulnerabilities related to their reliance on often brittle domestic electric grids. Consideration of nuclear energy as part of these islanding concepts is on the rise. On the other hand, opponents contend that sufficient numbers of military base personnel may not have the requisite training in nuclear reactor management, oversight and regulatory credentials to attend to reactors in the round-the-clock manner necessary. In most cases, additional qualified personnel and improved physical security and safety requirements would be needed. As with all nuclear power generation, materials proliferation, water usage, radioactive waste management and public opinion will also be major concerns. Most military bases also strive to be integrated into their surrounding communities, and, by our experience, many base officials consider integrated electric infrastructure an important point of connection between local and military needs. Concepts for nuclear energy generation solely to supply military bases must be sensitive to what public perceptions could be in the event of extended blackouts for surrounding communities. Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns.

#### No solvency – siting

King et al, 11 – Research Analyst and Project Director at CNA Corporation's Center for Naval Analyses (Marcus, with LaVar Huntzinger and Thoi Nguyen, March. “Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S. Military Installations.” http://www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear%20Power%20on%20Military%20Installations%20D0023932%20A5.pdf)

Finding specific sites for nuclear power plants on or near military installations will be challenging. There are many considerations that affect whether a site is appropriate. Some of the considerations relate to safety and others to limiting risks of attack or sabotage, and still others to public opinion. Being located on a military installation provides some advantages, but it also imposes some constraints on how portions of the installation near the nuclear power plant can be used. Trade-offs will be required.

#### Nuclear’s not inevitable –

#### A. Fukushima

**Mez, 12** – senior Associate Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin, and managing director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre (Lutz, "Nuclear energy–Any solution for sustainability and climate protection?” Energy Policy. ScienceDirect.)

The total meltdown in March 2011 of three units of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station placed international energy policy at a crossroads and will have a paradigm-shifting impact on the future of nuclear energy. We have seen that planned global expansion of nuclear energy remains considerably slower than its own targets and expectations. The reasons why a renaissance of nuclear power has not materialized include not only lack of industrial and production capacities and shortages of technical experts in the nuclear power industry, but above all constantly rising costs for the construction of nuclear power plants and associated financing problems. The assertion that nuclear power plants help combat climate change also turns out to be spurious upon examining the life cycle of nuclear power plants. In weighing the pros and cons, it must always be kept in mind that military and civil use of nuclear power are intrinsically linked to one another like Siamese twins. This is why the danger of proliferation and vulnerability to terrorist attacks has taken on a greater importance as an argument against civilian nuclear energy in democratic societies. The global renaissance of nuclear energy hailed for decades has failed to materialise and following the nuclear disaster in Japan it has become even more unlikely that nuclear energy will play an important role in global energy production over the long term. On the contrary: since Fukushima there have been more or less clear signs of rethinking on the parts of governments in a number of countries—including Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, China and now even Japan—indicating that they are considering accelerating fundamental changes in energy policy. Especially the phase-out of nuclear power chosen by the influential EU member state Germany could have an impact on Europe as a whole, as EU Energy Commissioner Oettinger expects: the nuclear disaster in Japan faces us with the challenge of deciding “how Europe is to secure its energy needs in the foreseeable future without nuclear power”. Other countries like Russia, the Czech Republic or France, on the other hand, have announced that they intend to carry on expanding nuclear power. This raises the question as to what impact the events in Japan will have on civil use of atomic power and the future energy matrix over the medium term. Because Japan and Germany—the third and fourth largest economies in the world—have decided to phase out nuclear energy and increasingly base future growth on renewable energies and energy efficiency, this inevitably poses a question to the rest of the world: If Japan and Germany don't need nuclear power, why does anyone?

## Round 5 2NC vs. Wake DL

### Overview

#### The CP has the DOE create a Blue Ribbon Commision to conduct a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis of the plan including all stakeholders and experts. It then recommends that the US initiates power-purchase agreements of Small Modular Reactors in the United States.

Parthemore and Rogers, 10 – Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), where she directed the Natural Security Program; and Bacevich Fellow at CNAS (Christine and Will, 5/20. “PARTHEMORE & ROGERS: NUCLEAR REACTORS ON MILITARY BASES MAY BE RISKY.” http://www.cnas.org/node/4502)

Any legislation to consider the option of small nuclear reactors on military bases must include examination of these important concerns. We recommend that this examination should be initially led by a blue ribbon commission, led by the Department of Energy and including relevant DOD officials who have been examining this option. A blue ribbon commission, by conducting a thorough and transparent cost-benefit analysis and examining the interests of all key stakeholders, is a **necessary first step** in determining the viability of small nuclear reactors for federal facilities, and especially for military bases. This commission would need to include a range of stakeholders and experts qualified — and trusted by the public — to design national policies that will address and balance these concerns (even if that entails not going down the path of installing nuclear reactors on military bases at a large scale). Academics, regulators, nuclear scientists, proliferation and waste safety experts, state officials, and the governmental and nongovernmental policy communities should all be represented. It should seek to consider the full expanse of relevant concerns, including what technologies or models are most appropriate, what locations would be ideal or off-limits, where the energy security needs are the highest (for example, at combatant command locations), and along what timeline nuclear generation would even come online. The question of a proper policy approach to the issue of locating small nuclear reactors on bases is heating up, especially as energy and climate change are increasingly important topics of public debate. It is time to set the stage for a national conversation on the most appropriate path for this technology. Ensuring national security interests and a cleaner energy future demands no less.

### XT – Avoids Politics

#### No CP links to NB argument – no new 1AR extrapolation – Rogers ev says that involving all people will resolve all unpopular concerns with the plan

#### Using a Blue Ribbon Commission forges political consensus

**Bingaman, 12** – U.S. Senator from New Mexico (Jeff, 2/2. “Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future.” http://www.energy.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/democratic-news?ID=f9af4c4c-18f3-4882-a6da-b7de39bad2d4)

“The Committee meets this morning to hear about the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on nuclear waste. We’re very honored that Congressman Lee Hamilton and General Brent Scowcroft, the co-chairs, are here, as well as our friend and former chairman, Senator Domenici. “The two chairmen—and indeed, the entire 15-member Commission—are to be commended for their work. They were asked to look into a problem that has resisted solution, that remains highly controversial, and that everyone agrees must be solved. They did their job openly and thoroughly, they stayed focused on the tasks that were assigned to them, and they produced a solid and eminently sensible report. They have presented us with eight clear, concise and straightforward recommendations. “Now comes the difficult part. Implementing the Commission’s recommendations obviously will require legislation. It will be up to Congress to absorb these Commission recommendations, to translate them into legislation and to forge the political consensus needed to enact a bill into law.

### A2: BRC Recommendations Won’t Be Implemented

#### They concede that the BRC recs are successful means that - aff’s solvency evidence is a reason the recommendations would be implemented – if it’s actually a good idea, concerns will be resolved

### A2: Theory

#### We have a specific solvency advocate – that’s our 1NC Parthemore and Rogers evidence – literature should guide what CP’s are theoretically legitimate

#### Any other standard is arbitrary and incentivizes the aff to make theory interpretations limiting out all good CP’s

#### Education – debate should mirror real-world decisionmaking about the core issues of the topic

#### Checks predictability and infinite regression – if it’s in the literature they should be able to answer it

#### Tons of literature exists

Raso 10 (Connor R., JD – Yale Law School and Ph.D. in Political Science – Stanford University, “Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents”, The Yale Law Journal, January, 119 Yale L.J. 782, Lexis)

Scholars and policymakers alike have devoted increasing attention to a seemingly obscure question: do federal agencies improperly issue "guidance documents" 1 in place of legally binding "legislative rules" on a widespread basis? 2 This attention has been motivated by concern that agencies frequently use guidance documents to avoid procedures 3 intended both to facilitate public participation in the regulatory process and to enable the elected branches of government to monitor agencies more easily. 4 The scope of this loophole is potentially vast. Guidance documents greatly outnumber legislative rules, 5 [\*786] which in turn are approximately ten times more common than enacted legislation. 6 As a result, agency use of guidance documents is an important issue in administrative law. This Note provides the first large-scale empirical analysis of this issue, probing newly available data to determine whether agencies commonly issue guidance to avoid the notice and comment process.

#### The CP’s fair --- tons of tiny Affs because the word is so hard to define and none of the Affs have unified advantages. Testing the mechanism is the only way to get the neg back to ground zero. The alternative, especially at the beginning of the year, is word: condition, consult, and random K goo.

#### Err Neg --- they have structural biases, hard debate is good, and reject the argument not the team

#### Doesn’t steal the aff – there’s plenty of ground – they get certainty key, permanence key, and any argument that supports taking it off the books.

### AT: Disease Addon

#### Monitoring diseases fails – your evidence

**Harmon 9** [Katherine, News Reporter @ Scientific American “Satellites Used to Predict Infectious Disease Outbreaks” 8/24, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/author.cfm?id=1822>, Somya]

Much of the satellite work, however, still relies on clear skies. And all of it has been dependent on [quality information](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=old-spacecraft-satellites) from willing providers, such as NASA and its [Earth Observing System](http://eospso.gsfc.nasa.gov/), the availability of which researchers hope will continue in the future. **Even with the clearest NASA images, though, current methods are far from perfect. They employ complex models and incomplete information, risking false alarms and missed outbreaks**. To make the predictions as precise as possible takes understanding the ecology not just of the place being studied, but also of the disease and the human population. "You see tremendous variations in different areas," says Ford of how diseases behave, and "in some sense, [that is due to] just difference in human behavior." Judging the severity of avian flu's spread from satellite imaging, for instance, requires knowing how likely certain areas are to keep domestic chickens and ducks—a practice more common in countries that consume more poultry, Xiao explains. And getting precise poultry production statistics can be a real challenge, he notes, as record-keeping can vary greatly among countries and regions. But Ford thinks that even with these limitations, "There's no reason at all we shouldn't be able to say, 'This summer is going to be a bad hantavirus year' or 'This season will likely have a high cholera risk.'" Novel or long-dormant diseases present more challenges for remote prediction. "Whether we can predict emerging diseases is a whole other question," Ford says, especially as their vectors or risk factors might take time to assess. And some diseases that spread among people might turn out to be nearly impossible to predict using satellite and environmental data beyond what researchers already know about seasonal cycles, like that for the seasonal flu. And, the nonseasonal H1N1 **flu**, for example, "**is probably going to be more to do with human patterns [and] rapid transport between countries" than environmental changes that can be mapped**, Ford says.

### 2NC – Ext. 1

#### Extend 1NC 1 – No wars absent hegemony – nuclear deterrence, globalization, insituitions and democracy will exist with or without the US and will check great power conflict

#### Reject their vague assertions for conflict scenarios absent hegemony – their authors overestimate the importance of the US - *star this card*

**Fettweis 11** [Christopher J. Fettweis - Department of Political Science Tulane University and Professor of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, “Free Riding or Restraint Examining European Grand Strategy”, Comparative Strategy; Sep/Oct2011, Vol. 30 Issue 4, p316-332, 17p, Chetan]

**Assertions that without** the combination of **U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return** to Europe and the Pacific Rim **are usually rendered in rather vague language**. If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “**the world will become a more dangerous place** and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 **From where would this danger arise? Who** precisely **would do the fighting, and over what issues?** Without the United States, **would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack** mainland **China again**, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, **where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace?** With one exception, **these questions are rarely addressed**. That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon theworldwould witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed Chin a is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, **decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese** regional, must less global, political **expansion.** Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before. **Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind** a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, **specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers**. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. **Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination.**  Overestimating Our Importance One of **the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential** upon their behavior **as we perceive them to be.** A great deal of **experimental evidence exists to support the notion that** people (and therefore **states) tend to overrate the degree to which** **their behavior is responsible for the actions of others.** Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both ofwhichwould seem to be especially relevant in theU.S. case. 55 First, **believing that we are responsible** **for their actions gratifies our national ego** (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 **U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders**. **If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States.** Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might**, it is not possible to** fully **understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective.** The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. **They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one**. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57 **It is natural**, therefore, **for U.S**. policymakers and **strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does**. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, **we are probably not as important to them as we think**. **The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly overrated**. In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, **the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it can only be falsified, never proven**. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. **Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with**, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, **with or without the United States**.

#### Empirically the world grew more peaceful when heg declined

**Fettweis 11** [Christopher J. Fettweis - Department of Political Science Tulane University and Professor of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, “Free Riding or Restraint Examining European Grand Strategy”, Comparative Strategy; Sep/Oct2011, Vol. 30 Issue 4, p316-332, 17p, Chetan]

It is perhaps worth noting that **there is no evidence to support a** direct **relationship between** the relative level of **U.S. activism and international stability**. In fact, **the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true**. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990. 51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.” 52 On the other hand, if the paciﬁc trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: **The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered** by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred** once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. **The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a** pressing **concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities**. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conﬂict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending ﬁgures by themselves are insufﬁcient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was signiﬁcantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global paciﬁc trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never ﬁnal; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conﬂict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulﬁlled. If increases in conﬂict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, **the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military** spending. Evidently **the rest of the world can operate** quite effectively **without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.**

### 2NC – Ext. 2

#### Extend 1NC 2 – there is no statistical proof that unipolarity has prevened conflicts – our Montiero evidence indicates there is an 18.2% chance conflict will break out under hegemony which is more than 4 times other systems

#### American’s unipolar era has been its most violent

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

In contrast, **the question of unipolar peacefulness has received** virtually **no attention**. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such con flict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustified. The first two decades of **the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait** in 1991, **Kosovo** in 1999, **Afghanistan** from 2001 to the present, **and Iraq** between 2003 and 2010. 22 In all, **the U**nited **S**tates **has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years** since the end of the Cold War. 23 Put another way, **the first two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war**. 24 **And yet, the** theoretical **consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace**. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate. 25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention. In this article, I provide a theory of unipolarity that focuses on the issue of unipolar peacefulness rather than durability. I argue that **unipolarity creates significant conflict-producing mechanisms** that are likely to involve the unipole itself. Rather than assess the relative peacefulness of unipolarity vis-à-vis bipolar or multipolar systems, I identify causal pathways to war that are characteristic of a unipolar system and that have not been developed in the extant literature. To be sure, I do not question the impossibility of great power war in a unipolar world. Instead, I show how unipolar systems provide incentives for two other types of war: those **pitting the sole great power against another state and those** involving **exclusively other states**. In addition, I show that the type of con flict that occurs in a unipolar world depends on the strategy of the sole great power, of which there are three. The first two—defensive and offensive dominance—will lead to con flicts pitting the sole great power against other states. The third—disengagement—will lead to con flicts among other states. Furthermore, whereas the unipole is likely to enter unipolarity implementing a dominance strategy, over time it is possible that it will shift to disengagement. I support my theory with several empirical examples. These do not aim at systematically testing my argument, for two reasons. First, the unipolar era is too short a period to test structural mechanisms. Second, the United States has consistently implemented a strategy of dominance, limiting opportunities to test my claims on the consequences of disengagement. 26

### 2NC China Overview

#### Hegemony causes China war – our Layne evidence indicates that China’s rise guarantees conflict with the US as they vy for supremacy in East Asia – causes multiple hotspots in Korea, Taiwan and over oil

#### This outweighs

#### A. Magnitude – most likely scenario for extinction as it would draw in other powers from Asia including India, Pakistan, Russia, and North Korea who all have nukes guaranteeing global escalation

#### B. Timeframe/Probability – China is rising incredibly fast, which makes the brink for war incredibly thin.

### Turns Econ

#### Hegemony causes economic collapse – current economic crisis proves

**Eland 9** (Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on peace and Liberty at the Independent Institute, Director of Defense Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, B.A. Iowa State University, M.B.A. in Economics and Ph.D. in Public Policy from George Washington University, (Ivan, The Independent Institute, “How the U.S. Empire Contributed to the Economic Crisis”, May 11th, http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2498)

A few—and only a few—prescient commentators have questioned whether the U.S. can sustain its informal global empire in the wake of the most severe economic crisis since World War II. And the simultaneous quagmires in Iraq and Afghanistan are leading more and more opinion leaders and taxpayers to this question. But the U.S. Empire helped cause the meltdown in the first place. War has a history of causing financial and economic calamities. It does so directly by almost always causing inflation—that is, too much money chasing too few goods. During wartime, governments usually commandeer resources from the private sector into the government realm to fund the fighting. This action leaves shortages of resources to make consumer goods and their components, therefore pushing prices up. Making things worse, governments often times print money to fund the war, thus adding to the amount of money chasing the smaller number of consumer goods. Such “make-believe” wealth has funded many U.S. wars. For example, the War of 1812 had two negative effects on the U.S. financial system. First, in 1814, the federal government allowed state-chartered banks to suspend payment in gold and silver to their depositors. In other words, according Tom J. DiLorenzo in Hamilton’s Curse, the banks did not have to hold sufficient gold and silver reserves to cover their loans. This policy allowed the banks to loan the federal government more money to fight the war. The result was an annual inflation rate of 55 percent in some U.S. cities. The government took this route of expanding credit during wartime because no U.S. central bank existed at the time. Congress, correctly questioning The Bank of the United States’ constitutionality, had not renewed its charter upon expiration in 1811. But the financial turmoil caused by the war led to a second pernicious effect on the financial system—the resurrection of the bank in 1817 in the form of the Second Bank of the United States. Like the first bank and all other government central banks in the future, the second bank flooded the market with new credit. In 1818, this led to excessive real estate speculation and a consequent bubble. The bubble burst during the Panic of 1819, which was the first recession in the nation’s history. Sound familiar? Although President Andrew Jackson got rid of the second bank in the 1830s and the U.S. economy generally flourished with a freer banking system until 1913, at that time yet another central bank—this time the Federal Reserve System—rose from the ashes. We have seen that war ultimately causes the creation of both economic problems and nefarious government financial institutions that cause those difficulties. And of course, the modern day U.S. Empire also creates such economic maladies and wars that allow those institutions to wreak havoc on the economy. The Fed caused the current collapse in the real estate credit market, which has led to a more general global financial and economic meltdown, by earlier flooding the market with excess credit. That money went into real estate, thus creating an artificial bubble that eventually came crashing down in 2008. But what caused the Fed to vastly expand credit? To prevent a potential economic calamity after 9/11 and soothe jitters surrounding the risky and unneeded U.S. invasion of Iraq, Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan began a series of interest rate cuts that vastly increased the money supply. According to Thomas E. Woods, Jr. in Meltdown, the interest rate cuts culminated in the extraordinary policy of lowering the federal funds rate (the rate at which banks lend to one another overnight, which usually determines other interest rates) to only one percent for an entire year (from June 2003 to June 2004). Woods notes that more money was created between 2000 and 2007 than in the rest of U.S. history. Much of this excess money ended up creating the real estate bubble that eventually caused the meltdown. Ben Bernanke, then a Fed governor, was an ardent advocate of this easy money policy, which as Fed Chairman he has continued as his solution to an economic crisis he helped create using the same measures. Of course, according to Osama bin Laden, the primary reasons for the 9/11 attacks were U.S. occupation of Muslim lands and U.S. propping up of corrupt dictators there. And the invasion of Iraq was totally unnecessary because there was never any connection between al Qaeda or the 9/11 attacks and Saddam Hussein, and even if Saddam had had biological, chemical, or even nuclear weapons, the massive U.S. nuclear arsenal would have likely deterred him from using them on the United States. So the causal arrow goes from these imperial behaviors—and blowback there from—to increases in the money supply to prevent related economic slowdown, which in turn caused even worse eventual financial and economic calamities. These may be indirect effects of empire, but they cannot be ignored. Get rid of the overseas empire because we can no longer afford it, especially when it is partly responsible for the economic distress that is making us poorer.

### Turns Terror

#### Heg causes terrorism – US presence in the Middle East and 9/11 proves

**Layne 9** (Christopher, Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, literary and national editor of the Atlantic, Review of International Studies (2009), 5/25/9, “America’s Middle East grand strategy after Iraq: the moment for offshore balancing has arrived”, Cambridge Journals)

Terrorist organisations like Al-Qaeda are non-state actors, and as such, they are not, strictly speaking, engaged in ‘balancing’ the US (because balancing is a form of state behaviour). Yet, at the same time, the actions of groups like Al-Qaeda reflect some of the key attributes of balancing. After all, beyond connoting the idea of counterweight, balancing also signifies opposition, or resistance, to a hegemon. Terrorists may not be able to balance against the US, but they can engage in a related form of activity aimed at undermining American primacy by raising its costs. Organisations like Al-Qaeda may be non-state actors, but their actions are of a kind frequently found in international politics: the use of violence against a state(s) to attain clearly defined political objectives. Indeed the use of violence for such purposes is the hallmark of terrorism. As Bruce Hoffman says, terrorism is ‘about power: the pursuit of power, the acquisition of power, and the use of power to achieve political change’.38 Terrorism, moreover, is fundamentally an asymmetric form of conflict, because it is an instrument that the weak use against the strong.39 From this perspective, the 9/11 assault on the US was not a random, senseless, ‘irrational’ act of violence. In fact, the 9/11 attack was in keeping with the Clausewitzian paradigm of war: force was used against the US by its adversaries to advance their political objectives. As German military strategist Carl von Clausewitz himself observed, ‘War is not an act of senseless passion but is controlled by its political object’.40 Here, President Bush’s endlessly reiterated claim that the US was attacked because Islamic radicals ‘hate us because of our freedom’ betrayed a complete misunderstanding of the dynamics that underpin the clash between the US and Middle Eastern terrorists. For sure, there are Islamic radicals who, indeed, do hate the US for cultural, religious, and ideological reasons. But that is not why the US is a target for Islamic terrorists. 9/11 represented a violent counterreaction to America’s policies in the Middle East – especially its drive to dominate the region both geopolitically and culturally. As Michael Schuerer – who headed the CIA analytical team monitoring Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda – says, it is dangerous for the US to base its strategy for combating terrorism on the belief ‘that Muslims hate and attack us for what we are and think rather than for what we do’.41 In a similar vein, Richard K. Betts observed following the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center that, ‘It is hardly likely that Middle Eastern radicals would be hatching schemes like the destruction of the World Trade Center if the US had not been identified so long as the mainstay of Israel, the Shah of Iran, and conservative Arab regimes and the source of a cultural assault on Islam’.42 It is the US’ attempt to impose its primacy and preferences on the Middle East that fuels groups like Al-Qaeda and fans Islamic fundamental- ism. Terrorism is a form of ‘blowback’ against America’s preponderant role in international affairs. Despicable and brutal though it was, the 9/11 attack was undertaken with cool calculation to achieve well-defined geopolitical objectives. Underscoring this point, Scheurer observes that, ‘In the context of ideas bin Laden shares with his brethren, the military actions of Al-Qaeda and its allies are acts of war, not terrorism . . . meant to advance bin Laden’s clear, focused, limited, and widely popular foreign policy goals . . .’.43 Specifically, Al-Qaeda wants to compel the US to remove its military presence from the Persian Gulf, and force Washington to alter its stance on the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.44 Al-Qaeda’s leaders also apparently hoped that the September 11 attacks would provoke a US overreaction, and thereby trigger an upsurge of popular discontent in the Islamic world that would lead to the overthrow of the Saudi monarchy and other pro-American regimes in the Middle East (Egypt, Pakistan, and Jordan, for example) and their replacement by fundamentalist Islamic governments.45 In other words, Al-Qaeda seeks to undermine US primacy, and thereby compel changes in America’s Middle Eastern grand strategy. The US presence on the ground in the Middle East also incites terrorists to attack American interests. In his study of suicide terrorist groups, Pape has found that ‘what nearly all suicide terrorist attacks have in common is a specific secular and strategic goal: to compel modern democracies to withdraw military forces from territory that the terrorists consider to be their homeland’.46 Al-Qaeda fits this pattern, and one of its principal objectives ‘is the expulsion of American troops from the Persian Gulf and the reduction of Washington’s power in the region’.47 Here, the Bush adminis- tration’s inflexible determination to maintain a long-term American military presence in Iraq is exactly the wrong policy to reduce terrorism. The Bush administration, of course, claimed that the US is fighting terrorism in Iraq. To make this point, it has grossly exaggerated the links between the insurgent group Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) and Osama Bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda organisation and, hence – in a blatant prevarication – tied AQI and the war in Iraq to 9/11.48 Bush repeatedly asserted that, in Iraq the US is fighting the same terrorists who attacked the US on 9/11. Of course, this claim overlooked the fact that AQI came into existence only after the March 2003 US invasion of Iraq, and that its links with Bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda are, at best, tenuous. The Bush administration’s deliberate fabrications were designed to win Congressional and public support for a prolonged ‘surge’.49 When it first announced the surge, the administration said it would last through 2007. Instead it lasted well into 2008, and it is likely that there will be more US forces in Iraq in January 2009 than there were prior to the surge. And, even when the surge itself has ended, any draw-down of US forces will take place gradually.50 General David Petraeus, who served as senior American commander in Iraq during the surge and now heads CENTCOM (the US military command with overall responsibility for the Middle East) has repeatedly emphasised that the US commit- ment to Iraq is long-term in nature, and American military planners are preparing for a long-lasting ‘post-occupation’ US presence there.51 In fact, it is clear that the Bush administration never intended to withdraw from Iraq militarily and aimed for the US to retain permanent US military bases there. President Bush all but confirmed this in May 2007 when he said that he wanted the US to play the same kind of role in Iraq that it has in South Korea since the end of the Korean War.52 What will happen under the new US administration is unclear. During 2008, the government of Iraqi Nouri al-Maliki indicated that Baghdad wanted to set a timeline for US troop withdrawals. The Iraqi government refused to accede to the Bush administration’s desire to negotiate a long-term security agreement that would allow the US to maintain permanent bases in Iraq. Although the Bush administration had strongly opposed any suggestions that there should be a fixed timetable for US withdrawal from Iraq in July 2008, Bush’s position seemed to soften and the administration said the US would support a ‘time horizon’ for US troop withdrawals from Iraq as an ‘aspirational goal’.53 What the new US admin- istration will do about the US presence in Iraq is an open question, but based on the positions taken by Senator Barak Obama (D. Ill.) and Senator John McCain (R. Ariz.) during the 2008 US presidential campaign, it seems certain that there will be a significant American military presence in Iraq for some time to come. Instead of reducing American vulnerability to terrorism, the presence of US troops in Iraq and the Middle East increases it by reinforcing the widespread perception in the Islamic world that the US is pursuing a neo-colonial policy in the Middle East in furtherance of its own imperial ambitions. The huge US politico-military footprint in the Middle East region – including Iraq – is, along with America’s policy on the Israel/Palestinian issue, the primary driver of Middle Eastern terrorism. The admin- istration’s overall policy in the Middle East has inflamed anti-American sentiment, and turned the entire region into a source of recruits for various radical terrorist groups. Instead of solving this problem, staying in Iraq will exacerbate it.

### SMRs Turn

#### EXTEND Turn – military SMRs cause blowback and gut our nonproliferation agenda

Smith 11 (Terrence P., Program Coordinator and Research Assistant with the William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy – CSIS, “An Idea I Can Do Without: “Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations”,” Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2-16, http://csis.org/blog/idea-i-can-do-without-small-nuclear-reactors-military-installations)

What are the alternatives to small nuclear reactors (assuming we want to maintain a large oversees military presence)? The NDU report makes the point that the DoD has already been experimenting with “an array of initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable and alternative fuels.” But, according to the report, “unfortunately, even with massive investment and ingenuity, these initiatives will be insufficient to solve DOD’s reliance on the civilian grid or its need for convoys in forward areas.” While, to my knowledge, the DoD has not seen any huge relief from what I would call its token attempts at ‘going green,’ it hardly writes off the possibility of alternative energy supplies short of going nuclear. The report repeatedly emphasizes the point that “DOD’s “’first mover’ pursuit of small reactors could have a profound influence on the development of the industry,” and cautions that “if DOD does not support the U.S. small reactor industry, the industry could be dominated by foreign companies.” The U.S. nonproliferation agenda, if there is one, stands in opposition to this line of thinking. Pursuing a nuclear technology out of the fear that others will get it (or have it), is what fueled the Cold War and much of the proliferation we have seen and are seeing today. It is a mentality I think we should avoid. I do not mean to say this report ignores the risks. In fact they explicitly say, “We acknowledge that there are many uncertainties and risks associated with these reactors.” For example it says, Some key issues that require consideration include securing sealed modules, determining how terrorists might use captured nuclear materials, carefully considering the social and environmental consequences of dispersing reactors. The report also points out that “from a financial perspective, small reactors represent substantial losses in economies of scale.” These issues, which were briefly mentioned, hardly seem like small potatoes. The reports answer to the issues raised: “making reliable projections about these reactors’ economic and technical performance while they are still on paper is a significant challenge,” and “Nevertheless, no issue involving nuclear energy is simple.” On the other hand, the report argues, “failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD.” “First, small reactors may fail to be commercialized in the United States; second, the designs that get locked in by the private market may not be optimal for DOD’s needs; and third, expertise on small reactors may become concentrated in foreign countries.” Yes these are important issue for a business stand, but I don’t find them to be the primary concern. The reactors are purely for energy purposes, but in a world that seems to be growing tired of U.S. military intervention, the idea of ensuring our ability to do so through the proliferation of mobile nuclear reactors will hardly quell any hostile sentiment. In addition, it can only add fire to the “nuclear = good” flame. So, while even under best case scenario, the reactors are completely proliferation proof and pose no direct threat to the nonproliferation cause (ignoring the spreading of nuclear tech and knowledge in general), I have a tough time seeing how it helps. The report concludes that the DoD “should seriously consider taking a leadership role on small reactors.” Since the 1970s, the report says, “in the United States, only the military has overcome the considerable barriers to building nuclear reactors. This will probably be the case with small reactors as well.” For now, the plans for small nuclear reactors are “unfortunately,” for the most part, “caught between the drawing board and production.”My point is, maybe that is where they should stay.

#### READ - Military nuclear installments will be targeted for sabotage – causes accidents

Wong 12 (Kelvin, Associate Research Fellow – S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, “Beyond Weapons: The Military’s Quest For Nuclear Power – Analysis,” Eurasia Review, 5-22, http://www.eurasiareview.com/22052012-beyond-weapons-the-militarys-quest-for-nuclear-power-analysis/)

Civilian And Military Nuclear Incidents Despite improvements in nuclear safety, public sentiment on nuclear power is generally unfavourable, particularly after a series of high-profile nuclear incidents over the years. Disasters like Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, and the recent Fukushima episodes have sorely demonstrated the perils of operating nuclear reactors, emanating be it from human error or natural calamities. Military forces have also been stung by peacetime nuclear incidents. In March 2008, the American nuclear submarine USS Houston leaked minute amounts of radiation into Sasebo naval base while on a port call, triggering condemnation from Japanese citizens in the district. In the same year, the British nuclear submarine HMS Trafalgar leaked hundreds of litres of radioactive wastewater into a nearby river while docked at Devonport naval base, raising concerns from nuclear safety experts. Mainstream Nuclear Power In The Military? Yet military scientists have not ceased to be tempted by the potential of nuclear power. In response to increasing oil prices and global supply uncertainties, and well-documented cases of logistical strain on forces operating in the Middle East in recent conflicts, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) issued a proposal for innovative solutions in deployable compact nuclear reactors in 2010. In the proposal, DARPA outlined the need to reduce the logistical burden of supplying forward operating bases and forces without access to reliable fuel supply lines. The proposal also suggested that materials science have advanced to the stage where it might have a positive impact on deployable nuclear reactor research. While recent developments suggest that nuclear power technology can potentially be employed in unmanned aircraft and on the ground, it is unlikely to have mainstream military utility. The Cold War period was an era when general attitudes towards nuclear energy were quite favourable, and military experimentation was only limited by funding and scientific expertise. In contrast, nuclear power today has become a hotly debated issue despite its importance in powering the economies of advanced nations today. For the military, the problem with nuclear power is not just about cost and safety, but also of the nature of its operating environment. Deploying volatile nuclear reactors into harm’s way on the battlefield, where their destruction and sabotage are likely, should give military planners cause to pause.

### Solvency Fails

#### They’re going to lose solvency – 4 reasons

#### Foregin Grids - Military SMRs rely on foreign grids that are fragile – takes out solvency because the grids would not be able to integrate the electricity – that’s Smith this also means that bases are more likely to be targeted by terrorists

#### No experience – The base personnel can’t do nuclear – there will be a whole new work force for oversight and regulation required at the bases – others reactors will fail – that turns the case – that’s Parthemore & Rogers

#### Siting is going to be contentious – too many safety concerns – that’s King

#### Fukushima proves that nuclear industry is doomed – there’s an international paradigm shift away from nuclear power because of safety, costs, and lack of qualified experts – that’s Mez

## Round 5 1NR vs. Wake DL

### Kicking

#### Renewables DA not going for it, we’ll concede that nuclear energy’s already been funded which should’ve traded off with renewables, you’ve conceded that renewables solve warming which means warming is inevitable – takes out your SMRs solve warming arugment

#### DoD Trade off not going for it – concede that current funding should’ve already traded off which means that NMD development will never happen – takes out your heg impact because conventional power isn’t capable of deterring countries anymore since they’re burying their nukes underground

### 1NR - Impact

#### DA outweighs – No impact defense means any risk of the DA should be preferred. Romney will ruin US-Russia relations because he takes a hardline stance towards Putin and won’t cooperate on NMD or other missile defense issues – causes relations collapse and war

#### US- Russia war is the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

#### Turns Case-

#### Terrorism- Allison and blackwill = relations key to shut down terror networks

#### Economy- Relations collapse trade between US and Russia- kills major cooperation between two of the world’s largest economy- has a serious impact on the economy.

#### Romney’s economic plan causes economic collapse --- kills the housing market and consumer spending

**Waldron**, 1/12/**2012** (Travis, Economists: Romney’s Economic Plan Fails to Deal With ‘Main Drags’ On U.S. Economy, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/12/403210/economists-romneys-draconian/)

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney’s (R) economic plan has become the centerpiece of his presidential campaign. Though his proposals are often vague, analyses of the plan shows that it would provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while raising taxes on low-income families. And though Romney claims to be concerned about the federal budget deficit, his plan would add more than $6 trillion in deficits over 10 years. Romney, who touts his experience as a job creator, has suggested laying off thousands of public sector workers. He wants to slash vital programs for the poor and middle-classes, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and gut Medicare and Social Security. His embrace of the radical Cut, Cap, and Balance plan pushed by House Republicans would, in effect, shrink the federal government to pre-Ronald Reagan era sizes. But for all his talk about the plan on the campaign trail, economists surveyed by Reuters say Romney’s plan likely wouldn’t deal with the main drags on the American economy, while the cuts to vital programs would be “utterly draconian“: These steps would shrink the federal government’s role more than even former president Ronald Reagan managed 30 years ago when he turned many social programs over to the states. That scenario concerns liberal economists. “If applied, these fiscal measures would be utterly draconian. The attacks on Medicare and Social Security would throw large portions of the population into poverty,” said Jamie Galbraith, business professor at the University of Texas in Austin. Mainstream economists worry more that neither Romney nor his Republican opponents are addressing the main drag on the U.S. economy – weak demand from American consumers still weighed down by debt. Among the “main drags” highlighted in the Reuters piece is the housing crisis, which has placed “a big drag on consumer spending which drives two thirds of the U.S. economy.” But the GOP candidates have offered little in the way of solutions for the crisis, and Romney’s own prescription involves letting the housing market hit rock bottom — further damaging millions of homeowners. “Markets work,” Romney told moderators at a debate in November when asked what he would do to address the housing crisis. According to former Wall Street economist Thomas Gallagher, addressing demand should be at the top of the list when it comes to speeding the recovery. Instead, Romney is focused on budget deficits and tax reform — the types of austerity measures that are pushing Europe toward another recession. Perhaps that’s why a survey of economics professors found that the Republican proposals were so bad, they wouldn’t pass an Econ 101 class.

### 1NR – Uniqueness

#### Obama will win the election --- a consensus of polls and the Five Thirty Eight forecast prove. That’s the 1NC Silver 9/20 evidence. Prefer our evidence because it’s predictive and cites multiple battleground polls that Obama has pulled ahead in.

#### Prefer him - Nate Silver is the best analyst

**Lindgren 8** [Jim Lindgren - Professor of law at Northwestern University, leading scholar in the growing movement of New Legal Empiricists, How did the pollsters do in predicting the popular vote?, November 5th, 2008, <http://volokh.com/posts/1225926066.shtml>, Chetan]

UPDATE: Even though Nate Silver at 538 was not in the poll list I used for the post, I reached out to give him his props for being essentially as good as others who predicted a 6-7% spread before Tuesday's election. Several commenters point to 538's Tuesday afternoon prediction of a 6.1% spread, issued long after the polls opened and turnout info was filtering back. Judging his prediction by the same standard as the pollsters on the list above — subtracting his pre-election McCain prediction (46.1%) from his pre-election Obama prediction (52%), his predicted pre-election spread would be 5.9%, very slightly farther from the current spread than a couple of the pollsters above. Yet even that is complicated because his last pre-election presidential prediction post (on Monday evening) put the predicted spread at 6.0%, which simply means that the 52 to 46.1% spread actually rounded up to 6.0%: With fewer than six hours until voting begins in Dixville Notch, New Hampshire, the national polling picture has cleared up considerably. Barack Obama is on the verge of a victory, perhaps a decisive victory, in the race for the White House. The national polls have all consolidated into a range of roughly Obama +7. That is right about where our model sees the race as well, giving Obama a 6.8 point advantage in its composite of state and national polling. Our model notes, however, that candidates with large leads in the polls have had some tendency to underperform marginally on election day, and so projects an Obama win of 6.0 points tomorrow. Silver's performance this year has been terrific, clearly establishing himself as the most reliable of the poll-based aggregators /predictors. He has an intuitive feel for numbers and knows when to tweak his models. In part because he appears to be the best out there, I hope that next time he releases his “final” predictions BEFORE the election.

#### Their Wilson ev has zero qualifications – national Republican media and strategy consultant

#### Their Whitesides evidence, also with no quals but “political correspondent”, just says that Romney “remains in striking range” – neither cite any polls, momentum, or change in attitudes that signal he could change the game, the only polls they cite are ones that Obama is winning

#### Obama is winning --- momentum

**Blake**, **9/20**/2012 (Aaron, Is the 2012 election tilting toward Democrats?, The Washington Post, p. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/09/20/is-the-2012-election-tilting-toward-democrats/>)

Either we’re at a turning point in the 2012 election, or a lot of pollsters are getting it wrong. The question for the past week-plus has been whether President Obama’s convention bounce and a series of stumbles for Mitt Romney have recast the 2012 race. Some national polls say yes, and a few say no. But more and more, the data at the state level point to some real movement in Democrats’ favor. At least for now. As we wrote Tuesday, Gallup polling shows that the bump Obama got from the Democratic convention two weeks ago has subsided. And another new poll, released Wednesday by the Associated Press and pollster GfK, shows basically the same picture, with 47 percent of likely voters supporting Obama and 46 percent backing Romney — a tie ballgame nationally. But almost every state-specific poll in the last few days has shown progress for Democrats — both at the presidential level and in the very important contest for the Senate — with some showing unprecedented leads for the blue side in the the most important states. Swing-state polls from CBS News, the New York Times and Quinnipiac University released Wednesday morning in three key states — Colorado, Virginia and Wisconsin — showed Obama either gaining since last month or, in the case of Virginia, holding his lead. And Fox News polls released Wednesday evening showed Obama with a solid lead in the three biggest swing states; he’s up by seven points each in Ohio and Virginia and five points in Florida. The results confirm polls from NBC News and Marist College in the same three states last week. A Washington Post poll released Tuesday confirms the movement in Virginia, with Obama up by an unprecedented eight points. And a Marquette University Law School poll released Wednesday supports the idea that the race in Wisconsin has shifted, with Obama leading by an astounding 14 points. Even if some of these margins seem a little big, just consider that even the best polls for Romney haven’t shown him with that kind of lead in these states — or really anything close to it. In fact, Nate Silver points out that, of the 16 live-interview swing state polls conducted in the last two weeks, Obama is leading in all of them except Colorado by at least four points.

#### Obama will win --- economic factors, Romney’s favorability, increased approval rating, and swing states.

**Lombardo**, **9/20**/2012 (Steve – Global CEO of Edelman Berland, Election Monitor: 47 Days to Go and the Pendulum Has Swung Toward Obama, The Huffington Post, p. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-47-days_b_1900540.html>)

We can talk about 47 percent, the Libya stumbles, the lack of message discipline and a weak convention, but the simple fact is that the president and his team have had a better strategy than Team Romney from Day 1 and they have executed it to perfection. The result? Governor Romney has a damaged political persona and he's running behind the President in key states like Ohio, Virginia and -- to a lesser extent -- Florida. Losses in those three guarantee an Obama victory. With 47 days to go, the president has reversed his decline after his "you didn't build that" comment, is on a three week message win roll and is now likely to be reelected. How did we get here? As usual, it hasn't been just one thing; instead, the cumulative impact of a series of external events and strategic and tactical moves by each team has resulted in a significant competitive advantage for the president. In no particular order, here is our take on the most important of those events: 1. Romney entered the general election as a damaged and flawed candidate. Yes, this has happened to others who have rebounded, but this is different. Governor Romney's political persona was formed during the primaries when voters began to view him as elitist, rich and out of touch. This is where the Democrats' early advertising was crucial. Remember, Romney had to fight a two-front war as both Gingrich and the Democrats attacked Bain. It helped to galvanize a perception that has stuck like glue. Of course, miscues by the candidate and the campaign both old (the $10,000 bet) and new (47 percent) have reinforced this perception. That is why the 47 percent comment was so problematic. It was another layer on an already existing perception. The problem now is that this thing has hardened, making it virtually impossible to change. 2. Team Obama's early advertising strategy to make Romney an unacceptable alternative worked. They were able to define Romney before he had a chance to define himself. Of course, the Romney team inadvertently aided that effort but not doing a substantial positive media buy to explain who Mitt Romney is and what kind of President he might be. Romney's favorability rating is currently underwater with 44 percent favorable and 45 percent unfavorable. In the latest WSJ/NBC poll only 38 percent of the electorate had a positive impression of him. According to the latest CBS/NYT poll, only 37 percent of Virginia voters think that Romney "cares about people like them." This is politically debilitating. 3. Perceptions of the economy are improving. While unemployment remains high and GDP growth is abysmal, the stock market has improved (taking 401(k)s with it). Additionally, don't underestimate how effectively Team Obama has hammered home the idea that the president inherited a big problem. He has been saying it since he was inaugurated with extraordinarily good message discipline. Voters are likely to give him partial credit here. 4. Obama's approval rating is now in the "likely reelect zone. " We have been saying for months that an approval rating in the low- to mid-40s makes reelection difficult. Since last year, however, Obama's approval rating has improved by 5-6 points. He is now at approximately 49 percent approval, which is comparable to where President George W. Bush was in 2004. 5. The President had a strong convention and Romney had a weak one. Poor speeches and Eastwood's chair aside, the fact is that the RNC did not achieve its principal objective: to re-launch a re-branded Romney and create momentum heading into September. Forget all the talk about the convention's mechanics; this was about transforming the narrative. And they did not do that. Of course, the Democrats had the advantage of going second but the RNC did not put Team Obama on its heels. Speaking of which... 6. Team Romney has been in reactive mode for a month. Of course, part of this is a continuous cycle of damage control but there does not appear to be a forward-looking strategy. By now, we fully expected to see some sort of economic proposal or initiative that would have forced the Obama campaign to respond. This has not happened. 7. Last but certainly not least there was Libya. With respect to Team Romney, there seemed to be little recognition of the most basic political tenet of a foreign crisis: when there is an international incident in which America is attacked, voters in this country will (at least in the short term) rally around the flag and the president. Always. It is stunning that Team Romney failed to recognize this. In times of domestic crisis (the BP oil spill is a great example) voters will look to their political leaders and can be pretty quick to lay blame. On the other hand, it usually takes some time for voters to sour on how their leaders have handled international crises. Iraq is the perfect example. 8. The result is that the President is now running ahead (beyond the margin of error) of Romney in key battleground states including Virginia, Ohio, Florida and New Hampshire. Ohio is particularly troubling since it is awfully hard to see a winning Romney coalition without it.

### 1NR – Link

#### Nuclear power incentives are massively unpopular --- recent meltdowns have turned the American public off to any new plants. That’s Sheppard 2011 --- prefer it because it cites the most recent polls and is specific to the plan mechanism.

#### Link alone turns the case – public opposition undermines investment for nuclear power.

Civil Society Institute, 3/7/**2012** (Survey: Americans Not Warming Up to Nuclear Power One Year After Fukushima, p. http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm)

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

#### The public massively opposes spending on nuclear power.

**Mariotte**, 6/5/**2012** (Michael – Executive Director and chief spokesperson for Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the Polls Say, Daily Kos, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say>)

To try to get a better sense of what the public really thinks about nuclear power (and since we can’t afford to conduct our own polling), we took a look at every poll we could find on the issue, and related energy issues, over the past two years, and in some cases further back. Yes, that includes GOP/Fox News favorite Rasmussen. As DailyKos readers know, if not the general public, examining all the possible polls leads to a much greater confidence in conclusions than relying on a single poll. Thus, we have a fairly strong confidence that our conclusions are a good statement of where the American public is at on nuclear power and our energy future in the Spring of 2012. Conclusion 1: The public does NOT want to pay for new nuclear power. It IS willing to pay for renewable energy. This one is a slam dunk. New nuclear reactors are simply too expensive for utilities to build with their own assets. Nor are banks willing to lend money for most nuclear projects; they’re considered too risky given the long history of cost overruns, defaults, cancellations and other problems. Thus, the only two means of financing a new reactor are to either get money from taxpayers, through direct federal loans or taxpayer-backed loan guarantees, or from ratepayers in a few, mostly Southern states, which allow utilities to collect money from ratepayers before reactors are built—a concept known either as “early cost recovery” or Construction Work in Progress (CWIP). ORC International (which polls for CNN, among others) has asked a straightforward question for the past two years (March 2011 and February 2012) in polls commissioned by the Civil Society Institute: “Should U.S. Taxpayers Take on the Risk of Backing New Nuclear Reactors?” The answer? Basically identical both years: 73% opposed in 2011, 72% opposed in 2012. Maybe using the work “risk” skews the poll, you think? So ORC also asked, “Do you favor or oppose shifting federal loan guarantees from nuclear energy to clean renewables?” The answer was basically the same: 74% said yes in 2011, 77% in 2012 with 47% “strongly” holding that opinion both years.

#### Public opinion prevents deployment of SMR.

International Trade Administration, February **2011** (The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors, Department of Commerce, p. 7)

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

#### Women –

#### A) They oppose nuclear power.

**Pew Research Center**, 3/21/**2011** (Opposition to Nuclear Power amid Japanese Crisis, p. http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1934/support-nuclear-power-japan-gas-prices-offshore-oil-gas-drilling)

Continuing Gender Gap over Nuclear Power There has long been a wide gender gap in views of increased use of nuclear power and these differences persist amid the crisis in Japan. By greater than two-to-one (63% to 26%), women oppose promoting the increased use of nuclear power. A narrow majority of men (53%) favor the increased use of nuclear power, while 42% are opposed. The proportion of college graduates that supports the expanded use of nuclear power has fallen by 13 points since October (from 57% to 44%). College graduates remain slightly more likely than those with less education to support more use of nuclear power, but the gap has narrowed. About half of Republicans (49%) favor the expanded use of nuclear power compared with 41% of independents and 31% of Democrats. There were comparable partisan differences in these views last October.

#### B) They swing the election.

**Goodman and Rozell**, 5/14/**2012** (Paul – former chairman of the Democratic Party of Virginia, and Mark – professor of public policy at George Mason University, Will women finally determine presidential vote?, Politico, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76275.html)

The 2004 exit poll data produced controversial results. The adjusted data suggest Sen. John Kerry likely carried the women’s vote narrowly. But he lost in the Electoral College because of Bush’s far stronger support among men. So these current polls reveal a potentially historic wrinkle: The women’s vote could now be definitively decisive in electing the president. For 220 years, picking the president has remained, at least in terms of statistically provable results despite the 19th Amendment, a man’s prerogative. But this may finally change in 2012. Meanwhile, the latest polls suggest another important shift: Younger women may be the kingmakers — offsetting Romney’s gain among older white men angry at their fate in this struggling economy. Whatever you thought you knew about women and the gender gap — think again. The battle of the sexes, with an intergenerational female undercard, may finally redefine presidential politics 92 years after the passage of the 19th Amendment.

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power

Civil Society Institute, 3/7/**2012** (Survey: Americans Not Warming Up to Nuclear Power One Year After Fukushima, p. http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm)

One year after the disaster at the Fukushima nuclear reactors in Japan, Americans continue to want to keep the brakes on more nuclear power in the United States, according to a major new ORC International survey conducted for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI). To gauge any shift in public attitudes, the new survey was benchmarked to an earlier poll carried out by ORC International in March 2011 for CSI. Conducted February 23-26 2012, the new survey of 1,032 Americans shows that: • Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. This contrasts sharply with pre-Fukushima surveys by Gallup and other organizations showing a 60 percent support level for nuclear power. • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) say they are now more supportive than they were a year ago "to using clean renewable energy resources - such as wind and solar - and increased energy efficiency as an alternative to more nuclear power in the United States." This finding edged up from the 2011 survey level of 76 percent. • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) would support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors" in favor of wind and solar power. This level of support was up from the 74 percent finding in the 2011 survey. • In response to a new question in the 2012 survey, more than six in 10 Americans (61 percent) said they were less supportive of nuclear power as a result of reports in the U.S. during 2011 and so far in 2012 of nuclear reactors that had to be shut down due such factors as natural disasters, equipment failure and radioactive leaks. • About two thirds (65 percent) of Americans now say they would oppose "the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of [their] home." This figure was roughly the same as the 67 percent opposition level in the March 2011 survey. Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "It is clear that Fukushima left an indelible impression on the thinking of Americans about nuclear power. The U.S. public clearly favors a conservative approach to energy that insists on it being safe in all senses of the word - including the risk to local communities and citizens. These poll findings support the need for a renewed national debate about the energy choices that America makes."

#### Public opinion is against nuclear power --- it’s a political loss.

**de Rugy**, July **2012** (Veronique – senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, No to Nukes, Reason, p. http://reason.com/archives/2012/06/25/no-to-nukes)

Surprising as it may seem, the United States still generates around 20 percent of its electricity from nuclear power plants. This despite the fact that no new facilities have been built since the notorious Three Mile Island accident of 1979, which released small amounts of radioactive gases and iodine into the environment after a partial meltdown at a nuclear power plant in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Public opinion has remained steadfast against the technology ever since. In February The Economist reported that 64 percent of Americans opposed building new reactors. Disputes over waste disposal have never been resolved, and the Fukushima reactor meltdown in March 2011 cast further doubt on the idea that nuclear power will ever be a long-term clean-energy solution in the United States. All of this has not stopped the Obama administration from betting on nukes. Even though the president prefers talking up more fashionable (and less economically viable) technologies such as wind and solar, in February his Nuclear Regulatory Commission quietly approved construction of what would be the first two new nuclear reactors in two generations. In 2010 Secretary of Energy Steven Chu touted the White House’s commitment to “restarting the American nuclear industry and creating thousands of new jobs and export opportunities in the process.” But jump-starting nuclear power is not just bad politics. It’s awful economics.

#### Growing opposition to nuclear power --- most recent polls are on our side.

**Cart**, 4/26/**2012** (Julie, Support for more nuke plants in U.S. decreasing, poll finds, Los Angeles Times, p. http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/26/local/la-me-enviro-poll-20120426)

The American public is divided about whether to eliminate federal subsidies for any form of energy and is giving less support to nuclear power and U.S. funding of renewable energy, a new poll has found. Fifty-four percent of respondents opposed doing away with subsidies for oil, gas, coal, nuclear or renewable energy, while 47% favored the idea. Support for building more nuclear power plants has fallen dramatically, to 42% from 61% in 2008. The Yale-George Mason University poll being released Thursday found that 76% of Americans support regulating carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas pollutant and that two-thirds believe the U.S. should pursue policies to reduce its carbon footprint.

#### Americans oppose new power plants.

**Pew Research Center**, 11/10/**2011** (Partisan Divide Over Alternative Energy Widens, p. http://www.people-press.org/2011/11/10/partisan-divide-over-alternative-energy-widens/)

More Americans continue to oppose (53%) than favor (39%) promoting the increased use of nuclear power. Support for increased use of nuclear power has not recovered following the nuclear disaster at Japan’s Fukushima nuclear power plant. Opinion about increased nuclear power had been divided prior to the Japan disaster. (For more, see “Opposition to Nuclear Power Rises Amid Japanese Crisis,” March 21, 2011).

#### Public opinion prevents deployment of SMR.

International Trade Administration, February **2011** (The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors, Department of Commerce, p. 7)

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

#### The link only goes one way –

#### A) Negativity bias.

**Lariscy**, 1/2/**2012** (Ruthann Weaver – professor in the department of advertising and public relations in the Grady College at the University of Georgia, Why Negative Political Ads Work, CNN, p. http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/02/opinion/lariscy-negative-ads/index.html)

So if we don't like negative ads and even perhaps suspect they contribute to political malaise, why are they increasingly dominating candidates' strategies? Gingrich's drop in polls in Iowa last month was no accident -- it was choreographed by negative advertising. Ruthann Lariscy The answer is simple: They work. And they work very well. Gingrich's drop in polls in Iowa last month was no accident -- it was choreographed by negative advertising. Our brains process information both consciously and non-consciously. When we pay attention to a message we are engaged in active message processing. When we are distracted or not paying attention we may nonetheless passively receive information. There is some evidence that negative messages may be more likely than positive ones to passively register. They "stick" for several reasons. First, one of the most important contributors to their success may be the negativity bias. Negative information is more memorable than positive -- just think how clearly you remember an insult. Second, negative ads are more complex than positive ones. A positive message that talks about the sponsoring candidate's voting record, for example, is simple and straightforward. Every negative ad has at least an implied comparison. If Mitt Romney is "not a true conservative," then by implication the candidate sponsoring the ad is saying he or she is a true conservative. This complexity can cause us to process the information more slowly and with somewhat more attentiveness. I often use an analogy of running water from my garden hose. If I stand at the top of a smooth concrete driveway and turn on the water, it flows quickly, directly, and fairly seamlessly to the bottom. This is much how a positive message goes through the brain. If I take my same hose and stand at the top of a grassy hill and turn it on, the water travels more slowly than on the concrete hill, it picks up some loose dirt, and inevitably some of it gets "stuck" in grass along the way. Negative information, too, travels more slowly because of its enhanced complexity. It benefits from the negativity bias, and inevitably some of that negative information gets "stuck" in our minds, even if we don't like the ad or agree with its contents.

#### B) Sleeper Effect.

**Lariscy**, 1/2/**2012** (Ruthann Weaver – professor in the department of advertising and public relations in the Grady College at the University of Georgia, Why Negative Political Ads Work, CNN, p. http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/02/opinion/lariscy-negative-ads/index.html)

There is another benefit negative messages achieve that positive messages largely do not. In psychology the principle is called the sleeper effect. Over time, a message is likely to become disassociated from its sponsor. There is some evidence that negative ads benefit from this effect: Immediately upon hearing and seeing an attack, you might dismiss it as being "just politics." Then, typically several weeks later when you are making your voting decision, something in your mind recollects the negative information. You have likely forgotten when or where or from whom you heard it -- but the negative content "stuck." I wish I could say that mud-slinging in politics will end -- that since we are largely disgusted by its usage, negative political advertising will fade away. But I can't. Though negative political messages have always been around, they are increasing in quantity and are reaching different kinds of campaigns. While at one time attacks were reserved largely for campaigns for national office, today they are evident in local and statewide campaigns as well. Unfortunately, negative political ads work. And unless you live in a cave, you are likely not immune to their effects.

### AT: Nuclear Funding Now

#### The funding their evidence talks about is from March doesn’t assume the current political climate of election and campaign promises in the status quo.

#### Public hasn’t perceived the DOE funding from March or if they did- it was so far in the past no reason it would sway undecided voters- it’s a question of campaign promises and the way that Obama spins his promotional campaign.

#### They have zero evidence that says Obama has taken the blame for nuclear funding or that the DOE loan guarantees are connected to Obama – their first in the 1AC just says that the DOE funding builds on Obama’s support for nuke power,

#### Action Now is Uniquely Key To Trigger the Link.

### AT: Military Shields Link

#### Their evidence just says that the DoD can go ahead with energy prgrams because congress is gridlocked – doesn’t mean people don’t perceive it

#### DOD energy programs get drawn into election politics.

**Snider**, 2/23/**2012** (Annie – reporter for E & E, Military’s alt energy programs draw Republicans’ Ire, Greenwire, p. <http://www.eenews.net/public/Greenwire/2012/02/23/2>)

But as election-year politics ramp up and Republicans target the Obama administration for its clean energy programs, especially its investment in failed solar panel manufacturer Solyndra, the military's attempts to move to alternative energy are coming under new scrutiny. "Obama is hiding new renewable energy bets at the Pentagon, charging our Defense Department with major investments in 'low-emissions economic development' while cutting their budget by $5.1 billion," Catrina Rorke, director of energy policy at the center-right American Action Forum, wrote in a blog post following the Obama administration's budget release last week. "New energy spending is new energy spending, no matter where it happens." The idea that the administration is using DOD as a more politically palatable vehicle for renewable energy investments is now reverberating across Capitol Hill, even as Pentagon officials flatly deny the allegations.

### AT: Economy Key

#### Economic issues don’t matter --- they don’t affect voter turnout and Obama can shift the focus to other issues.

**Klein**, 9/6/**2012** (Alex – reports on business, finance and economics for Newsweek and the Daily Beast, Will the Economy Doom Obama?, The Daily Beast, p. http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/09/06/will-the-economy-doom-obama.html)

In a typical campaign year, economics is destiny. Incumbents find it difficult—if not, impossible—to win re-election when there’s widespread dissatisfaction with the economy. But this year may prove to be atypical. Niall Ferguson, author of the recent Newsweek cover that was highly critical of the president’s tenure, sees President Obama’s continued polling strength is something of a paradox. “The US economy is growing at half the rate we were led to expect,” Ferguson said, kicking off a Wednesday Newsweek/Daily Beast breakfast. “So why is the president so far ahead?” “This economy sucks,” as Barry Sternlicht put it. Sternlicht, who founded the W hotel chain and is now chief executive officer Starwood Capital—an investment firm with $20 billion under management—gave a dire prognosis for the American economy, and a tepid-but-firm endorsement of Mitt Romney. “Businesses are paralyzed,” he told the crowd. “The patient is lying on the table. They keep telling us to get up and walk, then hit us with morphine.” In Sternlicht’s view, the combination of ultra-permissive monetary policy, uncertain fiscal policy, and a lack of clarity and executive leadership from the White House have produced an environment that discourages businesses from putting cash to work. He believes, however, that the focus on social issues is buttressing President Obama’s support, especially among women. Of course, there have been a few green shoots of recovery. As Newsweek/Daily Beast Global Business Editor Daniel Gross put it, “some data,” like the housing and retail sales figures, “is moving in the right direction.” That could help the president. Even if we’re not back to pre-crisis prosperity, “Americans are feeling better off than they were a year or two ago.” Megan McArdle, special correspondent for business, economy, and social policy, added that, despite good news for some Americans, those without jobs are still in dire straits. Some are converting to disability, while others are dropping out of the labor market altogether. But again, to Obama’s advantage, “those people don’t tend to vote.” So why isn’t Romney polling better? For one, Romney hasn’t run the most inspiring campaign—or the most specific. As pollster Doug Schoen put it, “One thing that’s missing is a sense of a specific plan. Sixty-five to 70 percent of voters, regardless of ideology, want the specifics.” That’s why so few voters are tuning in to the conventions. “Why would it be a logical act to watch a bunch of speeches that say nothing?” Sternlicht, who has hosted a Romney fundraiser, says that despite Romney’s flaws as a candidate, he’s the man to revive private sector confidence. “Obama is not a businessman,” he says. “He believes you have to divide up a smaller pie. Romney wants to grow it.” Sternlicht believes political leaders need to reassure business leaders—fearful of seesawing interest rates and impending fiscal cliff—that it’s safe to start deploying their “mountain” of built-up corporate cash: almost $2 trillion, depending on whom you ask. Up to now, uncertainty has kept those assets chained: “with no place to put the money,” Sternlicht says, “we may as well put in stocks,” which helps explain this year’s Wall Street rally. A regime change at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, says Sternlicht, would unleash that capital and “blow the doors off” the economy. From a granular policy perspective, the man in the Oval Office might not make much of a difference. As McArdle pointed out, both Obama and Romney would have to deal with similar challenges. Both would have to roll back some entitlements, raise some taxes, and deal with Europe—which, as Ferguson put it, “is back from vacation, and will resume failing.” And Sternlicht noted that whoever wins will benefit from the continuing comeback in housing and rising production of natural gas. But for all the focus on the markets—and of course, this Friday’s blockbuster August jobs numbers—this election may prove less about the economy than anticipated. Since “there’s nobody who’s going to the center,” as Sternlicht put it, voters may focus on social issues. And as McArdle put it, “most of the economic results that matter to Obama are already baked into the cake.”

### Energy Policies Key

#### Energy attacks will matter in a close election.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

Yet if the election is as close as the polls suggest, the energy ads could prove a pivotal factor. "Advertising is generally not decisive. Advertising matters at the margins. ... But ask Al Gore if the margin matters," said Ken Goldstein, president of the Campaign Media Analysis Group at Kantar Media. "This is looking like an election where the margin may matter."

#### Energy outweighs other issues --- it’s fiercely debated and a central question.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

The Republican efforts appear to go beyond any modern campaign in their brash embrace of what is dirty, and their scorn of what is not. And the times seem to favor them. In 2009, the GOP, backed by heavy industry lobbying, knocked back environmentalists on their heels by crushing global warming legislation. Other previously central issues -- Afghanistan, Iraq, health care -- are still debated in the campaign, but not as centrally nor as viscerally as energy, said Frank Maisano, an energy and political analyst at Bracewell & Giuliani, a Houston-based law firm. Obama advisors have said rightly that energy is only one component of a much broader American and global economy, but the GOP appears to have at least partially successfully injected the oil and gas boom as a defining feature of the economic discourse. In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times entitled "America's New Energy Reality," industry consultant Daniel Yergin remarked that while Obama's 2010 State of the Union address focused on clean-energy jobs, the president pivoted this year to talk as much about oil and natural gas. "His announcement that ‘American oil production is the highest it has been in eight years' turned out to be an applause line," Yergin noted.

#### Energy issues kills Obama in key swing states.

**LeVine**, 6/13/**2012** (Steve – author of *The Oil and Glory*, How Dirty is Romney Prepared to get to win election, Foreign Policy, p. http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/12/how\_dirty\_is\_romney\_prepared\_to\_get\_to\_win\_election)

Notwithstanding Durbin's disclaimer, the API campaign seems to weave seamlessly into the GOP strategy. And Maisano told me that he sees grist for GOP success in the targeted states. "Energy plays a huge role in those states, and I see it as a huge problem for Obama," he said. "It's going to be hard for him to win these states that he has to win, like North Carolina, like Florida and Michigan and Ohio and Missouri and Wisconsin. Energy undercuts him in those economies."

### AT: Relations Resilient

#### Doesn’t assume change in presidency- our evidence indicates that Romney will aggressively implement policies that piss of Russia---

#### Romney’s policies would isolate Russia --- collapses relations

**Bandow**, 4/23/**2012** (Doug – senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836>)

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

#### Obama re-election key to health care reform

Nather 11 (David – POLITICO, “Health care reform's fate could be determined by 2012 races”, 10/8, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/65426.html>)

Think the Supreme Court is the only place to watch for the future of health care reform? You might want to read a few polls first. As President Barack Obama’s reelection prospects fall, the health reform law’s chances of survival seem to fall, too. So far, the Republicans’ efforts to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act have been entirely symbolic; without control of the Senate or the White House, there’s not much they can actually do. But now, with Democrats on the defensive in the Senate and Obama’s poll numbers tanking — 43 percent of those surveyed in a recent POLITICO/George Washington University Battleground Poll said they definitely won’t vote for his reelection — the law’s opponents are beginning to think about repeal strategies that could get them to the finish line. The supporters aren’t panicking — but they’re paying attention. “The prospects of the Affordable Care Act hinge totally on the 2012 elections,” said Ron Pollack, executive director of the health care consumer group Families USA. “If President Obama is reelected — and I’m fairly confident he will be, but that’s for others to judge — then the Affordable Care Act is going to move forward, pure and simple.” That’s one scenario. But there are at least four others — each of which has major implications for the future of the health reform law and health care in America. 1. Obama loses, Republicans take the Senate by a lot: Health reform is toast This is the scenario with the most obvious result: If there’s a Republican president and the GOP wins a wide majority in the Senate — say, 57 seats — the health reform law is probably history. It would take 60 votes in the Senate to break a filibuster and pass a bill repealing the entire law — or, at least, the parts that haven’t gone into effect yet. But even if the Republicans don’t control that many votes, they might be close enough to pick up the needed crossover votes. That’s because, if they win the White House and such a large margin in the Senate, they’ll argue to the remaining Democrats that the election was a mandate to change course — and scrap the health care law. In reality, the public is closely divided over the law, and some polls find a minority favor outright repeal, as opposed to making changes in it. But repeal is a Republican priority, so expect them to push it with all the momentum they can muster. All of the Republican presidential candidates have committed to signing repeal into law. The best scenario for Republicans is that “Obama loses in a dramatic enough fashion that Democrats are afraid to stick with the law, and they get to 60,” said Douglas Holtz-Eakin, president of the American Action Forum and a former adviser to Sen. John McCain’s 2008 presidential campaign. 2. Obama loses, Republicans take the Senate by a little: Health reform loses big chunks The more likely scenario — based on how the Senate races look at the moment — is that if the Republicans win the Senate, it would be by a thin margin. So a Republican majority of, say, 52 seats wouldn’t be able to get 60 votes to repeal the whole law. But there’s another tool they could use to wipe out big parts of the law with just 51 votes: a budget reconciliation bill. That strategy would be a lot more complicated, because it wouldn’t let Republicans repeal the whole law. Under budget rules, anything that passes through reconciliation — which can’t be filibustered — has to have a budget impact. In other words, it has to change spending levels or revenue in some way. Given the scope of the health law and its economic impact, that gives the Republicans lots of room to maneuver — but it’s not limitless. Democrats used reconciliation in 2010 to rewrite parts of the health care reform legislation before they passed the final version, but there were tweaks they couldn’t make that way. (The abortion coverage language, which anti-abortion Democrats wanted to make tougher, was the most notable example.) If a narrowly Republican Senate uses budget reconciliation, it could certainly repeal the expensive subsidies to help people buy insurance, and the scheduled expansion of Medicaid. It may well be able to get rid of the hated individual mandate — the requirement for nearly all Americans to get health insurance — unless the Supreme Court gets there first. Beyond that, though, it’s not clear what could get through. For example, could a Republican Senate get rid of the new rule, starting in 2014, banning insurance companies from turning down people with pre-existing health problems? Since that’s a rule that affects private insurers, not the federal government, it might be harder for lawmakers to argue that it has a direct budget impact. “You can clearly do away with the essence of health reform,” but “you never know exactly what the parliamentarian is going to do until he’s presented with a bill and says, ‘yes, you can do this’ and ‘no, you can’t do that,’” said Paul Van de Water, a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and a former analyst for the Congressional Budget Office. Holtz-Eakin said that uncertainty could limit the effectiveness of a budget reconciliation strategy. Even if a Republican House and Senate could repeal the central provisions of the health law and get a Republican president to sign the bill, “you can still be left with a vestige of insurance reform that wouldn’t make any sense,” he said. Republicans would have to figure out how to pay for the repeal — since the health care law creates enough savings through Medicare payment cuts and other provisions, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that it would actually cost money to repeal it. One option for Republicans would be to keep those Medicare cuts in place — as House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan’s budget did. But that would be a tough sell for Republicans, since they campaigned against the cuts in 2010 and could try it again next year. Still, Republicans are likely to look at budget reconciliation as a big step on the road to repeal, if that’s what they have to use. “It gets you a long way,” said Eric Ueland, a vice president at the Duberstein Group and a longtime Republican Senate aide who served as chief of staff to former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. There's also a newer repeal scenario emerging now, after Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's Thursday manuever to change the Senate rules. Since Reid was able to do that through a narrow, 51-48 vote to overrule the parliamentarian, there's talk on the Hill that Republicans could use the same kind of vote to force a last-minute amendment to repeal the entire health care law — and get it through with 51 votes. It's still speculative, but keep an eye on that scenario, too.

#### Healthcare boosts bioterror readiness --- checks disease outbreaks

Sklar 2 (Holly, Nationally Syndicated Columnist, Author, Policy Analyst, and Strategist, “Rolling the Dice on Our Nation’s Health”, Common Dreams, 12-19, <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/1219-07.htm>)

Imagine if the first people infected in a smallpox attack had no health insurance and delayed seeking care for their flu-like symptoms. The odds are high. Pick a number from one to six. Would you bet your life on a roll of the dice? Would you play Russian Roulette with one bullet in a six-chamber gun? One in six Americans under age 65 has no health insurance. The uninsured are more likely to delay seeking medical care, go to work sick for fear of losing their jobs, seek care at overcrowded emergency rooms and clinics, and be poorly diagnosed and treated. The longer smallpox--or another contagious disease--goes undiagnosed, the more it will spread, with the insured and uninsured infecting each other. Healthcare is literally a matter of life and death. Yet, more than 41 million Americans have no health insurance of any kind, public or private. The uninsured rate was 14.6 percent in 2001--up 13 percent since 1987. The rate is on the rise with increased healthcare costs, unemployment and cutbacks in Medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). One in four people with household incomes less than $25,000 is uninsured. One in six full-time workers is uninsured, including half the full-time workers with incomes below the official poverty line. The share of workers covered by employment health plans drops from 81 percent in the top fifth of wage earners to 68 percent in the middle fifth to 33 percent in the lowest fifth, according to the Economic Policy Institute. As reports by the American College of Physicians, Kaiser Family Foundation and many others have shown, lack of health insurance is associated with lack of preventive care and substandard treatment inside and outside the hospital. The uninsured are at much higher risk for chronic diseaseand disability, and have a 25 percent greater chance of dying (adjusting for physical, economic and behavioral factors). To make matters worse, a health crisis is often an economic crisis. "Medical bills are a factor in nearly half of all personal bankruptcy filings," reports the National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending per capita, but No. 34--tied with Malaysia--when it comes to child mortality rates under age five. The U.S. is No. 1 in healthcare spending, but the only major industrialized nation not to provide some form of universal coverage. We squander billions of dollars in the red tape of myriad healthcare eligibility regulations, forms and procedures, and second-guessing of doctors by insurance gatekeepers trained in cost cutting, not medicine. Americans go to Canada for cheaper prices on prescription drugs made by U.S. pharmaceutical companies with U.S. taxpayer subsidies. While millions go without healthcare, top health company executives rake in the dough. A report by Families USA found that the highest-paid health plan executives in ten companies received average compensation of $11.7 million in 2000, not counting unexercised stock options worth tens of millions more. The saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," couldn't be truer when it comes to healthcare. Yet, we provide universal coverage for seniors through Medicare, but not for children. We have economic disincentives for timely diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Universal healthcare is a humane and cost-effective solution to the growing healthcare crisis. Universal coverage won't come easy, but neither did Social Security or Medicare, which now serves one in seven Americans. Many proposals for universal healthcare build on the foundation of "Medicare for All," albeit an improved Medicare adequately serving seniors and younger people alike. Healthcare is as essential to equal opportunity as public education and as essential to public safety as police and fire protection. If your neighbor's house were burning, would you want 911 operators to ask for their fire insurance card number before sending--or not sending--fire trucks? Healthcare ranked second behind terrorism and national security as the most critical issue for the nation in the 2002 Health Confidence Surveyreleased by the Employee Benefit Research Institute. The government thinks the smallpox threat is serious enough to start inoculating militaryand medical personnelwith a highly risky vaccine.It's time to stop delaying universalhealthcare, which will save lives everyday while boosting our readiness for any bioterror attack.

#### Extinction

Ochs 2 (Richard, Member – Chemical Weapons Working Group, “Biological Weapons Must be Abolished Immediately, 6-9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

### Econ

No impact to economic decline – our Tir evidence indicates that not only is there no empirical evidence for that, but a bad economy would create incentives for leaders to avoid war and focus on fixing the economy. Prefer our evidence it cites a host of economic scholars.

AND - even if wars occur, they won’t escalate.

**Bennett & Nordstrom 2k** [Department of Political Science Professors @ Penn state U, D. Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic problems in Enduring Rivalries” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Feb., p33-61]

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a **cheap, quick** **victory** that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states’ desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

93 examples are on our side

Miller 2k [Morris Miller, Winter 2K. economist and adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration and former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank. Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 25.4]

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Link outweighs the link turn – even failed projects jack up the price

Madsen et al 9 (Travis, Analyst @ Frontier Group and Maryland PIRG Foundation, Johanna Neumann @ Maryland PIRG Foundation, and Emily Rusch @ CalPIRG Education Fund, "The High Cost of Nuclear Power," http://www.nirs.org/nukerelapse/calvert/highcostnpower\_mdpirg.pdf)

N o power company has successfully ¶ ordered a nuclear reactor in the ¶ United States since 1973. Despite¶ promises of power that would be “too ¶ cheap to meter,” the last generation of ¶ nuclear reactors ran aground on skyrocketing construction costs. Of 75 nuclear¶ reactors completed between 1966 and¶ 1986, the average reactor cost more than¶ triple its original construction budget.¶ 1¶ Later-built reactors came in as much ¶ as 1,200 percent over-budget.¶ 2¶ In 1985,¶ Forbes magazine wrote that “the failure ¶ of the U.S. nuclear power program ranks ¶ as the largest managerial disaster in business history, a disaster on a monumental ¶ scale.”¶ 3¶ Electricity customers ended up paying¶ the price. Only one-half of the reactors¶ proposed were ever built, and ratepayers ¶ often had to bear the costs of abandoned ¶ projects. Where reactor projects were¶ completed, rates often increased. Finally,¶ during the restructuring of the electricity ¶ industry in the 1990s, ratepayers were¶ saddled with billions in “stranded costs” ¶ from failed investments in nuclear power, ¶ saving nuclear power plant owners (and¶ their shareholders) from huge losses.

#### Nuclear power triples the cost that consumers pay

Madsen et al 9 (Travis, Analyst @ Frontier Group and Maryland PIRG Foundation, Johanna Neumann @ Maryland PIRG Foundation, and Emily Rusch @ CalPIRG Education Fund, "The High Cost of Nuclear Power," http://www.nirs.org/nukerelapse/calvert/highcostnpower\_mdpirg.pdf)

Compounding the problem are the¶ high cost estimates for new nuclear ¶ reactors. Some estimates of the cost of ¶ power from a new nuclear reactor range ¶ as high as 25 to 30 cents per kWh –¶ triple electricity rates in most parts of ¶ the country.¶ 57¶ Adding power at even half ¶ this price to a service territory could ¶ increase the cost that consumers pay for ¶ electricity, motivating additional efforts ¶ to conserve and dampening the power ¶ demand the plant was built to serve.¶ This exact situation contributed to ¶ the failure of the last wave of nuclear ¶ power plant construction in the United ¶ States. Dozens of reactors were cancelled, and billions of dollars in unnecessary investment were lost.

### No Nuclear Terror

#### Nuclear terrorism isn’t a thing – Mueller says that Islamist militants are operationally unsophisticated – they can’t plan or acquire weapons – it’s been 11 years since 9/11 – attack aren’t likely

#### No nuclear terrorism – acquisition impossible – prefer recent evidence

**Krepon 9** (Michael, Co-Founder – Henry L. Stimson Center and Diplomat Scholar – University of Virginia, “The Mushroom Cloud That Wasn’t”, Foreign Affairs, May / June, Lexis)

At the height of the Cold War, almost no one was bold enough or foolish enough to predict the Soviet Union's collapse, let alone without the eruption of a nuclear exchange between the two superpowers. One of the few who prophesied its demise, George Kennan, was deeply worried about a nuclear cataclysm. Kennan, a former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union and the father of containment policy, warned repeatedly that unwise U.S. nuclear policies could lead to Armageddon. The Cold War is now history, but warnings of an impending nuclear catastrophe are still very much alive. Anxieties today stem not from the threat of a surprise Soviet missile attack but from the fear of Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and terrorist groups seeking to carry out catastrophic attacks against soft targets in the United States. And yet, not a single death has occurred as a result of nuclear terrorism. Since 9/11, there have been more than 36,000 terrorist attacks, resulting in approximately 57,000 fatalities and 99,000 casualties. A terrible, mass-casualty attack using nuclear or biological weapons could occur at any time, and much more can be done to keep the United States safe. As the attacks that have occurred have repeatedly demonstrated, terrorists do not need weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to cause grievous harm; they can do so using hijacked airplanes, fertilizer, automatic weapons, and grenades. But the situation is far from bleak. It is not easy for terrorist groups to acquire the skills and materials necessary to construct a nuclear weapon. Meanwhile, Washington and Moscow have reduced their nuclear arsenals by 34,000 weapons over the past two decades, nuclear testing is now rare, the list of countries with worrisome nuclear programs is very short by historical standards, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council now have less to fight about -- and more reasons to cooperate in preventing worst-case scenarios from occurring -- than ever before.

#### And nuclear reactors are a no-go – There’s also no capability or motive because reactors are protected by guards and safety systems– it would be too difficult technically, organizationally, and financially – that’s Ferguson & Potter 4

## Round 8 1NC vs. Emory PS

### Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win --- a consensus of polls and forecasts prove.

**Silver**, **9/20**/2012 (Nate, Sept. 19: A Wild Day in the Polls, but Obama Ends Up Ahead, Five Thirty Eight, New York Times, p. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/20/sept-19-a-wild-day-in-the-polls-but-obama-ends-up-ahead/#h>[])

There are also going to be some outliers — sometimes because of unavoidable statistical variance, sometimes because the polling company has a partisan bias, sometimes because it just doesn’t know what it’s doing. (And sometimes: because of all of the above.) By the end of Wednesday, however, it was clear that the preponderance of the evidence favored Mr. Obama. He got strong polls in Ohio, Florida, Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia, all from credible pollsters. Mr. Obama, who had been slipping in our forecast recently, rebounded to a 75.2 percent chance of winning the Electoral College, up from 72.9 percent on Tuesday. The most unambiguously bearish sign for Mr. Romney are the poor polls he has been getting in swing states from pollsters that use a thorough methodology and include cellphones in their samples. There have been 16 such polls published in the top 10 tipping point states since the Democratic convention ended, all conducted among likely voters. Mr. Obama has held the lead in all 16 of these polls. With the exception of two polls in Colorado — where Mr. Obama’s polling has been quite middling recently — all put him ahead by at least four points. On average, he led by 5.8 percentage points between these 16 surveys. If this is what the post-convention landscape looks like, then Mr. Romney is in a great deal of trouble. Perhaps these polls imply that Mr. Obama’s lead is somewhere in the range of five percentage points in the popular vote — national polls suggest that it’s a bit less than that, but state polls provide useful information about the national landscape. Or perhaps they imply that Mr. Obama is overperforming slightly in the swing states. Either way, that’s a pretty big deficit for Mr. Romney to overcome. What’s more, Mr. Obama was at 49.4 percent of the vote on average between these 16 surveys, meaning that he’d need to capture only a tiny sliver of the undecided vote to get to an outright majority. (If we’re being technical, 49.4 percent might be sufficient for him to win these states on its own, since perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the vote will go to third-party candidates.) To be clear: I do not recommend that this is the only data you look at. The forecast model also evaluates polls that exclude cellphones, although it gives them slightly less weight. Those have not necessarily shown a great deal of strength for Mr. Obama. And just as the model looks at state polls to infer the national trend, it also does the reverse, using the national polls (and essentially the assumption of ”uniform swing”) to infer where the states stand. The national polls show a spread right now from an effective tie to an eight-point lead for Mr. Obama. Taken as a whole, they seem to imply more like a three or four point lead for Mr. Obama rather than something in the range of five points. (These distinctions really do make a difference, especially with so few undecided voters left.) The other questions, of course, are whether Mr. Obama’s bounce is fading, and if it might fade further. His FiveThirtyEight forecast remains off its high of about an 80 percent chance of victory, that he achieved late last week.

#### Nuclear power incentives are massively unpopular --- the public does not want to foot the cost.

**Sheppard**, 3/23/**2011** (Kate – staff reporter at Mother Jones’ Washington bureau, Public Opinion on Nuclear Goes Critical, Mother Jones, p. <http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2011/03/nuclear-power-public-opinion-poll>)

It's probably not too surprising, given the constant attention it's been getting in the press recently, but the Japanese nuclear crisis has turned more Americans off to nuclear power. Two new polls released Tuesday found that 58 percent of those polled said they are now less supportive of expanding nuclear power here in the US. The poll, conducted by ORC International on behalf of the Civil Society Institute (CSI), found that two-thirds of respondents said they would protest the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of their homes. Fifty-three percent said they support "a moratorium on new nuclear reactor construction in the United States" and would prefer energy efficiency and renewables. (It's worth noting, though, that among those that already supported of nuclear power, 24 percent now said they are actually more supportive now.) The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press also released a new poll on Tuesday that found nuclear support had taken a nose-dive. As for funding these new nuclear plants, 73 percent in the CSI poll said they don't think taxpayers should "take on the risk for the construction of new nuclear power reactors" with federal loan guarantees. The Obama administration has made expanding the loan guarantees a major part of its energy agenda, but there have been plenty of concerns about forcing taxpayers to foot the bill if something goes wrong. When Gallup last polled Americans on nuclear power in 2009, it found support at a new high—59 percent of the public favored it. It had been years since a nuclear accident was all over the news. But as I noted last week, the last major nuclear power accident in the US was enough to turn Americans off from it for a generation. I ventured then that this latest situation in Japan may have a similar effect. Given that the latest polls were conducted in the aftermath of a nuclear disaster, it's unclear what their conclusions mean for the future of nuclear power. What will be interesting is the longer-term influence on public opinion once Japan's nuclear emergency fades from the news.

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

#### US/Russian relations prevent nuclear war

Allison & Blackwill 11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups.

### Waivers CP

#### Text: The Environmental Protection Agency should grant regulatory waivers that exempt all parties from restrictions external to a fast track process for small modular reactors. . The EPA should summarize the decision in an annual agency publication in the Federal Register.

#### -- It competes –

#### The CP doesn’t reduce – “reductions” must be in quantity, not quality

**GEP 99** (Georgia Environmental Protection , http://www.air.dnr.state.ga.us/bank/forms/faqsheet.pdf)

The reductions **must be "quantifiable;"** i.e., the amount, rate and characteristics of the reduction must be measured or calculated through a reliable method and approved by the Environmental Protection Division;

#### The CP is a functionally different – it keeps the rule “on the books” and tailors it’s application – the plan creates a new rule – rulemaking is distinct from adjudication

Rossi 95 (Jim, Professor of Law – Vanderbilt University, “Making Policy through the Waiver of Regulations at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,” Administrative Law Review, 47 Admin L. Rev. 260, Hein Online)

A. RULEMAKING VERSUS ADJUDICATION Two distinctive methodologies are available to agencies in formulating law and policy: rulemaking and ad hoc adjudication. As defined in the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), a rule is a statement of general applicability and future effect that implements, interprets, or prescribes law or policy or the organization, procedures, and standards for practice before an agency.95 Rules arise from formal or informal rulemaking proceedings before the issuing administrative agency. Rules create law in the form of statements that are binding on those persons or entities to whom they are addressed, regardless whether those persons or entities participated in the rulemaking proceeding that generated the rule. Rules generally bind the agency in future cases, although, as this article suggests, this is not always the case, nor should it be. An adjudicative order, on the other hand, is an agency statement of particular applicability determining the rights of, or applying law or policy to, specific individuals or entities on the basis of their special circumstances.96 Such orders generally arise as the result of an adjudicative proceeding involving persons who have asserted an interest sufficient to meet the agency's intervention standards.97 An individualized adjudicative proceeding allows the agency to tailor application of its law or policy to the specific time, place, and context of persons affected. An adjudicative order generally adopts principles or rules of law on an ad hoc basis as necessary to solve the specific case before the agency. The impact of adjudicative orders, however, is often broader than the specific case at hand because they may serve as precedent in similar future cases. As a general matter, most commentators have argued that agencies should adopt and elaborate law and policy by rulemaking rather than ad hoc adjudica- tion.98 By overlooking the particularities of time, place, and context, rules have the inherent values of predictability, stability, uniformity, and control. Yet, it is these very values about which adjudication is most skeptical. In addition to the inherent values of rules, rulemaking is generally regarded as a preferable decisionmaking methodology for several process-based reasons.99

#### -- It solves the whole case better

Glicksman and Shapiro 4 (Robert L., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, and Sidney A., Professor of Law – University of Kansas, “Improving Regulation through Incremental Adjustment,” Kansas Law Review, 52 U. Kan. L. Rev. 1179, Hein Online)

Reform of environmental and other regulation has been a popular topic for academics, think-tanks, and interested parties for the last two decades. Claiming that existing regulation is excessive and irrational, critics have successfully convinced Congress and the White House to implement a plethora of procedural requirements to analyze a proposed regulation before it is promulgated.1 In our recent book, Risk Regulation at Risk,2 we argued that the previous initiatives address the possibility of regulatory failure on the wrong end of the regulatory policy implementation process. Current efforts to rationalize environmental and other health and safety regulation at the "front end" of the regulatory process are doomed to fail because of moral, methodological, and informational limitations.3 We suggested that one way of improving regulation would be to rely on incremental adjustments in regulation on the "back end" of the regulatory process.4 One important advantage of proceeding in this manner is that regulatory policy is adjusted in light of its actual impact, as compared to the significant guesswork that is required to use front-end analysis. In this manner, a back-end adjustment process is consistent with the pragmatic approach to public policy that we advocated in the book.5 This article addresses in more detail the potential of two types of back-end processes: (1) deadline extensions and (2) waivers, exceptions, and variances.6 Our analysis proceeds in three steps. Part II describes the almost exclusive focus of regulatory reformers on the front end of the process. Part III offers a close examination of five federal statutes that provide opportunities for the two types of adjustments we are studying. The results confirm our earlier assertion that Congress has authorized agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occu- pational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Interior Department to make these types of back-end adjustments available in a variety of contexts and for a variety of reasons.7 Our analysis reveals that Congress has established six different grounds for back-end adjustment, and we assess the potential for each of these grounds to improve regulatory policy. Although we recommend the imposition of conditions on the issuance of some of these back-end adjustments, we find that these adjustments are generally consistent with the precautionary tilt of the statutes in which they are located because they still require the regulated entity to do the best it can to protect people and the environment. Where such protective mechanisms are absent, we urge that the statutes be amended to include them. Part IV analyzes the procedures by which requests for back-end adjustments are currently processed. We find that agencies consider most applications for back-end adjustments using informal procedures that include public notice and solicitation of public comments, although in a few instances, more formal procedures apply. We favor the informal approach because it is an efficient way for agencies to respond to the issues raised by requests for back-end adjustments and because more elaborate procedures are not necessary to promote rational decision- making, given the nature of the issues likely to be raised in back-end adjustment proceedings. We are concerned, however, about the extent to which effective public participation will occur under these procedures. We therefore endorse two steps to enhance the transparency of back-end adjustment decision-making: the establishment of electronic reading rooms and the issuance by agencies of annual reports on back-end adjustments.8 We argue that these two mechanisms will facilitate involvement by public interest groups and interested citizens by allowing them to prioritize the adjustment proceedings in which they wish to become involved. The result is likely to be enhanced agency accountability and reduced opportunities for agency abuse of the back-end adjustment process.

### Electricity Prices DA

#### A. Electricity prices are declining

**Burtraw 8/21/12** (one of the nation’s foremost experts on environmental regulation in the electricity sector. “Falling Emissions and Falling Prices: Expectations for the Domestic Natural Gas Boom” http://common-resources.org/2012/falling-emissions-and-falling-prices-expectations-for-the-domestic-natural-gas-boom/)

Moreover, the boom in domestic natural gas production could have even more immediate affects for U.S. electricity consumers. The increased supply of gas is expected to lower natural gas prices and retail electricity prices over the next 20 years, according to a [new RFF Issue Brief](http://www.rff.org/Publications/Pages/PublicationDetails.aspx?PublicationID=22019). These price decreases are expected to be even larger if demand for electricity continues on a slow-growth trajectory brought on by the economic downturn and the increased use of energy efficiency.For example, RFF analysis found that delivered natural gas prices would have been almost 35% higher in 2020 if natural gas supply projections had matched the lower estimates released by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) in 2009. Instead, with an increased gas supply, consumers can expect to pay $4.9 per MMBtu for delivered natural gas in 2020 instead of $6.6 per MMBtu. These trends are even more exaggerated if demand for electricity were to increase to levels projected by the EIA just three years ago, in 2009.This decrease in natural gas prices is expected to translate into a decrease in retail electricity prices for most electricity customers in most years out to 2020. Compared to the world with the lower gas supply projections, average national electricity prices are expected to be almost 6% lower, falling from 9.25 cents to 8.75 cents per kilowatt-hour in 2020. Residential, commercial, and industrial customers are all expected to see a price decrease, with the largest price changes occurring in parts of the country that have competitive electricity markets. All of these prices decreases translate into real savings for most electricity customers. The savings are largest for commercial customers, who stand to save $33.9 Billion (real $2009) under the new gas supply projections in 2020. Residential customers also stand to save big, with estimates of $25.8 Billion (real $2009) in savings projected for 2020.

#### New nuclear reactors drive up electricity prices

Cooper 9 (Mark, SENIOR FELLOW FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT¶ VERMONT LAW SCHOOL, "THE ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR REACTORS: RENAISSANCE OR RELAPSE?," http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Cooper%20Report%20on%20Nuclear%20Economics%20FINAL%5B1%5D.pdf)

Within the past year, estimates of the cost of nuclear power from a new generation of ¶ reactors have ranged from a low of 8.4 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh) to a high of 30 cents. This ¶ paper tackles the debate over the cost of building new nuclear reactors, with the key findings as ¶ follows: ¶ • The initial cost projections put out early in today’s so-called “nuclear renaissance” were about ¶ one-third of what one would have expected, based on the nuclear reactors completed in the ¶ 1990s. ¶ • The most recent cost projections for new nuclear reactors are, on average, over four times as ¶ high as the initial “nuclear renaissance” projections. ¶ • There are numerous options available to meet the need for electricity in a carbon-constrained ¶ environment that are superior to building nuclear reactors. Indeed, nuclear reactors are the worst ¶ option from the point of view of the consumer and society. ¶ • The low carbon sources that are less costly than nuclear include efficiency, cogeneration, ¶ biomass, geothermal, wind, solar thermal and natural gas. Solar photovoltaics that are presently ¶ more costly than nuclear reactors are projected to decline dramatically in price in the next ¶ decade. Fossil fuels with carbon capture and storage, which are not presently available, are ¶ projected to be somewhat more costly than nuclear reactors. ¶ • Numerous studies by Wall Street and independent energy analysts estimate efficiency and ¶ renewable costs at an average of 6 cents per kilowatt hour, while the cost of electricity from ¶ nuclear reactors is estimated in the range of 12 to 20 cents per kWh. ¶ • The additional cost of building 100 new nuclear reactors, instead of pursuing a least cost ¶ efficiency-renewable strategy, would be in the range of $1.9-$4.4 trillion over the life the ¶ reactors. ¶ Whether the burden falls on ratepayers (in electricity bills) or taxpayers (in large subsidies), ¶ incurring excess costs of that magnitude would be a substantial burden on the national economy and ¶ add immensely to the cost of electricity and the cost of reducing carbon emissions.

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth via consumer spending and investment

Perry 7/31/12 (Mark, Prof of Economics @ Univ. of Michigan, "America's Energy Jackpot: Industrial Natural Gas Prices Fall to the Lowest Level in Recent History," http://mjperry.blogspot.com/2012/07/americas-energy-jackpot-industrial.html)

Building petrochemical plants could suddenly become attractive in the United States. Manufacturers will "reshore" production to take advantage of low natural gas and electricity prices. Energy costs will be lower for a long time, giving a competitive advantage to companies that invest in America, and also helping American consumers who get hit hard when energy prices spike.¶ After years of bad economic news, the natural gas windfall is very good news. Let's make the most of it." ¶ The falling natural gas prices also make the predictions in this December 2011 study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers, "Shale gas: A renaissance in US manufacturing?"all the more likely: ¶ U.S. manufacturing companies (chemicals, metals and industrial) could employ approximately one million more workers by 2025 because of abundant, low-priced natural gas.¶ Lower feedstock and energy cost could help U.S. manufacturers reduce natural gas expenses by as much as $11.6 billion annually through 2025.¶ MP: As I have emphasized lately, America's ongoing shale-based energy revolution is one of the real bright spots in an otherwise somewhat gloomy economy, and provides one of the best reasons to be bullish about America's future. The shale revolution is creating thousands of well-paying, shovel-ready jobs in Texas, North Dakota and Ohio, and thousands of indirect jobs in industries that support the shale boom (sand, drilling equipment, transportation, infrastructure, steel pipe, restaurants, etc.). In addition, the abundant shale gas is driving down energy prices for industrial, commercial, residential and electricity-generating users, which frees up billions of dollars that can be spent on other goods and services throughout the economy, providing an energy-based stimulus to the economy. ¶ Cheap natural gas is also translating into cheaper electricity rates, as low-cost natural gas displaces coal. Further, cheap and abundant natural gas is sparking a manufacturing renaissance in energy-intensive industries like chemicals, fertilizers, and steel. And unlike renewable energies like solar and wind, the natural gas boom is happening without any taxpayer-funded grants, subsidies, credits and loans. Finally, we get an environmental bonus of lower CO2 emissions as natural gas replaces coal for electricity generation. Sure seems like a win, win, win, win situation to me.

#### Econ decline risks extinction

Auslin 9 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

### 1NC – Nuke Leadership

#### No impact – prolif will be limited and slow

Yusuf 9 (Moeed, Fellow and Ph.D. Candidate in the Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range

Future – Boston University, “Predicting Proliferation: The History of the Future of Nuclear Weapons”, Brookings Policy Paper 11, January, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2009/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_ yusuf/01\_nuclear\_proliferation\_yusuf.pdf)

It is a paradox that few aspects of international security have been as closely scrutinized, but as incorrectly forecast, as the future nuclear landscape. Since the advent of nuclear weapons in 1945, there have been dozens, if not hundreds of projections by government and independent analysts trying to predict horizontal and vertical proliferation across the world. Various studies examined which countries would acquire nuclear weapons, when this would happen, how many weapons the two superpowers as well as other countries would assemble, and the impact these developments might have on world peace. The results have oscillated between gross underestimations and terrifying overestimations. Following the September 11, 2001 attacks, the fear that nuclear weapons might be acquired by so-called “rogues states” or terrorist groups brought added urgency – and increased difficulty – to the task of accurately assessing the future of nuclear weapons. A survey of past public and private projections provides a timely reminder of the flaws in both the methodologies and theories they employed. Many of these errors were subsequently corrected, but not before, they made lasting impressions on U.S. nuclear (and non-nuclear) policies. This was evident from the time the ‘Atoms for Peace’ program was first promulgated in 1953 to the 1970 establishment of the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and more recently during the post-Cold War disarmament efforts and debates surrounding U.S. stance towards emerging nuclear threats. This study offers a brief survey of attempts to predict the future of nuclear weapons since the beginning of the Cold War.1 The aim of this analysis is not merely to review the record, but to provide an overall sense of how the nuclear future was perceived over the past six decades, and where and why errors were made in prediction, so that contemporary and future predictive efforts have the benefit of a clearer historical record. The survey is based on U.S. intelligence estimates as well as the voluminous scholarly work of American and foreign experts on the subject. Six broad lessons can be gleaned from this history. First, it reveals consistent misjudgments regarding the extent of nuclear proliferation. Overall, projections were far more pessimistic than actual developments; those emanating from independent experts more so than intelligence estimates. In the early years of the Cold War, the overly pessimistic projections stemmed, in part, from an incorrect emphasis on technology as the driving factor in horizontal proliferation, rather than intent, a misjudgment, which came to light with the advent of a Chinese bomb in 1964. The parallel shift from developed-world proliferation to developing-world proliferation was accompanied by greater alarm regarding the impact of proliferation. It was felt that developing countries were more dangerous and irresponsible nuclear states than developed countries. Second, while all the countries that did eventually develop nuclear weapons were on the lists of suspect states, the estimations misjudged when these countries would go nuclear. The Soviet Union went nuclear much earlier than had been initially predicted, intelligence estimates completely missed China’s nuclear progress, and India initially tested much later than U.S. intelligence projections had anticipated and subsequently declared nuclear weapon status in 1998 when virtually no one expected it to do so. Third, the pace of proliferation has been consistently slower than has been anticipated by most experts due to a combination of overwhelming alarmism, the intent of threshold states, and many incentives to abstain from weapons development. In the post-Cold War period, the number of suspected threshold states has gradually decreased and the geographical focus has shifted solely to North-East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. There is also much greater concern that a nuclear chain reaction will break out than was the case during the Cold War.

#### US nuclear leadership high now – Vogtle project proves

**Peterson, 12** – Senior Vice President of Communications, Nuclear Energy Institute (J. Scott, 2/21. “New Nuclear Construction Will Help Secure U.S. Energy Technology Leadership.” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/j-scott-peterson/new-nuclear-construction-\_b\_1292429.html)

Ayers, who leads the AFL-CIO's building trades unions, understands the value of 4,000 to 5,000 construction jobs that will be created by the Vogtle nuclear energy project -- the largest construction project ever in Georgia. The two reactors, awarded federal construction permits last week, represent "a strong and unmistakable signal that nuclear energy will now assume an important role in a low-carbon energy future." Chu, at the Vogtle site on Wednesday, reviewed for hundreds of workers the Obama administration's commitment to nuclear energy, and announced an investment of $10 million in advanced nuclear technologies research. Nuclear energy, Chu said, will have growing influence globally as nations confront a changing climate and increasing energy demand. Southern Company already has invested more than $1.5 billion in two advanced reactors that will power about 1.5 million homes. Two existing reactors at Vogtle already serve 600,000 customers in the fast-growing Southeast market. The region is the most hospitable to nuclear energy, with about one-third of America's 104 reactors in seven Southeastern states. The Southern States Energy Board -- a band of government leaders from 14 southern states -- recognizes the economic and environmental benefits of safely operated reactors: "Without nuclear energy, carbon dioxide emissions would have been 28 percent greater... and an additional 700 million tons of carbon dioxide would have been emitted each year." The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is expected to vote in the coming weeks on the construction permits for two more reactors in South Carolina. In addition, the Tennessee Valley Authority is completing its Watts Bar 2 reactor in Tennessee, a facility where construction started many years ago but was never completed. New reactors are becoming a reality in the face of low-priced natural gas for several reasons. Nuclear energy facilities are large, 24/7 power producers that operate at industry-leading levels of reliability. Around the clock production, coupled with low uranium fuel prices, results in low production costs for residential and industrial customers alike. That's an important economic driver for companies that are migrating to the Southeast, where regulated electricity markets provide stability and predictability in energy costs. Add to that package of benefits the fact that nuclear energy facilities emit no greenhouse gases in the production of electricity and the prospect for powering electric vehicles, and one can understand the appeal to long-term energy planners. Will Marshall, president of the Progressive Policy Institute, wrote last week that an expansion of nuclear power "shows that the United States is serious about meeting growing energy demand without pumping more carbon into the atmosphere. At a time when political support for some kind of carbon cap or tax has seemingly collapsed, that's an important sign that Americans aren't giving up on protecting the Earth's climate." Given our troubled economy, public concern over climate change has taken a back seat to more pressing policy issues. Americans are more concerned about the safety and price of electricity options, but climate and environmental issues remain strong drivers. That's why 82 percent of Americans believe that U.S. companies should learn and apply the lessons from the Fukushima Daiichi accident in Japan, but continue to develop new reactors to supply electricity here at home, according to a September 2011 survey by Bisconti Research Inc. Nuclear energy, like all energy sources, has hurdles it must clear. The capital investment required for new reactors makes it difficult to build new projects in competitive electricity markets with today's gas prices. The industry also has suffered from decades of intractable federal policy on used fuel management. The Energy Department, which is 15 years in arrears of meeting contractual obligations to take used uranium fuel rods from commercial reactors, now will make recommendations to Congress to revamp the program. This is a political problem however, not a technical challenge. The Vogtle project, featuring U.S. reactor innovation, is a significant signal of American leadership in nuclear energy technology, which the Commerce Department forecasts to be a $740 billion global market over the next decade. It would be shortsighted for our nation to cede this leadership, and tens of thousands of jobs, to other nations by not building on this momentum.

#### Nuke leadership fails – it’s an ineffective tool and outdated

Weiss 9 (Leonard, Affiliated Scholar – Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation, “Reliable Energy Supply and Nonproliferation,” Nonproliferation Review, 16(2), July, http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/npr\_16-2\_weiss.pdf)

Part of the problem is that its value as a nonproliferation tool was at its height at the beginning of the nuclear age**,** when few countries were in a position to achieve nuclear autarky. The probability of consensus on establishing a worldwide regime in which there are fuel guarantees and no nationally owned fuel cycle facilities has been on a decreasing slope. Technology denial has become a less effective tool, thanks especially to A.Q. Khan and others. The spread of fuel cycle technologies has perhaps reached a tipping point in which the technology is**,** if not widely available, then sufficiently available to any determined party**.** Hence, the argument made by proponents of internationalization that giving up national nuclear development in favor of more restrictive international efforts will result in much greater security for all does not have the power it may once have had.

#### Double bind – either countries want the bomb and they don’t care what the US says, or they want nuclear power for the energy source and were never going to prolif in the first place.

#### US leadership can’t solve the prolif – no enforcement mechanism for regulations

**Mez, 12** – senior Associate Professor at the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin, and managing director of the Environmental Policy Research Centre (Lutz, "Nuclear energy–Any solution for sustainability and climate protection?” Energy Policy. ScienceDirect.)

Viewed in historical terms, military use of nuclear energy has gone hand in hand with the development of civil nuclear technology, because most countries attached first priority to the development of nuclear weapons and other military uses, with production of energy in nuclear power plants at first only being a waste product. This by-product developed its own momentum, however: nuclear power became an icon for clean, highly modern technology and technological progress. Moreover, it was a risk-free, highly profitable business for operators of plants because governments paid considerable sums in subsidies and producers could pass on costs to electrical power customers. Branches of the economy which are the most intensive users of electrical power profited from ‘cheap nuclear power’—as did the militaries in countries with nuclear weapons—because civil nuclear facilities offer many possibilities for military use. The borderlines between military and civil nuclear technology and thus between war and peace are often hazy (Mez et al., 2010). In order to minimize the risks of military use, regulation of civil use of nuclear energy have been contemplated within a multilateral framework for some time. The idea of establishing an international atomic energy agency (IAEA), to which states are to transfer uranium stocks and other fissionable material, was proposed by former US President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his ‘Atoms for Peace’ speech3 as far back as 1953 and during the first Geneva atomic conference in 1955. The purpose of the IAEA was to develop methods to ensure that fissionable nuclear material can be used by humankind in a ‘peaceful’ manner—in agriculture, medicine and energy production for countries and regions of the world with limited energy resources. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which went into effect in 1970, constituted an attempt to prevent nuclear ‘beggars’ from becoming nuclear powers through civil nuclear technology transfer. In reality, however, a series of countries including Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea have obtained nuclear weapons under the pretext of civil use of nuclear power, while other countries such as Iran are accused of having this same intention. This development shows that it is difficult to prevent nuclear weapons from being built and that there is a great likelihood that more and more countries will obtain nuclear capabilities in the future. When a nuclear infrastructure is in place and the basic material for weapons is being produced in facilities for enrichment or reprocessing—in military reactors, dual-purpose reactors or fast breeder-reactors—then it is merely a question of political will and willingness to invest in nuclear technology which decides whether a country develops nuclear weapons or not.

#### Alt cause – nuclear hypocrisy

**Caldicott, 6** – Founder and President of the Nuclear Policy Research Institute (Helen, “Nuclear Power is not the answer.” pp. 134-135)

In light of terrorist attacks using conventional weapons, it is only a matter of time before someone steals enough plutonium to make an adequate nuclear weapon. Then we proceed into the age of nuclear terrorism. Meanwhile, with the world awash in plutonium and highly enriched uranium, the Bush administration pursues its own nuclear armament development policy that makes it increasingly likely that a rogue nation will procure and possibly use nuclear weapons. The United States has adopted three contradictory stances at the same time: It is aggressively forging ahead to build more nuclear weapons, stating that it will use them preemptively even against non- nuclear nations. It is instrumental in denying the right to build nuclear weapons to all but a handful of countries. In the context of promoting nuclear energy, it has offered dozens of countries nuclear technology and access to nuclear power fuel. The fission process makes plutonium, which can then be separated by reprocessing and converted to fuel for nuclear weapons. While the Bush proposal includes taking the spent fuel back to the United States, it is not clear that that process can be undertaken with no cheating. Thus, even as there is much hand-wringing at the United Nations about the possibility that Iran and North Korea may be developing nuclear weapons, eight nation-states-Russia, the United States, France, China, Britain, India, Israel, and Pakistan- possess their own nuclear arsenals, and others are free to develop weapons without the admonitions that the United States and the United Nations are imposing upon Iran and North Korea. This strange juxtaposition of opposing attitudes needs to be examined in the context of the sixty-five-year history of nuclear fission and related weapons development.

#### Alt cause – waste management

**Moniz, 11** – Cecil and Ida Green Distinguished Professor of Physics and Engineering Systems and Director of the Energy Initiative at MIT, served as Undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Energy in 1997-2001 (Ernest, December. “Why We Still Need Nuclear Power.” Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec2011, Vol. 90, Issue 6, EBSCO.)

The United States' dysfunctional nuclear waste management system has an unfortunate international side effect: it limits the options for preventing other countries from using nuclear power infrastructure to produce nuclear weapons. If countries such as Iran are able to enrich uranium to make new reactor fuel and separate out the plutonium to recover its energy value, they then have access to the relevant technology and material for a weapons program. Safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency are intended to make sure that civilian programs do not spill over into military ones, but the agency has only a limited ability to address clandestine programs.

#### No US nuclear expansion – NRC licensing and waste doom it – recent projects prove

PACE, 9/5/12 (Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy, “Nuclear Renaissance Stalls.” http://energyfairness.org/2012/09/nuclear-renaissance-stalls/)

In early August, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) signaled a slowdown to what some perceived as a renaissance in American nuclear power when it put a hold on all final licensing decisions – thirty-two in total – until the commission can decide how to deal with spent nuclear fuel. The move hits the pause button on nineteen construction and operating licenses for new nuclear units, including TVA’s Bellefonte Units 3 and 4, and freezes license renewals for twelve nuclear units already in operation. Add to this a recent ruling by a D.C. appellate court that the NRC could essentially throw in the towel on the Yucca Mountain project, which was supposed to be America’s long-term nuclear fuel storage solution, and it’s pretty clear: it hasn’t been a good year for nuclear power in the U.S. This summer has seen a string of government and private sector decisions that indicate that whatever renaissance might be on the way for nuclear power in the U.S., such a rebirth is likely to be slow in the making. Neither government policy nor market conditions are creating fertile ground for nuclear power. Witness just a few recent results. In a ruling last week, a 3-judge panel for the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board denied a construction and operating license for a proposed new nuclear reactor in Maryland. The proposed Calvert Cliffs 3 Reactor would have been located along two existing units already operating in the area. However, the panel ruled that the reactor would have too much foreign ownership. Intervening to stop the reactor were groups such as Beyond Nuclear and others who opposed the project. The news comes on the heels of an announcement by Chicago-based Exelon, the nation’s largest nuclear operator, that it would withdraw its application for a permit to site two new nuclear reactors near Victoria in southeast Texas. The company’s CEO, Charles Pardee, cited low natural gas prices and market conditions that have made “construction of new merchant nuclear power plants in competitive markets **uneconomical now and for the foreseeable future**.” Just weeks ago, Southern California Edison, the operator of the San Onofre nuclear power plant south of Los Angeles announced that it will lay off 730 employees during the fourth quarter of this year to cut costs. The announcement comes in the midst of news that the plant will empty the radioactive fuel from a disabled reactor unit and place the fuel in storage. The news seems to confirm what many have speculated: that the plant, which has not produced electricity since January, might never again run at full capacity.

### 1NC – Warming

#### Nuclear doesn’t solve warming –

#### A) Not cost-competitive and can’t produce enough hydrogen

Ahearne et al, 12 – adjunct scholar for Resources for the Future and an adjunct professor of engineering at Duke University (John F, February. Federation of American Scientists. “The Future of Nuclear Power in the United States.” http://www.fas.org/pubs/\_docs/Nuclear\_Energy\_Report-lowres.pdf)

In response to mitigating climate change, many countries will ﬁnd that nuclear power is neither the least-cost nor the quickest approach to reducing carbon dioxide emissions.1 Until nuclear energy is able to produce hydrogen or process heat, or until transportation sectors are electriﬁed, nuclear energy’s potential contribution to reducing carbon dioxide emissions will be somewhat limited.

#### B) Takes too long and can’t reduce emissions

**Madsen and Dutzik, 9** – Policy Analyst at Frontier Group and senior policy analyst with Frontier Group (Travis and Tony, November. With Bernadette Del Chiaro and Rob Sargent of the Environment America Research & Policy Center. “Generating Failure: How Building Nuclear Power Plants Would Set America Back in the Race Against Global Warming.” http://www.environmentamerica.org/sites/environment/files/reports/Generating-Failure---Environment-America---Web\_0.pdf)

Building 100 new nuclear reactors would happen too slowly to reduce global warming pollution in the near-term, and would actually increase the scale of emission cuts required in the future. At best, the nuclear industry could have a new reactor up and running by 2016, assuming that construction could be completed in four years. This pace would be faster than 80 to 95 percent of all reactors completed during the last wave of reactor construction in the United States. 70 If construction follows historical patterns, it could take nine years after a license is issued before the first reactor is up and running – into the 2020s. Under this very plausible scenario, new nuclear power could make no contribution toward reducing U.S. emissions of global warming pollution by 2020 – despite the investment of hundreds of billions of dollars for the construction of nuclear power plants. And even if the industry completed 100 new reactors by 2030, which is highly unlikely, these reactors would reduce cumulative power plant emissions of carbon dioxide over the next two decades by only 12 percent below business as usual, when a reduction of more than 70 percent is called for. In other words, 100 new nuclear reactors would be too little, too late to successfully meet our goals for limiting the severity of global warming.

#### C) Transportation outweighs

**Gordon, 10** – nonresident senior associate in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program, where her research focuses on climate, energy, and transportation issues in the United States and China (Deborah, December. “The Role of Transportation in Driving Climate Disruption.” http://carnegieendowment.org/files/transport\_climate\_disruption.pdf)

Climate impacts differ by sector. On-road transportation has the greatest negative effect on climate, especially in the short term. This is primarily because of two factors unique to on-road transportation: (1) nearly exclusive use of petroleum fuels, the combustion of which results in high levels of the principal warming gases (carbon dioxide, ozone, and black carbon); and (2) minimal emissions of sulfates, aerosols, and organic carbon from on-road transportation sources to counterbalance warming with cooling effects. Scientists find that cutting on-road transportation climate and air-pollutant emissions would be unambiguously good for the climate (and public health) in the near term. Transportation’s role in climate change is especially problematic, given the dependence on oil that characterizes this sector today. There are too few immediate mobility and fuel options in the United States beyond oil-fueled cars and trucks. U.S. and international policy makers have yet to tackle transportationclimate challenges. In its fourth assessment report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the global transportation sector was responsible for the most rapid growth in direct greenhouse gas emissions, a 120 percent increase between 1970 and 2004. To further complicate matters, the IPCC projects that, without policy intervention, the rapidly growing global transportation sector has little motivation to change the way it operates, because consumer choices are trumping best practices. Herein lies a fundamental mismatch between the climate problem and solutions: transportation is responsible for nearly one of every three tons of greenhouse gas emissions but represents less than one of every twelve tons of projected emission reductions. Clearly this sector is a major contributor to climate change; therefore, it should be the focus of new policies to mitigate warming. Government must lead this effort as the market alone cannot precipitate the transition away from cars and oil, which dominate this sector.

#### D) No global spillover – can’t solve developing countries

**Socolow and Glaser, 9** – Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Princeton University and Assistant Professor at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Princeton University (Robert H. and Alexander, Fall. “Balancing risks: nuclear energy & climate change.” Dædalus Volume 138, Issue 4, pp. 31-44. MIT Press Journals.)

In this paper we consider a nuclear future where 1,500 GW of base load nuclear power is deployed in 2050. A nuclear fleet of this size would contribute about one wedge, if the power plant that would have been built instead of the nuclear plant has the average CO2 emissions per kilowatt hour of all operating plants, which might be half of the value for a coal plant. Base load power of 1,500 GW would contribute one fourth of total electric power in a business-as-usual world that produced 50,000 terawatt-hours (TWh) of electricity per year, two-and-a-half times the global power consumption. However, in a world focused on climate change mitigation, one would expect massive global investments in energy efficiency–more efficient motors, compressors, lighting, and circuit boards–that by 2050 could cut total electricity demand in half, relative to business as usual. In such a world, 1,500 GW of nuclear power would provide half of the power. We can get a feel for the geopolitical dimension of climate change mitigation from the widely cited scenarios by the International Energy Agency (iea) presented annually in its World Energy Outlook (weo), even though these now go only to 2030. The weo 2008 estimates energy, electricity, and CO2 emissions by region. Its 2030 world emits 40.5 billion tons of CO2, 45 percent from electric power plants. The countries of theOrganisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (oecd) emit less than one third of total global fossil fuel emissions and less than one third of global emissions from electric power production. By extrapolation, at midcentury the oecd could contribute only one quarter of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions. It is hard for Western analysts to grasp the importance of these numbers. The focus of climate change mitigation today is on leadership from the OECD countries, which are wealthier and more risk averse. But within a decade, the targets under discussion today can be within reach only if mitigation is in full gear in those parts of the developing world that share production and consumption patterns with the industrialized world. The map (see Figure 1) shows a hypothetical global distribution of nuclear power in the year 2050 based on a highnuclear scenario proposed in a widely cited mit report published in 2003. Three-fifths of the nuclear capacity in 2050 as stated in the mit report is located in the oecd, and more nuclear power is deployed in the United States in 2050 than in the whole world today. The worldview underlying these results is pessimistic about electricity growth rates for key developing countries, relative to many other sources. Notably, per capita electricity consumption in almost every developing country remains below 4,000 kWh per year in 2050, which is one-fifth of the assumed U.S. value for the same year. Such a ratio would startle many analysts today–certainly many in China. It is well within limits of credulity that nuclear power in 2050 could be nearly absent from the United States and the European Union and at the same time widely deployed in several of the countries rapidly industrializing today. Such a bifurcation could emerge, for example, if public opposition to nu clear power in the United States and Europe remains powerful enough to prevent nuclear expansion, while elsewhere, perhaps where modernization and geopolitical considerations trump other concerns, nuclear power proceeds vigorously. It may be that the United States and other countries of the oecd will have substantial leverage over the development of nuclear power for only a decade or so. Change will not happen overnight. Since 2006, almost 50 countries that today have no nuclear power plants have approached the International Atomic Energy Agency (iaea) for assistance, and many of them have announced plans to build one or more reactors by 2020. Most of these countries, however, are not currently in a good position to do so. Many face important technical and economic constraints, such as grid capacity, electricity demand, or gdp. Many have too few trained nuclear scientists and engineers, or lack an adequate regulatory framework and related legislation, or have not yet had a public debate about the rationale for the project. Overall, the iaea has estimated that “for a State with little developed technical base the implementation of the first [nuclear power plant] would, on average, take about 15 years.” 11 This lead time constrains rapid expansion of nuclear energy today. A wedge of nuclear power is, necessarily, nuclear power deployed widely– including in regions that are politically unstable today. If nuclear power is suf-ficiently unattractive in such a deployment scenario, nuclear power is not on the list of solutions to climate change.

#### E) China and domestic politics block

Hale 11 (Thomas, PhD Candidate in the Department of Politics – Princeton University and a Visiting Fellow – LSE Global Governance, London School of Economics, “A Climate Coalition of the Willing,” Washington Quarterly, Winter, http://www.twq.com/11winter/docs/11winter\_Hale.pdf)

Intergovernmental efforts to limit the gases that cause climate change have all but failed. After the unsuccessful 2010 Copenhagen summit, and with little progress at the 2010 Cancun meeting, it is hard to see how major emitters will agree any time soon on mutual emissions reductions that are sufficiently ambitious to prevent a substantial (greater than two degree Celsius) increase in average global temperatures. It is not hard to see why. No deal excluding the United States and China, which together emit more than 40 percent of the world’s greenhouse gases (GHGs), is worth the paper it is written on. But domestic politics in both countries effectively block ‘‘G-2’’ leadership on climate. In the United States, the Obama administration has basically given up on national cap-and-trade legislation. Even the relatively modest Kerry-Lieberman-Graham energy bill remains dead in the Senate. The Chinese government, in turn, faces an even harsher constraint. Although the nation has adopted important energy efficiency goals, the Chinese Communist Party has staked its legitimacy and political survival on raising the living standard of average Chinese. Accepting international commitments that stand even a small chance of reducing the country’s GDP growth rate below a crucial threshold poses an unacceptable risk to the stability of the regime. Although the G-2 present the largest and most obvious barrier to a global treaty, they also provide a convenient excuse for other governments to avoid aggressive action. Therefore, the international community should not expect to negotiate a worthwhile successor to the Kyoto Protocol, at least not in the near future.

#### Increased CO2 is key to crop fertilization that prevents famine and solves extinction

Idsos 10 [Sherwood, Keith, Craig - Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change with a PhD in Botany, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy in St. Louis, Missouri and is a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, American Meteorological Society, Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Association of American Geographers, Ecological Society of America, “Food Security: The Real Planetary Problem ”, Volume 13, Number 51: 22 December 2010, <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N51/EDIT.php>, Chetan]

In a paper recently published in the Journal of Proteome Research, Sarkar et al. (2010) write that "increasing population and unsustainable exploitation of nature and natural resources have made 'food security' a burning issue in the 21st century," echoing sentiments much like those expressed by Farrell (2009), who has noted that "the alarming increase in biofuel production, the projected demand for livestock products, and the estimated food to feed the additional 700 million people who will arrive here by 2016, will have unprecedented consequences," among which are likely to be the unsavory facts that "arable land, the environment, water supply and sustainability of the agricultural system will all be affected," and not in a positive manner. Furthermore, when the human population of the globe reaches 8.7-11.3 billion by the year 2050 (Bengtsson et al., 2006), the situation will become truly intolerable, unless something is done, far in advance of that date, to dramatically mitigate the situation. Thus, as Sarkar et al. suggest, "a normal approach for any nation/region is to strengthen its agricultural production for meeting future demands and provide food security." But a major difficulty, which could well spoil mankind's ability to do so, is the ongoing rise in the atmosphere's ozone concentration, which is the subject of Sarkar et al.'s new paper. In a study designed to elucidate the many ways in which ozone (O3) is harmful to plants, the eight researchers grew two high-yielding cultivars (Sonalika and HUW 510) of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) out-of-doors at the Agriculture Research Farm of India's Banaras Hindu University. This was done within open-top chambers that they maintained at the ambient O3 concentration and at elevated O3 concentrations of 25% and 50% above ambient during the peak O3 period of the day (10:00 to 15:00 hours local time) for a total of fifty days, during which period they measured numerous responses of the plants to the two levels of ozone enrichment. So what did they find? Sarkar et al. determined, among several other things, that the moderate increases in the air's O3 concentration resulted in higher foliar injury, a reduction in photosynthetic efficiency, induced inhibition in photochemical efficacy of photosystem II, lowered concentrations of photosynthetic pigments and proteins, plus what they describe as "drastic reductions" in RuBisCO large and small subunits, while noting that major leaf photosynthetic proteins and important energy metabolism proteins were also "drastically reduced." In discussing the results of their study, the scientists from India, Japan and Nepal remark that anthropogenic activities have made ozone a "major environmental pollutant of our time," while noting that some are predicting it to be an even "greater problem for the future." And adding this dilemma to the problem of feeding the world over the next few decades and beyond, humanity's future is not looking good. In fact, it's incredibly bleak. So what can be done to help us weather this potentially devastating perfect storm? Sarkar et al. suggest that we focus on "engineering crops for future high O3," concentrating on maintaining "effective stomatal conductance of plants which can avoid O3 entry but not hamper their productivity." We agree. But not knowing to what extent we will be successful in this endeavor, we need to do something else that we know will work; and that is to allow the air's CO2 content to rise, unimpeded by the misguided efforts of climate alarmists who would curtail anthropogenic CO2 emissions in the guise of fighting what they claim is anthropogenic-induced global warming. This contention is largely theoretical and wholly unproven; but we know that atmospheric CO2 enrichment nearly always acts to increase both the productivity and water use efficiency of nearly all plants, as a result of literally hundreds, if not thousands, of real-world experiments, while it often more than compensates for the negative effects of O3 pollution. Clearly, we are going to need all of the help we can possibly get to make it unscathed through even the first half of the 21st century; and we cannot afford to throw away any of the means we have at our disposal to help us in this great effort. We have got to see carbon dioxide for what it truly is -- the elixir of life: one of the two raw materials (the other being water) that combine during the process of photosynthesis to produce the substances of plant tissues that provide the food for nearly all human and animal life on the planet, either directly, in the case of herbivores, or indirectly in the case of other life forms. And that makes carbon dioxide just the opposite of what the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently declared it to be -- a dangerous air pollutant. Shame on them! ... and on all those who demonize this life-giving molecule that we expel to the air every time we exhale.

#### Famine sparks World War 3

Calvin 98 (William H. Calvin, Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the University of Washington, January 1998, “The Great Climate Flip-Flop,” The Atlantic Monthly, Ebsco Host]

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands – if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end : eliminating competitors for the remaining food.      This would be a worldwide problem – and could lead to a Third World War – but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

### 1NC – Solvency

#### Cost is the biggest hurdle for the nuclear industry – outweighs the restriction

**Johnson, 11** – deputy editor at the Council on Foreign Relations (Toni, 3/18. “Nuclear Power Expansion Challenges.” http://www.cfr.org/united-states/nuclear-power-expansion-challenges/p16886#p2)

Costs remain the biggest hurdle for the nuclear industry. The production of electricity from nuclear reactors--once online--is economically [competitive with other power generation (PDF)](http://www.world-nuclear.org/reference/pdf/economics.pdf) types, says the World Nuclear Association. However, a 2003 Massachusetts Institute for Technology paper on nuclear power, which was updated in 2009, notes that high start-up costs, regulatory uncertainty, and long-lead construction times put nuclear power at an investment disadvantage (PDF). Cost projections for building a single nuclear power plant range from $5 billion to $12 billion--with construction times estimated at between six and ten years. The lower-end estimate alone is almost double the cost and the construction time of building a coal or gas plants. Heymer, of the Nuclear Energy Institute, says recent nuclear construction contracts were priced between $6 billion and $7 billion. Some experts say until some of these current projects are completed, including the TVA reactor, there is no way to know the full cost of nuclear construction. A reactor's price is estimated at "overnight costs" (as if the reactor could be built tomorrow). Yet as construction stretches over several years to a decade, a number of things can unpredictably raise the price tag. For example, prices for necessary commodities--such as steel, copper, and concrete--have risen significantly in the past few years.

#### Can’t solve without loan guarantees – lenders and investors will fear the risk too much

**Roy et al, 7** – Managing Director of Export and Agency Finance Group, Citigroup Global Markets, Inc. (Mini, 7/2. “Comments in response to Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Loan Guarantees for Projects that Employ Innovative Technologies.” <http://www.lgprogram.energy.gov/nopr-comments/comment29.pdf>)

Summarized below are the consensus views of the six banks named above regarding the minimum conditions necessary for a workable loan guarantee program as authorized by Title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that can achieve the twin goals of supporting the financing of new nuclear plants in the United States while adequately protecting the U.S. taxpayer. We believe many new nuclear construction projects will have difficulty accessing the capital markets during construction and initial operation without the support of a federal government loan guarantee. Lenders and investors in the fixed income markets will be acutely concerned about a number of political, regulatory and litigation-related risks that are unique to nuclear power, including the possibility of delays in commercial operation of a completed plant or “another Shoreham”. We believe these risks, combined with the higher capital costs and longer construction schedules of nuclear plants as compared to other generation facilities, will make lenders unwilling at present to extend long-term credit to such projects in a form that would be commercially viable.

#### Natural gas blocks investment

Domenici and Miller 12 (Pete, Senator – New Mexico, and Dr. Warren F., Co-Chair – Nuclear Initiative; Former Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy – Department of Energy, “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Global Nuclear Energy Markets,” Bipartisan Policy Center, July, http://bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Leadership%20in%20Nuclear%20Energy%20Markets.pdf)

Prospects for new reactor construction in the United States have constricted significantly in recent years. In the years following passage of EPACT05, 18 utilities applied for combined construction and operating licenses (COLs) to build a total of 28 reactors. 2 In addition, DOE received 19 applications for loan guarantees to support financing for 21 proposed reactors. A combination of factors—including downward revisions to electricity demand projections, difficulty executing the EPACT05 loan guarantee program as intended, and drastically reduced natural gas prices—has put all but two projects on hold. While these projects, comprising four reactors, have received NRC licenses and are currently under construction in Georgia and South Carolina, these plants still face financial, regulatory, and construction challenges. 3 And, though natural gas prices have historically been quite volatile, the ability to tap large shale gas reserves will likely keep natural gas prices sufficiently low to make financing additional new reactor construction very difficult for at least the next decade, if not longer.

**No solvency – lack of nuclear waste management, and inefficient government intervention**

**Spencer and Loris 11** (Jack, Senior Research Fellow at Heritage for Nuclear Energy Policy, and Nicolas D., Herbert and Joyce Morgan Fellow at Heritage, focuses on energy and regulatory issues,"A Big Future for Small Nuclear Reactors?", Feb 2, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/a-big-future-for-small-nuclear-reactors)

While some designs are closer to market introduction than others, the fact is that America’s regulatory and policy environment is not sufficient to support a robust expansion of existing nuclear technologies, much less new ones. New reactor designs are difficult to license efficiently, and the lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management policy causes significant risk to private investment. Many politicians are attempting to mitigate these market challenges by offering subsidies, such as loan guarantees. While this approach still enjoys broad support in Congress and industry, the reality is that it has not worked. Despite a lavish suite of subsidies offered in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including loan guarantees, insurance against government delays, and production tax credits, no new reactors have been permitted, much less constructed. These subsidies are in addition to existing technology development cost-sharing programs that have been in place for years and defer significant research and development costs from industry to the taxpayer. The problem with this approach is that it ignores the larger systemic problems that create the unstable marketplace to begin with. These systemic problems generally fall into three categories: 1. Licensing. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is ill prepared to build the regulatory framework for new reactor technologies, and no reactor can be offered commercially without an NRC license. In a September 2009 interview, former NRC chairman Dale E. Klein said that small nuclear reactors pose a dilemma for the NRC because the commission is uneasy with new and unproven technologies and feels more comfortable with large light water reactors, which have been in operation for years and has a long safety record. 11 The result is that enthusiasm for building non-light-water SMRs is generally squashed at the NRC as potential customers realize that there is little chance that the NRC will permit the project within a timeframe that would promote near-term investment. So, regardless of which attributes an SMR might bring to the market, the regulatory risk is such that real progress on commercialization is difficult to attain. This then leaves large light water reactors, and to a lesser extent, small ones, as the least risky option, which pushes potential customers toward that technology, which then undermines long-term progress, competition, and innovation. 2. Nuclear Waste Management. The lack of a sustainable nuclear waste management solution is perhaps the greatest obstacle to a broad expansion of U.S. nuclear power. The federal government has failed to meet its obligations under the 1982 Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, to begin collecting nuclear waste for disposal in Yucca Mountain. The Obama Administration’s attempts to shutter the existing program to put waste in Yucca Mountain without having a backup plan has worsened the situation. This outcome was predictable because the current program is based on the flawed premise that the federal government is the appropriate entity to manage nuclear waste. Under the current system, waste producers are able to largely ignore waste management because the federal government is responsible. The key to a sustainable waste management policy is to directly connect financial responsibility for waste management to waste production. This will increase demand for more waste-efficient reactor technologies and drive innovation on waste-management technologies, such as reprocessing. Because SMRs consume fuel and produce waste differently than LWRs, they could contribute greatly to an economically efficient and sustainable nuclear waste management strategy. 3. Government Intervention. Too many policymakers believe that Washington is equipped to guide the nuclear industry to success. So, instead of creating a stable regulatory environment where the market value of different nuclear technologies can determine their success and evolution, they choose to create programs to help industry succeed. Two recent Senate bills from the 111th Congress, the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act (S. 2052) and the Nuclear Power 2021 Act (S. 2812), are cases in point. Government intervention distorts the normal market processes that, if allowed to work, would yield the most efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate nuclear technologies. Instead, the federal government picks winners and losers through programs where bureaucrats and well-connected lobbyists decide which technologies are permitted, and provides capital subsidies that allow investors to ignore the systemic problems that drive risk and costs artificially high. This approach is especially detrimental to SMRs because subsidies to LWRs distort the relative benefit of other reactor designs by artificially lowering the cost and risk of a more mature technology that already dominates the marketplace.

## Round 8 2NC vs. Emory PS

### No Impact

#### Prolif will be slow and limited – Yusuf ev says that No impact – prolif will be limited and slow

Forecasts on prolif are over estimated – projections are based on tech not intent – alarimism makes it slow – post Cold War the threat has greatly decreased

That’s Yusuf

#### Prolif doesn’t cause war or increase the proliferators influence – empirically proven

Farley, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, 11-16-11

(Dr. Robert, “Over the Horizon: Iran and the Nuclear Paradox,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox, accessed 11-21-11, CMM)

How much danger would Iranian nuclear weapons pose to the world? This question animates the debate over whether the threat of the Iranian nuclear program is worth robust sanctions or a preventive military attack. Nuclear weapons are by their nature alarming, and the Iranian regime says and does a lot of alarming things. But how useful are nuclear weapons, even to a state with bad intentions? How much do they change tactical and strategic behavior? For devices capable of destroying cities and killing millions, the answer is surprisingly murky.

States sometimes have excellent reasons for developing nuclear weapons. Countries that believe themselves likely to have trouble deterring potential conventional foes consider nuclear weapons an insurance policy against catastrophic defeat. Although nukes cannot prevent small-scale conventional defeats, they can presumably limit the damage, especially when regime survival is at stake. We can identify several situations in which nuclear weapons probably had an impact on the outcomes of crises between states. Nuclear weapons may have limited the extent of the Kargil War between Pakistan and India in 1999, and they may have prevented India from launching a conventional retaliation for the Mumbai attacks in 2009. The effect of nuclear deterrence in the Cold War is hard to calculate -- the closest the U.S. and the USSR came to war was over new deployments of nuclear weapons -- but the presence of massive, second-strike arsenals on each side may well have served to reduce or at least contain tensions.

But states and policymakers habitually overestimate the impact of nuclear weapons. This happens among both proliferators and anti-proliferators. Would-be proliferators seem to expect that possessing a nuclear weapon will confer “a seat at the table” as well as solve a host of minor and major foreign policy problems. Existing nuclear powers fear that new entrants will act unpredictably, destabilize regions and throw existing diplomatic arrangements into flux. These predictions almost invariably turn out wrong; nuclear weapons consistently fail to undo the existing power relationships of the international system.

The North Korean example is instructive. In spite of the dire warnings about the dangers of a North Korean nuclear weapon, the region has weathered Pyongyang’s nuclear proliferation in altogether sound fashion. Though some might argue that nukes have “enabled” North Korea to engage in a variety of bad behaviors, that was already the case prior to its nuclear test. The crucial deterrent to U.S. or South Korean action continues to be North Korea’s conventional capabilities, as well as the incalculable costs of governing North Korea after a war. Moreover, despite the usual dire predictions of nonproliferation professionals, the North Korean nuclear program has yet to inspire Tokyo or Seoul to follow suit. The DPRK’s program represents a tremendous waste of resources and human capital for a poor state, and it may prove a problem if North Korea endures a messy collapse. Thus far, however, the effects of the arsenal have been minimal.

#### Prolif isn’t destabilizing – won’t be used, no cascades, no incentive, and their ev is hype

Farley, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, 11-16-11

(Dr. Robert, “Over the Horizon: Iran and the Nuclear Paradox,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox, accessed 11-21-11, CMM)

The problem with nukes is that there are strong material and normative pressures against their use, not least because states that use nukes risk incurring nuclear retaliation. Part of the appeal of nuclear weapons is their bluntness, but for foreign policy objectives requiring a scalpel rather than a sledgehammer, they are useless. As a result, states with nuclear neighbors quickly find that they can engage in all manner of harassment and escalation without risking nuclear retaliation. The weapons themselves are often more expensive than the foreign policy objectives that they would be used to attain. Moreover, normative pressures do matter. Even “outlaw” nations recognize that the world views the use of nuclear -- not to mention chemical or biological -- weapons differently than other expressions of force. And almost without exception, even outlaw nations require the goodwill of at least some segments of the international community.¶ Given all this, it is not at all surprising that many countries eschew nuclear programs, even when they could easily attain nuclear status. Setting aside the legal problems, nuclear programs tend to be expensive, and they provide relatively little in terms of foreign policy return on investment. Brazil, for example, does not need nuclear weapons to exercise influence in Latin America or deter its rivals. Turkey, like Germany, Japan and South Korea, decided a long time ago that the nuclear “problem” could be solved most efficiently through alignment with an existing nuclear power.¶ Why do policymakers, analysts and journalists so consistently overrate the importance of nuclear weapons? The answer is that everyone has a strong incentive to lie about their importance. The Iranians will lie to the world about the extent of their program and to their people about the fruits of going nuclear. The various U.S. client states in the region will lie to Washington about how terrified they are of a nuclear Iran, warning of the need for “strategic re-evaluation,” while also using the Iranian menace as an excuse for brutality against their own populations. Nonproliferation advocates will lie about the terrors of unrestrained proliferation because they do not want anyone to shift focus to the manageability of a post-nuclear Iran. The United States will lie to everyone in order to reassure its clients and maintain the cohesion of the anti-Iran block.

### Can’t Solve Nuclear Leadership

#### Nuke leadership fails – it’s an ineffective tool and outdated

It might’ve worked during the nuclear scares, but it doesn’t matter now because of

1. Motive

2. Tech is so spread out, that it’s tech is already available to countries – no matter

Weiss 9

#### Discriminatory order – can’t provent actors form being pissed

#### Can’t solve nuclear leadership – discrimination breeds resistance

**Perkovich, 8** – vice president for studies and director of the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (George, October. “Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: Why the United States Should Lead.” <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/abolishing_nuclear_weapons.pdf>)

This Brief summarizes four security interests that would be served by making the longterm project of abolishing nuclear weapons a central purpose of U.S. policy: preventing proliferation; preventing nuclear terrorism; reducing toward zero the unique threat of nuclear annihilation; and fostering optimism regarding U.S. global leadership. Each of these objectives can be (and has been) pursued without the larger purpose of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, the chances of success will steadily diminish if the few nuclear-armed states try to perpetuate a discriminatory order based on haves and have-nots and if they enforce it firmly against some states and hollowly against others. Such inequity breeds noncooperation and resistance when what is needed now is cooperation to prevent proliferation, nuclear terrorism, and the failure of deterrence. Why should everyone cooperate in enforcing a system that looks like it was designed to favor just a few?

### Nuclear Leadership Not Solve Prolif

#### Double bind – either countries want the bomb and they don’t care what the US says, or they want nuclear power for the energy source and were never going to prolif in the first place.

#### US leadership can’t solve the prolif – no enforcement mechanism for regulations

When there are any forms of reactors in place in other countries like India, Pakistan, and North Korea – it’s only a question of willingness to initiate prolif – that’s Mez

SMRs don’t solve because countries with existing nuclear power don’t need to switch out – none of their evidence speaks to these specific countries – just other ones WITHOUT nuclear capabilities

#### Proliferation risk with SMRs – enables countries with high prolif risk to get nuclear energy

**Moor, 12** – Consultant in nuclear technology, licensing, and business structuring and former Director of Project Management at GPU Nuclear, Chair of the American Nuclear Society (ANS) President’s Special Committee on SMR Licensing Issues (Philip O, 5/9. “Small Modular Reactor Panel Discussion Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.” Summary Prepared by Derek Updegraff, Rebecca Lordan, Pierce Corden Dirksen. http://cstsp.aaas.org/files/SummaryFinalSMR.pdf)

Moor also discussed one of the downsides of SMRs: The O&M costs are likely to be higher per MW than large reactors, unless new NRC regulations allow a reduction in staffing. However, additional costs for infrastructure would be avoided if SMR designs that mimic the larger LWRs were incorporated into the existing nuclear infrastructure. SMRs would use essentially the same fuel mixture and level of fuel enrichment (5% Uranium-­‐235) in fuel assemblies scaled to their size. The SMR designs that are designed to use higher enrichment (up to 20% for some designs) and longer fueling cycles would incur greater fuel costs. However, these models are not expected be competitive in the near term, both for reasons of infrastructure delay and concerns about proliferation.2 Proliferation is of particular concern in nations with lower security capacity and experience with nuclear materials. Since many of the nations who might accept SMRs for power generation fall into these categories, nonproliferation and materials safeguarding is paramount. One example Moor sited was Iran’s domestic enrichment to 20% — Iran could rationalize possessing highly enriched uranium if there were reactors that require it. However, if available technologies were using only low enriched uranium, it would be easier to decipher their intentions. To remedy these potential ambiguities, Moor said that a requirement could be to remove spent SMR fuel for disposal or reprocessing outside the country of concern.

#### The aff alone isn’t sufficient to solve prolif

Doyle and Newman, 11 – Former Program Coordinator, Project on Managing the Atom; and Former Research Associate, Project on Managing the Atom (Neal and Andrew, 1/18. “"Modular Nuclear Reactors Can Meet Safe, Secure, and Proliferation Resistant Energy Demands".” http://belfercenter.hks.harvard.edu/publication/20960/modular\_nuclear\_reactors\_can\_meet\_safe\_secure\_and\_proliferation\_resistant\_energy\_demands.html)

Smaller, modular reactors are a potentially important part of the nuclear future because they could potentially reduce the risk of accidents, terrorism, and proliferation. However, there are **many other risks** from the existing nuclear complex that need to be managed. As nuclear energy use spreads, making sure it is safe, secure, and used only for peaceful purposes will require a new global management framework. This should include new or strengthened institutions that can effectively accomplish agreed safety, security, and nonproliferation goals while respecting states’ interests in sovereignty and energy security. Russia and the United States, working with other countries, should lead an international negotiation of effective global nuclear safety standards, binding on all participants. Improving safety will also require all states to: strengthen existing regulatory approaches, and establish effective nuclear regulation in “newcomer” states building their first nuclear power plants, to align with the global standard; build “reporting cultures” in which all staff are encouraged to report and resolve all problems that arise that could have an effect on safety; and commit to accepting IAEA-led peer reviews for major civilian facilities. Leading nuclear states must also work together to forge effective global standards for nuclear security, building on agreements already in place, such as the amended Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials and Facilities, the International Convention on the Suppression of Nuclear Terrorism, and the IAEA’s physical protection recommendations. Expanded exchange of international best practice and more comprehensive and detailed reporting on safety and security-related incidents is vital to this mission. If, on the other hand, nuclear energy is pursued *without* such measures, the result could be both dangerous and inimical to the conditions necessary to achieve and sustain large-scale nuclear growth. Even a single catastrophe – whether a Chernobyl-scale accident, a successful sabotage (a “security Chernobyl”), or worse yet, a terrorist nuclear bomb – would severely undermine prospects for nuclear growth.

### Hypocrisy

#### EXT Alt cause – nuclear hypocrisy

**Caldicott, 6** – Founder and President of the Nuclear Policy Research Institute (Helen, “Nuclear Power is not the answer.” pp. 134-135)

In light of terrorist attacks using conventional weapons, it is only a matter of time before someone steals enough plutonium to make an adequate nuclear weapon. Then we proceed into the age of nuclear terrorism. Meanwhile, with the world awash in plutonium and highly enriched uranium, the Bush administration pursues its own nuclear armament development policy that makes it increasingly likely that a rogue nation will procure and possibly use nuclear weapons. The United States has adopted three contradictory stances at the same time: It is aggressively forging ahead to build more nuclear weapons, stating that it will use them preemptively even against non- nuclear nations. It is instrumental in denying the right to build nuclear weapons to all but a handful of countries. In the context of promoting nuclear energy, it has offered dozens of countries nuclear technology and access to nuclear power fuel. The fission process makes plutonium, which can then be separated by reprocessing and converted to fuel for nuclear weapons. While the Bush proposal includes taking the spent fuel back to the United States, it is not clear that that process can be undertaken with no cheating. Thus, even as there is much hand-wringing at the United Nations about the possibility that Iran and North Korea may be developing nuclear weapons, eight nation-states-Russia, the United States, France, China, Britain, India, Israel, and Pakistan- possess their own nuclear arsenals, and others are free to develop weapons without the admonitions that the United States and the United Nations are imposing upon Iran and North Korea. This strange juxtaposition of opposing attitudes needs to be examined in the context of the sixty-five-year history of nuclear fission and related weapons development.

### Inev

#### Extend No US nuclear expansion – NRC licensing and waste doom it – recent projects prove

PACE, 9/5/12 (Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy, “Nuclear Renaissance Stalls.” http://energyfairness.org/2012/09/nuclear-renaissance-stalls/)

#### Expert consensus – The nuclear industry is all but doomed

**Feuerberg, 12** – Epoch Times staff (Gary, 1/2. “US Nuclear Power Industry in Weakened State.” http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/united-states/nuclear-power-industry-in-weakened-state-168618.html)

So, does nuclear energy have a viable future? No, say two experts from the Institute for Energy and the Environment of the Vermont Law School. The economic realities and safety concerns have all but doomed the nuclear industry unless it is able to be financed by massive government subsidies and loan guarantees, they contend. Peter Bradford was a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for five years and was chairman of the New York and Maine state utility regulatory commissions. On a Dec. 28 telebriefing, he said, “It becomes clear that we are witnessing not a revival but a collapse in expectations for new reactor construction. The two forthcoming projects [i.e., Georgia and S.C.] are all that remain of a 31-reactor fleet that was said to constitute the real ‘nuclear renaissance’ as recently as early 2009. “It is important to understand that this collapse was well underway before the accident at Fukushima.” Bradford said that in 2002 the nuclear energy industry forecasted increasing plant capacity to 50 gigawatts by 2020—the equivalent of 40 to 50 new reactors. Today, the industry realistically puts the number at four to eight reactors, a reduction of 90 percent. Bradford says the industry has suffered major setbacks: rising nuclear construction cost estimates, indefinite delays and accidents, and falling costs of energy alternatives—most notably natural gas. These factors have eliminated the need for the 30-plus new plants. All have announced cancellations, cost overruns, or significant delays, and only a handful “even pretend to be on a serious pathway to a definite scheduled completion.” Bradford agrees with John Rowe, the CEO of Exelon, which owns the nation’s largest nuclear fleet of 17. Rowe said recently Exelon is not interested in building a third additional plant at Calvert Cliffs, Md., because it would be “utterly uneconomic.” Cited by NEI Smart, Rowe said, “At today’s [natural] gas prices, a new nuclear power plant is out of the money by a factor of two.” Fukushima Raises Safety Issues The Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster in March 2011 magnified the economic problems that the nuclear renaissance faced, according to Mark Cooper, who is a colleague of Bradford’s at the Institute for Energy and the Environment, Vermont Law School, and the author of a recent paper, published Dec. 2011, “Nuclear Safety and Nuclear Economics.” “History shows that each major nuclear accident has caused re-examination of the risks of nuclear power, leading to more stringent safety requirements at higher costs,” Cooper said. Cooper added that after Three Mile Island in 1979, concerns about nuclear safety increased and the NRC became more vigorous in the enforcement of the rules, which magnified the cost problem. The Aug. 23 Virginia earthquake was said to be the biggest one on the East Coast in 67 years, according to CBS News. Carol Werner, executive director, Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI) said at the telebriefing that nuclear plants in the county of the epicenter were not built to withstand an earthquake with such magnitude (5.8). Two nuclear reactors at the North Anna Power Station were automatically shut down, according to CBS News. As a troubled investment with projected higher costs and risks, Fukushima—the world’s second worst nuclear accident—aggravates an already difficult situation. Cooper said costs of the accident are estimated as high as $250 billion, bankrupting Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), the fourth largest utility in the world. The Chernobyl disaster in 1986 is estimated at $700 billion. “These are numbers no [company] in a market economy can sustain,” said Cooper. In the United States, the liability estimate for a reactor is around $12.5 billion—well behind the at least $100 billion for Fukushima, said Bradford. It’s not possible to insure against the risk. Moreover, “The accident happened in a nation where it was not supposed to happen,” said Cooper. It occurred in Japan, which was assumed to have a high standard of safety and first-rate technical skills. The perceived risks of nuclear power were heightened when the public witnessed “the drama and trauma of losing control of a nuclear reactor in real time,” Cooper said. Cooper said the Japanese government recently estimated that the cost of power from nuclear reactors will be 50 percent higher than seven years ago. New safety concerns have forced the NRC to impose additional costs on existing reactors. “The pressure is going to be substantial,” such that every site will require significant upgrades for safety, retrofitting existing reactors, Cooper said. Bradford said that the reactors that have been retired occurred before their licensing period elapsed. They were retired because the costs of modifications to continue operation surpassed the income they would accrue. Early retirements of nuclear reactors can therefore be expected. “The next year is going to be a year of substantial reassessment—reassessment as to the real economics of falling demand, falling [natural] gas prices, rising costs, and reassessment in light of Fukushima,” Bradford said. The anticipated license approvals of new plants in Georgia and South Carolina do not portend a nuclear renaissance.

### SMRs no solve

#### SMRs can’t solve warming – they take too long and Renewables block.

Makhijani, President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, and Boyd, former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility, 10

(September, ARJUN MAKHIJANI, electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research AND MICHELE BOYD, former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility, September, “Small Modular Reactors No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power,” http://www.psr.org/nuclear-bailout/resources/small-modular-reactors-no.pdf, accessed 9-15-12, CMM)

Not a climate solution

Efficiency and most renewable technologies¶ are already cheaper than new large reactors.¶ The long time — a decade or more — that it¶ will take to certify SMRs will do little or nothing¶ to help with the global warming problem¶ and will actually complicate current efforts¶ underway. For example, the current schedule¶ for commercializing the above-ground¶ sodium cooled reactor in Japan extends to¶ 2050, making it irrelevant to addressing the¶ climate problem. Relying on assurances that¶ SMRs will be cheap is contrary to the experience¶ about economies of scale and is likely¶ to waste time and money, while creating new¶ safety and proliferation risks, as well as new¶ waste disposal problems.

#### Nuclear can’t be quickly ramped up

Lovering et al, Breakthrough Institute Energy and Climate Program policy analyst, 9-7-12

(Jessica, Ted Nordhaus, chairman, Michael Shellenbergerare president of the Breakthrough Institute, “Out of the Nuclear Closet,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/07/out\_of\_the\_nuclear\_closet?page=full, accessed 9-8-12, CMM)

As long as nuclear technology is characterized by enormous upfront capital costs, it is likely to remain just a hedge against overdependence on lower-cost coal and gas, not the wholesale replacement it needs to be to make a serious dent in climate change. Developing countries need large plants capable of bringing large amounts of new power to their fast-growing economies. But they also need power to be cheap. So long as coal remains the cheapest source of electricity in the developing world, it is likely to remainking.

The most worrying threat to the future of nuclear isn't the political fallout from Fukushima -- it's economic reality. Even as new nuclear plants are built in the developing world, old plants are being retired in the developed world. For example, Germany's plan to phase out nuclear simply relies on allowing existing plants to be shut down when they reach the ends of their lifetime. Given the size and cost of new conventional plants today, those plants are unlikely to be replaced with new ones. As such, the combined political and economic constraints associated with current nuclear energy technologies mean that nuclear energy's share of global energy generation is unlikely to grow in the coming decades, as global energy demand is likely to increase faster than new plants can be deployed.

### 2NC Overview

#### Continued CO2 emissions are key to sustain all life on the planet and prevent the impending global famine. Increasing ozone concentrations is damaging crop production – only CO2 enrichment can offset it and provide enough food for ALL life on the planet

#### Absent CO2 – global famine will spark World War 3 – Calvin says plummeting crop yields would cause countries to invade different lands to take over resources – and these conflicts go nuclear

Klare 6 (Michael Klare, Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, “The Coming Resource Wars,” 3/11/2006, <http://www.waterconserve.org/shared/reader/welcome.aspx?linkid=53710&keybold=water%20land%20conflict>)

"As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

#### And, warming does not outweigh – global food demand will double by 2050 and absent a solution, all the geopolitical and environmental impacts of warming are inevitable because of the expansion of unsustainable agriculture – that’s Idso

### Economy

#### CO2 key to plant growth and economic stability

Wall Street Journal 1/19/12 (“No Need to Panic About Global Warming” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html>, PZ)

\*The following has been signed by the 16 scientists with the following credentials: Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva.

The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Princeton physics professor William Happer on why a large number of scientists don't believe that carbon dioxide is causing global warming. A recent study of a wide variety of policy options by Yale economist William Nordhaus showed that nearly the highest benefit-to-cost ratio is achieved for a policy that allows 50 more years of economic growth unimpeded by greenhouse gas controls. This would be especially beneficial to the less-developed parts of the world that would like to share some of the same advantages of material well-being, health and life expectancy that the fully developed parts of the world enjoy now. Many other policy responses would have a negative return on investment. And it is likely that more CO2 and the modest warming that may come with it will be an overall benefit to the planet.

#### Reducing CO2 emissions prevents economic growth

Zhao 2011- Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association’s 2011 AAEA & NAREA Joint Annual Meeting (Xiaobing “The Impact of CO2 Emission Cuts on Income” July 24th-26th, <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/103412/2/Zhao-1-the%20impact%20of%20The%20cost%20of%20CO2%20emission%20cuts%20on%20income.pdf>, PZ)

3. Empirical Results We estimate Equation (5) year by year from 1980 to 2004. The coefficient estimates and the adjusted R are reported in Table 2. To save space, we do not report the White (1980) heteroscedasticity-consistent t-ratios. The significant coefficient estimates at the 5% level for two-sided tests are in bold. As we can see, the impact of CO2 emissions on income is statistically significant in each year. In fact, the coefficient estimate increases from 0.28 in 1980 to 0.35 in 2004, with an average of 0.31. That is, holding constant other relevant variables, a one percent cut in CO2 emissions will on average reduce income per capita by 0.31%. There are several popular proposals regarding CO2 emission cuts. However, a deep linear cut of 50% below 1990 emissions by 2050 may be more relevant to policy discussions. This proposal means at least a 1% cut in CO2 emissions per year. If a 1% cut in CO2 emissions will on average reduce income per capita by 0.31% as we show in Table 2, the cost of emission cuts is not only statistically but also economically significant. Since the average economic growth rate for the 23 OECD countries from 1980 to 2004 is only about 2% per year based on our data, a 0.31% reduction in GDP per capita per year represents a 15% slowdown in economic growth. This is the central finding of our paper. 4. Conclusion We study how CO2 emission cuts affect income in this paper. First we derive an income-CO2 relationship based on a structural production function, which is a natural way to model the relationship between income and CO2 emissions. We then use a similar methodology as Tucker (1995) to estimate the income-CO2 relationship. Such an 11 approach not only allows us to focus on the long-run relationship but also enables us to project the relationship between income and CO2 emissions for future years. Our main findings are as follows. Over the 1980-2004 period, for 23 OECD countries, the reverse EKC relationship between CO2 emissions and income is statistically and economically significant. To reduce emissions 50% below 1990 levels by 2050, the economic cost per year for developed countries is about 0.3% reduction in GDP per capita which represents a 15% slowdown in economic growth.

### AT: Short Term Benefit

#### Plants adjust and adapt to warming

Idso and Idso 11 [Craig D., founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, B.S. in Geography from Arizona State University, his M.S. in Agronomy from the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, and his Ph.D. in Geography from Arizona State University, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy, faculty researcher in the Office of Climatology at Arizona State University; and Sherwood, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, former Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology at ASU, M.S from UMinnesota, receipt of the Arthur S. Flemming Award, "Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future," 1-31-11, <http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf>]

Last of all, it should be noted that this “water conservation effect” of atmospheric CO2 enrichment appears to operate even in the face of rising temperatures, as was found to be the case in the experimental studies of Dermody et al. (2007) and Saleska et al. (2007). And in an informative review of the direct and indirect effects of rising air temperature and atmospheric CO2 concentration on plant behavior, Kirschbaum (2004) makes a number of pertinent and revealing observations, the primary ones of which we here briefly summarize. With respect to rising temperatures and their effect on photosynthesis, Kirschbaum states that “all plants appear to be capable of a degree of adaptation to growth conditions,” noting that “photosynthesis in some species can function adequately up to 50°C.” In fact, he says that “photosynthesis can acclimate considerably to actual growth conditions,” noting that “optimum temperatures for photosynthesis acclimate by about 0.5°C per 1.0°C change in effective growth temperature (Berry and Bjorkman, 1980; Battaglia et al., 1996).” This response, wherein plants adjust the workings of their photosynthetic apparatus to perform better at higher temperatures as temperatures rise, would appear to be especially beneficial in a warming world. With respect to rising CO2 concentrations and their effect on photosynthesis, Kirschbaum notes that CO2 assimilation rates generally rise as the air’s CO2 content rises: by 25-75% in C3 plants in response to a doubling of the air’s CO2 content, and by something on the order of 25% in C4 grasses, according to the major review of Wand et al. (1999). This response, wherein plants adjust the workings of their photosynthetic apparatus to perform better at higher atmospheric CO2 concentrations as atmospheric CO2 concentrations rise, would also appear to be especially beneficial in a CO2-acreting atmosphere. With respect to the synergistic effect of simultaneous increases in both atmospheric CO2 concentration and temperature on photosynthesis, Kirschbaum notes that plant growth responses to increasing CO2 are usually much more pronounced for plants grown at higher temperatures,” presenting a graph that suggests an approximate six-fold amplification of the aerial fertilization effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment at an air temperature of 35°C compared to one of 5°C. Consequently, in a world where both air temperature and CO2 concentration are rising, this response would appear to be hugely beneficial. Nevertheless, according to Robock et al. (2005), “most global climate model simulations of the future, when forced with increasing greenhouse gases and anthropogenic aerosols, predict summer desiccation in the midlatitudes of the Northern Hemisphere,” and they state that “this predicted soil moisture reduction, the product of increased evaporative demand with higher temperatures overwhelming any increased precipitation, is one of the gravest threats of global warming, potentially having large impacts on our food supply.” But inquisitive enough to want to know for themselves what actually happens in the real world, they went on to analyze 45 years of gravimetrically-measured plant-available soil moisture in the top one meter of soil for 141 stations from fields with either winter or spring cereals in the Ukraine over the period 1958-2002, finding, in their words, “a positive soil moisture trend for the entire period of observation.” And they emphasized that “even though for the entire period there is a small upward trend in temperature and a downward trend in summer precipitation, the soil moisture still has an upward trend for both winter and summer cereals.” Two years later, Li et al. (2007) compared soil moisture simulations derived from the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment climate models (which were driven by observed climate forcings) for the period 1958-1999 with actual measurements of soil moisture made at over 140 stations or districts in the mid-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere, which were averaged in such a way as to yield six regional results: one each for the Ukraine, Russia, Mongolia, Northern China, Central China and Illinois (USA). And in doing so, they found that the models showed realistic seasonal cycles for the Ukraine, Russia and Illinois but “generally poor seasonal cycles for Mongolia and China.” In addition, they said that the Ukraine and Russia experienced soil moisture increases in summer “that were larger than most trends in the model simulations.” In fact, they reported that “only two out of 25 model realizations show trends comparable to those observations,” and they noted that the two realistic model-derived trends were “due to internal model variability rather than a result of external forcing,” which means that the two reasonable matches were actually accidental. Noting further that “changes in precipitation and temperature cannot fully explain soil moisture increases for [the] Ukraine and Russia,” Li et al. noted that in response to elevated atmospheric CO2 concentrations, “many plant species reduce their stomatal openings, leading to a reduction in evaporation to the atmosphere,” so that “more water is likely to be stored in the soil or [diverted to] runoff,” correctly reporting that this phenomenon had recently been detected in continental river runoff data by Gedney et al. (2006). In addition, in a free-air CO2-enrichment study conducted in a pasture on the North Island of New Zealand, Newton et al. (2003) found there was a significant reduction in the water repellency of the soil in the elevated CO2 treatment, where they describe water repellency as “a soil property that prevents free water from entering the pores of dry soil,” as per Tillman et al. (1989). In fact, they wrote that “at field moisture content the repellence of the ambient soil was severe and significantly greater than that of the elevated [CO2] soil,” suggesting that the reduction in the repellency of the soil provided by atmospheric CO2 enrichment would allow more water to enter and remain in the soil.

## Round 8 1NR vs. Emory PS

### Overview

#### CP’s not a reason to reject the team – it’s key to test the necessity of Congressional action, as well as words in the resolution that you should be prepared to defend like “reduce”

#### DA outweighs – No impact defense means any risk of the DA should be preferred. Romney will ruin US-Russia relations because he takes a hardline stance towards Putin and won’t cooperate on NMD or other missile defense issues – causes relations collapse and war

#### US- Russia war is the only existential threat

**Bostrum**, March **2002** (Nick – prof of philosophy at Oxford University and recipient of the Gannon Award, Existential Risks, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### Turns Prolif

#### Romney will end cooperation with Russia --- spills over to Iran proliferation, Afghanistan and CTR programs

**Lyman**, 3/30/**2012** (John – editor-in-chief of International Policy Digest, Romney’s Foreign Policy and Russia, International Policy Digest, p. http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/2012/03/30/romneys-foreign-policy-and-russia/)

U.S.-Russian relations transcend the United Nations and other multilateral institutions. The United States relies on Russian assistance in counterterrorism, Afghanistan, shoring up loose nuclear material in the former Soviet Republics, international narcotics trafficking, WMD proliferation and reducing American and Russian nuclear stockpiles, which has become a cause celeb for Mr. Obama. Obama has calculated that the Russians would be amendable to significant reductions in their nuclear stockpiles if he negotiates with the Russians in good faith over missile defense. This process was started several years ago in an effort to “reset” U.S.-Russian relations, when Obama ordered a different configuration to the missile defense system – the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) – planned for construction in Eastern Europe. The original system envisioned a radar base that was to be built in the Czech Republic with interceptors housed in Poland. The EPAA is designed to intercept ballistic missiles launched from “rogue” nations from interceptors housed in Poland and now Romania. The Russians have been highly critical of the system first announced by the Bush administration as they claim it would undermine their own nuclear deterrent. “This is not a matter of hiding the ball,” Mr. Obama said. “I want to see us gradually, systematically reduce reliance on nuclear weapons.” Now that Mr. Romney has antagonized the Russians, he might find it difficult to negotiate with them over a whole host of issues, much less getting Russia on board with prodding the Iranians to return to the negotiating table or facilitating America’s withdrawal from Afghanistan if he defeats Mr. Obama in November.

### Turns Economy

#### Romney’s economic plan causes economic collapse --- kills the housing market and consumer spending

**Waldron**, 1/12/**2012** (Travis, Economists: Romney’s Economic Plan Fails to Deal With ‘Main Drags’ On U.S. Economy, Think Progress, p. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/01/12/403210/economists-romneys-draconian/)

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney’s (R) economic plan has become the centerpiece of his presidential campaign. Though his proposals are often vague, analyses of the plan shows that it would provide huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while raising taxes on low-income families. And though Romney claims to be concerned about the federal budget deficit, his plan would add more than $6 trillion in deficits over 10 years. Romney, who touts his experience as a job creator, has suggested laying off thousands of public sector workers. He wants to slash vital programs for the poor and middle-classes, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and gut Medicare and Social Security. His embrace of the radical Cut, Cap, and Balance plan pushed by House Republicans would, in effect, shrink the federal government to pre-Ronald Reagan era sizes. But for all his talk about the plan on the campaign trail, economists surveyed by Reuters say Romney’s plan likely wouldn’t deal with the main drags on the American economy, while the cuts to vital programs would be “utterly draconian“: These steps would shrink the federal government’s role more than even former president Ronald Reagan managed 30 years ago when he turned many social programs over to the states. That scenario concerns liberal economists. “If applied, these fiscal measures would be utterly draconian. The attacks on Medicare and Social Security would throw large portions of the population into poverty,” said Jamie Galbraith, business professor at the University of Texas in Austin. Mainstream economists worry more that neither Romney nor his Republican opponents are addressing the main drag on the U.S. economy – weak demand from American consumers still weighed down by debt. Among the “main drags” highlighted in the Reuters piece is the housing crisis, which has placed “a big drag on consumer spending which drives two thirds of the U.S. economy.” But the GOP candidates have offered little in the way of solutions for the crisis, and Romney’s own prescription involves letting the housing market hit rock bottom — further damaging millions of homeowners. “Markets work,” Romney told moderators at a debate in November when asked what he would do to address the housing crisis. According to former Wall Street economist Thomas Gallagher, addressing demand should be at the top of the list when it comes to speeding the recovery. Instead, Romney is focused on budget deficits and tax reform — the types of austerity measures that are pushing Europe toward another recession. Perhaps that’s why a survey of economics professors found that the Republican proposals were so bad, they wouldn’t pass an Econ 101 class.

### Asian Engagement 2NC

#### Obama reelection is key to Asian engagement.

**Klein**, 5/5/**2012** (Ezra, - editor of Wonkblog and columnist at the Washington Post, What would Obama do ina second term?, Wonkblog, The Washington Post, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/what-would-obama-do-in-a-second-term/2012/05/04/gIQAj4E61T\_blog.html)

Presidents tend to have a freer hand on foreign policy, where Congress is generally less involved. So if Obama is facing a difficult Congress and he doesn’t have to spend his time campaigning for reelection, foreign policy is a natural place to put his energies — not to mention to burnish his legacy. Among his counselors, there’s a barely concealed sense of excitement about the possibilities in this arena. As they see it, the Iraq war is officially over. The conflict in Afghanistan is winding down. Osama bin Laden is dead. The Obama administration, in other words, is nearer to a clean slate than they’ve been since taking office. The next phase, in their view, would be focused on “rebalancing” America’s attention away from the Middle East and toward regions of the world that are more economically important to the United States. As Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton has said, that effort begins with China and the rest of the Asia-Pacific region. It could mean using free-trade agreements to increase our economic influence and the annual East Asia Summit to create an opportunity for multilateral engagement. Obama’s advisers would also like to spend more time building relationships with Brazil, India and Turkey.

#### Engagement in Asia prevents multiple scenarios of nuclear war.

**Colby**, 8/10/**2011** (Elbridge – research analyst at the Center for Naval Analysis, Why US Needs its Liberal Empire, The Diplomat, Why US needs its Liberal Empire, p. <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/08/10/why-us-needs-its-liberal-empire/?all=true>)

But the pendulum shouldn’t be allowed to swing too far toward an incautious retrenchment. For our problem hasn’t been overseas commitments and interventions as such, but the kinds of interventions. The US alliance and partnership structure, what the late William Odom called the United States’ ‘liberal empire’ that includes a substantial military presence and a willingness to use it in the defence of US and allied interests, remains a vital component of US security and global stability and prosperity. This system of voluntary and consensual cooperation under US leadership, particularly in the security realm, constitutes a formidable bloc defending the liberal international order. But, in part due to poor decision-making in Washington, this system is under strain, particularly in East Asia, where the security situation has become tenser even as the region continues to become the centre of the global economy. A nuclear North Korea’s violent behaviour threatens South Korea and Japan, as well as US forces on the peninsula; Pyongyang’s development of a road mobile Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, moreover, brings into sight the day when North Korea could threaten the United States itself with nuclear attack, a prospect that will further imperil stability in the region. More broadly, the rise of China – and especially its rapid and opaque military build-up – combined with its increasing assertiveness in regional disputes is troubling to the United States and its allies and partners across the region. Particularly relevant to the US military presence in the western Pacific is the development of Beijing’s anti-access and area denial capabilities, including the DF-21D anti-ship ballistic missile, more capable anti-ship cruise missiles, attack submarines, attack aircraft, smart mines, torpedoes, and other assets. While Beijing remains a constructive contributor on a range of matters, these capabilities will give China the growing power to deny the United States the ability to operate effectively in the western Pacific, and thus the potential to undermine the US-guaranteed security substructure that has defined littoral East Asia since World War II. Even if China says today it won’t exploit this growing capability, who can tell what tomorrow or the next day will bring? Naturally, US efforts to build up forces in the western Pacific in response to future Chinese force improvements must be coupled with efforts to engage Beijing as a responsible stakeholder; indeed, a strengthened but appropriately restrained military posture will enable rather than detract from such engagement. In short, the United States must increase its involvement in East Asia rather than decrease it. Simply maintaining the military balance in the western Pacific will, however, involve substantial investments to improve US capabilities. It will also require augmented contributions to the common defence by US allies that have long enjoyed low defence budgets under the US security umbrella. This won’t be cheap, for these requirements can’t be met simply by incremental additions to the existing posture, but will have to include advances in air, naval, space, cyber, and other expensive high-tech capabilities. Yet such efforts are vital, for East Asia represents the economic future, and its strategic developments will determine which country or countries set the international rules that shape that economic future. Conversely, US interventions in the Middle East and, to a lesser degree, in south-eastern Europe have been driven by far more ambitious and aspirational conceptions of the national interest, encompassing the proposition that failing or illiberally governed peripheral states can contribute to an instability that nurtures terrorism and impedes economic growth. Regardless of whether this proposition is true, the effort is rightly seen by the new political tide not to be worth the benefits gained. Moreover, the United States can scale (and has scaled) back nation-building plans in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Balkans without undermining its vital interests in ensuring the free flow of oil and in preventing terrorism. The lesson to be drawn from recent years is not, then, that the United States should scale back or shun overseas commitments as such, but rather that we must be more discriminating in making and acting upon them. A total US unwillingness to intervene would pull the rug out from under the US-led structure, leaving the international system prey to disorder at the least, and at worst to chaos or dominance by others who could not be counted on to look out for US interests. We need to focus on making the right interventions, not forswearing them completely. In practice, this means a more substantial focus on East Asia and the serious security challenges there, and less emphasis on the Middle East. This isn’t to say that the United States should be unwilling to intervene in the Middle East. Rather, it is to say that our interventions there should be more tightly connected to concrete objectives such as protecting the free flow of oil from the region, preventing terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies, and forestalling or, if necessary, containing nuclear proliferation as opposed to the more idealistic aspirations to transform the region’s societies. These more concrete objectives can be better met by the more judicious and economical use of our military power. More broadly, however, it means a shift in US emphasis away from the greater Middle East toward the Asia-Pacific region, which dwarfs the former in economic and military potential and in the dynamism of its societies. The Asia-Pacific region, with its hard-charging economies and growing presence on the global stage, is where the future of the international security and economic system will be set, and it is there that Washington needs to focus its attention, especially in light of rising regional security challenges.

### AT: DOE Now

#### I’ll answer their leadership high now cross application – wasn’t tied to Obama, happened a WHILE ago, the approval was granted years ago, the construction is beginning now which is why it didn’t piss off his base then

#### Obama’s not pushing SMR’s – he’s avoiding talking about nuclear power entirely

Capitoilette 9/7/12 (“Obama Drops Nuclear from Energy Segment of Convention Speech,” http://capitoilette.com/2012/09/07/obama-drops-nuclear-from-energy-segment-of-convention-speech/)

\*Note: yes, this card is from a blog; but the argument is based on Obama’s speech and the difference between the 2004 and 2008 convention speeches, which is a factual issue

When then-Senator Barack Obama took the stage in Denver four years ago to accept the nomination of the Democratic Party, he delivered what many saw as a powerful and pitch-perfect speech that contained an ambitious plan to correct course after eight years of President George W. Bush. But to this reporter, sitting amongst the cheering throngs at Mile High, one point hit a decidedly sour note. In the section on energy, which began with the understanding that the country’s economy, security and energy futures are intertwined, Obama pledged to “end our dependence on oil from the Middle East” in ten years, and also spoke of investing $150 billion in renewable energy over that same decade. But then the Democratic nominee added this: As President, I will tap our natural gas reserves, invest in clean coal technology, and find ways to safely harness nuclear power. And with that, at least from where I sat (politically more than physically), a soaring speech came crashing to the ground. Even four years ago, “tapping natural gas reserves” was an ominous gloss-over for dangerous drilling techniques and increased carbon emissions. “Clean coal” had already proven to be nothing better than a marketing laugh line, something the Senator from coal-producing Illinois had to say. And “find[ing] ways to safely harness nuclear power,” well, funny that, both because it, too, felt like campaign-trail noblesse oblige for some of Obama’s biggest contributors, and because it implied that a safe way to harness nuclear power was something that had not yet been found. But there it was–what would eventually come to be known as “fracking,” plus the myth of “clean coal,” and a big nod to the moribund nuclear power industry. One, two, three strikes in Obama’s energy pitch. Fast, uh, “forward” four years, move indoors and 2,000 miles east, and listen to what President Obama had to say about America’s energy future in his 2012 convention speech: We’ve doubled our use of renewable energy, and thousands of Americans have jobs today building wind turbines, and long-lasting batteries. In the last year alone, we cut oil imports by one million barrels a day, more than any administration in recent history. And today, the United States of America is less dependent on foreign oil than at any time in the last two decades. So, now you have a choice – between a strategy that reverses this progress, or one that builds on it. We’ve opened millions of new acres for oil and gas exploration in the last three years, and we’ll open more. But unlike my opponent, I will not let oil companies write this country’s energy plan, or endanger our coastlines, or collect another $4 billion in corporate welfare from our taxpayers. We’re offering a better path. We’re offering a better path, a future where we keep investing in wind and solar and clean coal; where farmers and scientists harness new biofuels to power our cars and trucks; where construction workers build homes and factories that waste less energy; where — where we develop a hundred year supply of natural gas that’s right beneath our feet. Yes, despite a concrete acknowledgement two minutes later that “climate change is not a hoax” and “droughts and floods and wildfires are not a joke,” the president still brags of opening “millions of new acres for oil and gas exploration in the last three years”–and then he promises to open more. And, yes, there is still a reference to the fool’s anthracite, “clean coal,” this time incongruously grouped with “wind and solar.” But notice what is not there–not in this section, not in the paragraph about the climate, not anywhere in the entire 38-minute speech. President Obama no longer promises to “safely harness nuclear power”–that likely would have sounded like a cruel joke in a world now contaminated by the ongoing Fukushima disaster–but beyond that, **he does not promise anything about nuclear power at all.** There was no platitude, no carefully crafted signal to the industry that has subsidized much of Obama’s political career, no mention of nuclear power whatsoever.

#### Go to flow

### AT: Uniq Overwhelms

#### Romney can still swing the election back --- the plan turns the first debate into a winner.

**Ambinder**, **9/20**/2012 (Marc – editor-at-large of The Week, contributing editor for the Atlantic, former White House correspondent for National Journal, 5 ways Romney can still win, The Week, p. http://theweek.com/article/index/233101/five-ways-romney-can-still-win)

I first began to write this post on September 12, the day when Mitt Romney was supposed to don the fall collection of campaign clothing and start new and fresh. And then Libya happened, and then the leaked videotape happened, and then came a crunch of state polls showing that almost all routes to electoral victory were blocked by a president with leads outside the margin of error. Gallup's tracking has provided the only comfort data for Boston, so perhaps that's a place to start. But when your pollster has to tell the press not to believe the polls, you know you're looking at an uphill climb to the presidency. Romney has high hurdles ahead of him. But his cause is not lost. Here are five ways he can still win. Some combination of the following events and contingencies will have to intrude upon the race for him to do so, but a Romney/Ryan administration remains within the realm of possibility. Keep in mind: There will be natural tightening (as opposed to the political Botox kind) between now and election day. 1. Romney has a stellar first debate, which galvanizes his campaign and allows late-breaking independents to finally see the man that Ann Romney so loves dearly. Likelihood: 60 percent. Every Romney route to victory has to include a great first debate, because the first debates tend to matter the most, and because Romney will have a relatively unfiltered opportunity to try to make his case, probably his last. Debate 1 is about domestic policy, and the economy is lackluster. If ever there was a time to step up and force Barack Obama to explain to the American people just what he would do to create jobs — if ever there was an opportunity to refocus the campaign back onto the jobs issue — it's on October 3 at the University of Denver. No doubt Romney will be prepared. Jim Lehrer, the moderator, is not going to throw anything Romney's way that he hasn't already anticipated.

#### Romney is competitive enough to flip the election.

**Khan and Bell**, **9/20**/2012 (Naureen and Peter, Insiders: Obama More Likely to Win, National Journal, p. <http://hotlineoncall.nationaljournal.com/archives/2012/09/insiders.php>)

Nevertheless, several insiders also said that it was too early to call the race for anybody, particularly with three presidential debates left on the general election calendar, trouble brewing in the Middle East and the economy still struggling to recover. "This is still closer than people think and money does work," one Democrat said, alluding to Romney's formidable fundraising advantage, aided by GOP-allied super PAC money. "Romney remains competitive virtually everywhere he needs to win, despite weeks of feckless campaigning," another Republican added. "This means that voters are cringing at the idea of four more years of Obama."

#### Our links matter more than uniqueness --- polls will constantly fluctuate but the link shapes the outcome.

Chicago Tribune, 9/20/2012 (How to read polling data, p. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-09-20/news/ct-nw-presidential-polls-sidebar-20120919\_1\_national-polls-public-polls-battleground-states)

Don't obsess about small shifts in those horse race numbers. Right now, Obama vs. Romney is a close election, and it's likely to be so till Election Day. The numbers will bounce around from week to week, and "analysts" will come up with reasons to explain the "movement," much of which is caused by nothing more than the natural variations of any statistical sample. Instead, pay attention to the "internals." What issues are moving voters? Which subgroups are favoushkaring one candidate or another? That's data that actually mean something.

### Link Debate

#### Nuclear power incentives are massively unpopular --- recent meltdowns have turned the American public off to any new plants. That’s Sheppard 2011 --- prefer it because it cites the most recent polls and is specific to the plan mechanism.

#### Their link ev is from ONE poll and done by a former EPA administrator, it’s all about how you look read into polls and theirs is clearly biased

#### The public massively opposes spending on nuclear power.

**Mariotte**, 6/5/**2012** (Michael – Executive Director and chief spokesperson for Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Nuclear Power and Public Opinion: What the Polls Say, Daily Kos, p. <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/06/05/1097574/-Nuclear-Power-and-Public-Opinion-What-the-polls-say>)

To try to get a better sense of what the public really thinks about nuclear power (and since we can’t afford to conduct our own polling), we took a look at every poll we could find on the issue, and related energy issues, over the past two years, and in some cases further back. Yes, that includes GOP/Fox News favorite Rasmussen. As DailyKos readers know, if not the general public, examining all the possible polls leads to a much greater confidence in conclusions than relying on a single poll. Thus, we have a fairly strong confidence that our conclusions are a good statement of where the American public is at on nuclear power and our energy future in the Spring of 2012. Conclusion 1: The public does NOT want to pay for new nuclear power. It IS willing to pay for renewable energy. This one is a slam dunk. New nuclear reactors are simply too expensive for utilities to build with their own assets. Nor are banks willing to lend money for most nuclear projects; they’re considered too risky given the long history of cost overruns, defaults, cancellations and other problems. Thus, the only two means of financing a new reactor are to either get money from taxpayers, through direct federal loans or taxpayer-backed loan guarantees, or from ratepayers in a few, mostly Southern states, which allow utilities to collect money from ratepayers before reactors are built—a concept known either as “early cost recovery” or Construction Work in Progress (CWIP). ORC International (which polls for CNN, among others) has asked a straightforward question for the past two years (March 2011 and February 2012) in polls commissioned by the Civil Society Institute: “Should U.S. Taxpayers Take on the Risk of Backing New Nuclear Reactors?” The answer? Basically identical both years: 73% opposed in 2011, 72% opposed in 2012. Maybe using the work “risk” skews the poll, you think? So ORC also asked, “Do you favor or oppose shifting federal loan guarantees from nuclear energy to clean renewables?” The answer was basically the same: 74% said yes in 2011, 77% in 2012 with 47% “strongly” holding that opinion both years.

#### Public opinion prevents deployment of SMR.

International Trade Administration, February **2011** (The Commercial Outlook for U.S. Small Modular Nuclear Reactors, Department of Commerce, p. 7)

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

#### Women –

#### A) They oppose nuclear power.

**Pew Research Center**, 3/21/**2011** (Opposition to Nuclear Power amid Japanese Crisis, p. http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1934/support-nuclear-power-japan-gas-prices-offshore-oil-gas-drilling)

Continuing Gender Gap over Nuclear Power There has long been a wide gender gap in views of increased use of nuclear power and these differences persist amid the crisis in Japan. By greater than two-to-one (63% to 26%), women oppose promoting the increased use of nuclear power. A narrow majority of men (53%) favor the increased use of nuclear power, while 42% are opposed. The proportion of college graduates that supports the expanded use of nuclear power has fallen by 13 points since October (from 57% to 44%). College graduates remain slightly more likely than those with less education to support more use of nuclear power, but the gap has narrowed. About half of Republicans (49%) favor the expanded use of nuclear power compared with 41% of independents and 31% of Democrats. There were comparable partisan differences in these views last October.

#### B) They swing the election.

**Goodman and Rozell**, 5/14/**2012** (Paul – former chairman of the Democratic Party of Virginia, and Mark – professor of public policy at George Mason University, Will women finally determine presidential vote?, Politico, p. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76275.html)

The 2004 exit poll data produced controversial results. The adjusted data suggest Sen. John Kerry likely carried the women’s vote narrowly. But he lost in the Electoral College because of Bush’s far stronger support among men. So these current polls reveal a potentially historic wrinkle: The women’s vote could now be definitively decisive in electing the president. For 220 years, picking the president has remained, at least in terms of statistically provable results despite the 19th Amendment, a man’s prerogative. But this may finally change in 2012. Meanwhile, the latest polls suggest another important shift: Younger women may be the kingmakers — offsetting Romney’s gain among older white men angry at their fate in this struggling economy. Whatever you thought you knew about women and the gender gap — think again. The battle of the sexes, with an intergenerational female undercard, may finally redefine presidential politics 92 years after the passage of the 19th Amendment.

#### Massive public opposition to nuclear power

Civil Society Institute, 3/7/**2012** (Survey: Americans Not Warming Up to Nuclear Power One Year After Fukushima, p. http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm)

One year after the disaster at the Fukushima nuclear reactors in Japan, Americans continue to want to keep the brakes on more nuclear power in the United States, according to a major new ORC International survey conducted for the nonprofit and nonpartisan Civil Society Institute (CSI). To gauge any shift in public attitudes, the new survey was benchmarked to an earlier poll carried out by ORC International in March 2011 for CSI. Conducted February 23-26 2012, the new survey of 1,032 Americans shows that: • Nearly six in 10 Americans (57 percent) are less supportive of expanding nuclear power in the United States than they were before the Japanese reactor crisis, a nearly identical finding to the 58 percent who responded the same way when asked the same question one year ago. This contrasts sharply with pre-Fukushima surveys by Gallup and other organizations showing a 60 percent support level for nuclear power. • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) say they are now more supportive than they were a year ago "to using clean renewable energy resources - such as wind and solar - and increased energy efficiency as an alternative to more nuclear power in the United States." This finding edged up from the 2011 survey level of 76 percent. • More than three out of four Americans (77 percent) would support "a shift of federal loan-guarantee support for energy away from nuclear reactors" in favor of wind and solar power. This level of support was up from the 74 percent finding in the 2011 survey. • In response to a new question in the 2012 survey, more than six in 10 Americans (61 percent) said they were less supportive of nuclear power as a result of reports in the U.S. during 2011 and so far in 2012 of nuclear reactors that had to be shut down due such factors as natural disasters, equipment failure and radioactive leaks. • About two thirds (65 percent) of Americans now say they would oppose "the construction of a new nuclear reactor within 50 miles of [their] home." This figure was roughly the same as the 67 percent opposition level in the March 2011 survey. Pam Solo, founder and president, Civil Society Institute, said: "It is clear that Fukushima left an indelible impression on the thinking of Americans about nuclear power. The U.S. public clearly favors a conservative approach to energy that insists on it being safe in all senses of the word - including the risk to local communities and citizens. These poll findings support the need for a renewed national debate about the energy choices that America makes."

#### Growing opposition to nuclear power --- most recent polls are on our side.

**Cart**, 4/26/**2012** (Julie, Support for more nuke plants in U.S. decreasing, poll finds, Los Angeles Times, p. http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/26/local/la-me-enviro-poll-20120426)

The American public is divided about whether to eliminate federal subsidies for any form of energy and is giving less support to nuclear power and U.S. funding of renewable energy, a new poll has found. Fifty-four percent of respondents opposed doing away with subsidies for oil, gas, coal, nuclear or renewable energy, while 47% favored the idea. Support for building more nuclear power plants has fallen dramatically, to 42% from 61% in 2008. The Yale-George Mason University poll being released Thursday found that 76% of Americans support regulating carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas pollutant and that two-thirds believe the U.S. should pursue policies to reduce its carbon footprint.

#### Link alone turns the case – public opposition undermines investment for nuclear power.

Civil Society Institute, 3/7/**2012** (Survey: Americans Not Warming Up to Nuclear Power One Year After Fukushima, p. http://www.civilsocietyinstitute.org/media/030712release.cfm)

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

### AT: Election Not Referendum on Policies

#### Obama gets blame --- he is the most visible and perceived as responsible.

**Fitts 1996** (Michael A. – Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, The Paradox of Power in the Modern State: Why a Unitary, Centralized Presidency May Not Exhibit Effective Or Legitimate Leadership, 144 U. Pa. L. Rev. 827, p. Lexis)

Finally, the public may hold the president more responsible simply because individual members of Congress are less likely to be held responsible. As many political scientists have observed, public perceptions of members of Congress seem to present a classic collective action problem, in which no one individual member appears to have a significant effect on collective government action. In this context, it can be quite easy to avoid individual responsibility for collective decisions because each representative faces a prisoner's dilemma in effecting change. 210 No one is a "but for" cause of an event. Even if the result is not literally collective, moreover, the information problems faced by the public in assessing the individual contribution of a representative in a body such as Congress can be overwhelming. 211 Where constituents do not surmount this prisoner's dilemma, individual members of Congress who avoid responsibility enjoy a structural advantage. 212 This is one explanation for the well-known "incumbency effect" that members of Congress enjoy, in which they avoid responsibility for nationally contentious issues and claim it for locally favorable results. 213 A modern, more unitary president, on the other hand, seems to come out on the other end in this process, due to the increased authority and visibility he has within the modern government structure. The assessment of joint causal responsibility can present [\*889] intractable moral and game theoretic problems. 214 Yet, to the extent that power is viewed as a zero-sum game, avoidance of responsibility by individual members of Congress can lead naturally to a public overassessment of presidential responsibility; the president may be the only person who can reasonably be assessed responsibility for collective decisions. While a number of scholars have explored the legislative effect described above, 215 few have analyzed the executive contrapositive: overassessment of presidential responsibility. C. Effect on Presidential Influence What are the long term effects of this perception on the president's legitimacy and power? While the consequences are obviously quite complex, there is reason to believe it can undermine the support for and influence of the president in some contexts. First, the perception of presidential influence may simply exacerbate the problems of presidential visibility described above. The perception of presidential power increases public scrutiny. This makes the president even more central to the resolution of symbolic and moral disputes in government, ranging from the placement of his children in private schools to affirmative action. Second, at the same time, the asymmetry in visibility creates an environment that is conducive to strategic behavior by other actors in government, for which the president may be forced to take responsibility. To the extent that a system exists that holds one actor responsible for the actions of others, free-riding members have a clear incentive to act strategically. 216 This may explain why individual members of Congress are often accused of being less concerned with collective results. Opportunities for strategic behavior can arise in a variety of situations, including international affairs, such as Haiti, the Mexican bailout, Kuwait and Bosnia, as [\*890] well as in domestic areas, such as the budget deficit. As a result, it may be difficult for a president to elicit cooperative behavior from members of Congress. Third, the president may have a perverse incentive to exacerbate this process by overstating public problems and the need for action. As noted above, one of the most important devices of a modern president is his ability to mobilize support through the bully pulpit - to take advantage of his unitary and visible position as a "focal point." 217 Unfortunately, this device has its costs. The president may need to overstate the problem in order to generate an appropriate level of attention and thereby to garner influence. 218 The president thus may gain strength over the short run, but when he subsequently fails to meet heightened expectations, he can pay a price in unrealized goals.

#### Obama will actively seek involvement in any energy policy.

**Leone**, 3/27/**2012** (Steve – Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World, Part 1: Lots at Stake in the US as Energy Takes Political Spotlight, Renewable Energy World, p. http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/03/part-1-lots-at-stake-as-energy-takes-political-spotlight)

But Obama’s not running away from renewable energy. In fact, it seems like he’s running toward it faster than anyone expected six months ago. And in an election year, it’s clear that he and his Republican opponents are aiming to make our energy future one of the central issues come November. This, conceivably, has the Republican base licking its chops. Could Obama possibly endorse the very type of technology that’s given him his biggest lumps of late?

### AT: Plan Happens After the Election

#### --Kills ground – it makes the aff a moving target and removes uniqueness considerations from DA evaluation.

#### --Double-bind – either Congress will use a special session or the executive branch should do the plan now. Either way --- the plan is immediate.

### AT: Relations Resilient

#### Doesn’t assume change in presidency- our evidence indicates that Romney will aggressively implement policies that piss of Russia---

#### Romney’s policies would isolate Russia --- collapses relations

**Bandow**, 4/23/**2012** (Doug – senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836>)

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