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### Electricity Prices DA

#### First off is the Electricity Prices Disad

#### Prices are declining in the status quo

**Burtraw 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.

#### But, 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

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.

### Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win now – electoral college projections, national popular vote projections

Silver 10/4/12 (Nate, Founder @ Fivethirtyeight.com, "Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls," http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/)

It may be a bit fruitless to spend too much time worrying about the Wednesday afternoon FiveThirtyEight forecast when Wednesday night’s debate had the potential to change the election landscape. But for the sake of continuity, here goes. The FiveThirtyEight forecast had Mr. Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney. As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, a great deal of this comes down to Ohio. Historically, Ohio is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.

#### But the next 10 days are key - new issues that “shake up the race” are key to Romney’s chances

Cook 10/1/12 (Charlie, Founder of Cook Political Report, "Shades of 1996," <http://cookpolitical.com/story/4846>)

Public attitudes toward candidates and elections often start off in a fluid state. Then they gradually begin to jell, first reaching a semisolid state before hardening to rock-solid. This year’s presidential race isn’t over, but Mitt Romney’s current trajectory in the polls will not cross President Obama’s by Nov. 6—or maybe even Nov. 6 of next year. If something doesn’t happen to shake up the race, Romney will lose. Romney’s negatives, particularly in swing states, have grown to the point that if allowed to solidify, his opportunity to recover will vanish. The GOP nominee still has a chance to change the trajectory of the campaign, but the longer he takes, the smaller the payoff. Very few undecided voters are left in swing states; campaign pollsters say that maybe 4 or 5 percent of likely voters fit in this category. And no one would be surprised if some of the remaining undecided voters, after being subjected to saturation advertising for months—in some cases since June—throw up their hands and opt to stay home on Election Day. If the presidential race stays on its current course for another week or 10 days, Romney faces the very real prospect that Republican donors, super PACs, and other parts of the GOP support structure will begin to shift resources away from helping him and toward a last-ditch effort to win a Senate majority—which once seemed very likely—and to protect the party’s House majority. A year and a half ago, it looked like Republicans had a 65 to 70 percent chance of capturing the Senate. The 23 Democratic seats up for grabs, compared with just 10 for Republicans, offered the GOP many opportunities for gains, particularly in states that Democrats had captured from Republicans in 2006. Jennifer Duffy, senior Senate editor of *The Cook Political Report*, now argues that the range of possible Senate outcomes goes from Republicans picking up two or three seats to actually losing a seat or two. For the most part, the deterioration of the Senate outlook is unrelated to Romney’s problems at the top of the ticket, and it comes despite a strong effort by the National Republican Senatorial Committee. But there’s no denying that things are not looking so good for the red team in the Senate. Arguably, Republicans now have a chance against only one of the four most vulnerable Democratic Senate incumbents, with GOP Rep. Denny Rehberg now running even with [Jon Tester](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Montana](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Republican prospects to unseat Democrats [Claire McCaskill](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Missouri](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), [Bill Nelson](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Florida](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), and[Sherrod Brown](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Ohio](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) are remote, at best. Top-tier recruits in open seats in [Hawaii](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) and [New Mexico](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) have not caught on despite strong campaign efforts, further undercutting GOP chances of securing a Senate majority. Two moderate Democrats running for open Senate seats in very Republican states are doing unexpectedly well: Democratic former state Attorney General Heidi Heitkamp is locked in a tight race in [North Dakota](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) with GOP Rep. [Rick Berg](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), while Democratic [Rep. Joe Donnelly](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) is in an equally close contest with Republican state Treasurer Richard Mourdock in[Indiana](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Republicans were heavily favored to win both seats early on; now both races are very tight. Duffy points to the last time this class of Senate seats was up, in 2006: Then, three Senate seats and control of the chamber were settled by 60,665 votes spread among three states, [Missouri](http://cookpolitical.com/state/MO/articles), [Montana](http://cookpolitical.com/state/MT/articles), and [Virginia](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Of the 10 Senate races that *The Cook Political Report* rates as toss-ups, six are now in Democratic hands and four are in GOP hands. The range of possible outcomes is very wide. In the House, we have not yet seen any signs of deterioration for the GOP majority. Even if Democrats were to win every seat currently rated solid Democratic, likely Democratic, or lean Democratic, as well as every toss-up, they would still come up short of a majority. The canaries in the coal mine are GOP seats currently rated as lean Republican or likely Republican. *Cook Political Report* House Editor David Wasserman points out that with Democrats likely to lose perhaps 10 of their own seats, they would have to gross 35 seats to hit the 25 net seats necessary to win a majority. That’s a very tall order. House Republican strategists have been preaching the “balance message” to their candidates: If the top of the ticket starts to go south on them, then Republicans need to argue that the party must keep the House in GOP hands to have a firm check in place to balance against a second-term President Obama. The next week or 10 days are thus critical for Romney and the GOP. If things don’t turn around, a stampede could ensue reminiscent of 1996, when Republicans realized that Bob Dole was not going to defeat President Clinton. History could repeat itself.

#### 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.

### States CP

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should substantially increase its High Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor energy production funding in the United States.

#### States solves upfront capital costs of nuclear power

Yanosek 12 (Kassia, Entrepreneur-in-Residence – Stanford University’s Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, “Financing Nuclear Power in the US,” Stanford Energy Journal, Spring, http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Financing\_Nuclear\_Power\_by\_Kassia\_Yanosek)

Furthermore, capital costs are inherently high, ranging in the billions or tens of billions of dollars, and are compounded by financing charges during long construction times. Without government support, financing nuclear is currently not possible in the capital markets. Recently, Constellation Energy and NRG separately pulled the plug on new multi-billion dollar plants, citing financing problems. Projects, however, will get done on a one-off basis. Southern Company’s Vogtle Plant in Eastern Georgia is likely to be the sponsor of the first new generation to be constructed, taking advantage of local regulatory and federal support. Two new reactors of next-generation technology are in the permitting stage, which will bring online 2,200 megawatts (MW) of new capacity, and will cost $14 billion. The project will take advantage of tax credits and loan guarantees provided in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. What is the ideal financial structure for funding new nuclear generation? The simplest answer is “through the rate base.” This is typically accomplished by state-level legislation which allows utilities to pass the construction costs through to the ratepayers. The ideal mechanism, which exists in a few states, allows the utility to raise rates during plant construction and adjust rates periodically for delays or cost overruns. However, this structure is not possible in most markets. California, for example, has a moratorium where utilities are not legislatively authorized to recover rates for nuclear development. And even with a regulated territory, utilities often require additional financing to raise sufficient up-front funds for construction or to mitigate risks in markets where cost recovery through the rate base is not assured. Another option, which could be a complementary solution, is a project finance model, in which debt is raised at the project level and backstopped by long-term contracts with creditworthy parties. Even this would be complex, since project financing would require finding a suite of investors willing to take on the different risk/return profiles that exist at different stages of the project. In addition, federal and/or state-based financial support designed specifically for nuclear would still be critical.

#### And – the signal is the same

Bickers 8 (Richard, Editor – NPO, quarterly journal published by the Nuclear Energy Institute, “The Trickle-Up Effect,” Nuclear Policy Outlook, Second Quarter, [www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook\_June.pdf](http://www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook_June.pdf))

States Put Singular Stamp on Energy Policy—With National Implications Spurred by federal legislation and public concern about energy costs, electricity supply and environmental issues, the pace of state and local government activity on energy policy in general— and nuclear power in particular—has skyrocketed in the past few years. Energy, environmental and economic concerns are coalescing, and states are taking action. “For most people, the federal government seems too removed from their daily lives,” said Del. Sally Jameson (D), a member of the Maryland House of Delegates since 2003. Her district straddles the nation’s capital and Calvert County, Md., home to Constellation Energy’s Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant. “Most people look to the state for policy. They know us one-on-one and state policy directly affects their lives. “The federal government is so huge that they believe they will get lost in it. At the state level,” she noted, “their voices are heard.” Looking to the future, the United States must maintain at least the current 30 percent share of non-emitting electric generating capacity if it is to meet its clean-air goals. Even with conservative assumptions about increases in electricity demand and a doubling of renewable energy production, the United States faces a challenge to maintain its current proportion of carbon-free electricity production. A substantial increase in nuclear energy is essential. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, which incorporated a wide range of measures to support current nuclear plants and provided important incentives for building new nuclear plants, reflects a national commitment to carbon-free energy sources. The legislation includes investment incentives to encourage construction of new nuclear plants, including production tax credits, loan guarantees and business risk protection for companies pursuing the first new reactors. Now, states are linking environment and energy in the policy calculus. “The view is that when the federal government isn’t taking the lead, the legislatures need to step up to the plate,” said Melissa Savage, program director for the Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). States are “repealing moratoriums, holding committee session study hearings, looking at changing regulations, and just getting the conversation started in some cases,” she noted. “We’re facing a pretty critical energy crunch in the country. The issue is starting to bubble back up,” Savage said. “In some states, it never went away.” Ten states have passed policies instituting some form of cost recovery assurance for nuclear plant construction. Three states have introduced and one has passed legislation requiring that nuclear energy be included in some form of clean or alternative energy portfolio. Six of the 13 states with moratoriums preventing new nuclear plants are considering removing those bans. Two states have passed local tax incentives for nuclear plants. For Maryland’s Jameson, the link between environmental and energy policy is a driving factor in policy formulation. “We are nearly surrounded by water in Maryland,” she said, pointing to the Chesapeake Bay, Atlantic Ocean and a network of rivers. “We are doing everything we can to limit harm to our waterways and environment because of climate change and global warming.” The state has taken a “fairly proactive approach” to addressing both environmental and energy issues in the face of a Maryland Public Service Commission warning that electricity customers could face power restrictions or rolling blackouts as early as 2011, she said. STATES AS POLICY LABORATORIES “It is one of the happy incidents of the federal system that a single courageous state may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country,” Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis wrote in 1932. Historically, state and local governments have led the way on issues as varied as child labor, the environment and social reform. And state governments indeed are serving as laboratories in the development of policy supporting nuclear energy. One such policy is the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or RGGI, a cooperative effort by 10 Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Participating states have agreed to implement RGGI through a regional cap-andtrade program whereby participating states anticipate auctioning nearly the entire annual regional emissions budget, approximately 188 million tons of carbon dioxide. Each ton of carbon dioxide will constitute an “allowance.” The multi-state agreement treats all carbon-free sources of electricity, such as nuclear energy and renewables, equally in the framework for awarding monetary credits for greenhouse gas reduction. The RGGI states have agreed to participate in regional auctions for the allowances, beginning this September. Officials have scheduled a second auction in December.

### Nuclear Leadership/Proliferation

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12 (Jacques, Associate Professor of International Relations – USC, North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb, Foreign Affairs, 4-16, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show)

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Nuclear taboo fails – only deterrence checks escalation

Wellen 11 (Russ, Foreign Policy in Focus, “Is the Nuclear Taboo More of a Deterrent Than Deterrence Itself?,” 4-22-11, <http://www.fpif.org/blog/is_the_nuclear_taboo_more_of_a_deterrent_than_deterrence>)

Rosenbaum also cites films from On the Beach to Dr. Strangelove to The Day After. He concludes Cumulatively culture has had a powerful effect in creating the norm and contributing to the taboo. I would even go so far as to say that popular culture **more than politics** was responsible for the peace movement becoming -- in its nuclear freeze phase -- a mass phenomenon. But, he notes that the taboo itself "could undo the taboo." If there is **no certainty** of retaliatory response, because tabooed, a foe would be **more likely to use** or threaten to use nuclear weapons for a **first strike** regardless of the taboo since they would have reason to believe retaliation was taboo. In other words, however unexpected a blessing the taboo has turned out to be, it's **foolhardy** to rely on so **fragile a phenomenon** to protect us from a nuclear holocaust.

#### 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.

#### No risk of terrorism

Walt 12 (Stephen, Belfer Professor of International Affairs – Harvard University, “What Terrorist Threat?,” Foreign Policy, 8-13, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/08/13/what\_terrorist\_threat)

Remember how the London Olympics were supposedly left vulnerable to terrorists after the security firm hired for the games admitted that it couldn't supply enough manpower? This "humiliating shambles" forced the British government to call in 3,500 security personnel of its own, and led GOP presidential candidate Mitt Romney to utter some tactless remarks about Britain's alleged mismanagement during his official "Foot-in-Mouth" foreign tour last month. Well, surprise, surprise. Not only was there no terrorist attack, the Games themselves came off rather well. There were the inevitable minor glitches, of course, but no disasters and some quite impressive organizational achievements. And of course, athletes from around the world delivered inspiring, impressive, heroic, and sometimes disappointing performances, which is what the Games are all about. Two lessons might be drawn from this event. The first is that the head-long rush to privatize everything -- including the provision of security -- has some obvious downsides. When markets and private firms fail, it is the state that has to come to the rescue. It was true after the 2007-08 financial crisis, it's true in the ongoing euro-mess, and it was true in the Olympics. Bear that in mind when Romney and new VP nominee Paul Ryan tout the virtues of shrinking government, especially the need to privatize Social Security and Medicare. The second lesson is that we continue to over-react to the "terrorist threat." Here I recommend you read John Mueller and Mark G. Stewart's The Terrorism Delusion: America's Overwrought Response to September 11, in the latest issue of International Security. Mueller and Stewart analyze 50 cases of supposed "Islamic terrorist plots" against the United States, and show how virtually all of the perpetrators were (in their words) "incompetent, ineffective, unintelligent, idiotic, ignorant, unorganized, misguided, muddled, amateurish, dopey, unrealistic, moronic, irrational and foolish." They quote former Glenn Carle, former deputy national intelligence officer for transnational threats saying "we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed and miserable opponents that they are," noting further that al Qaeda's "capabilities are far inferior to its desires." Further, Mueller and Stewart estimate that expenditures on domestic homeland security (i.e., not counting the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan) have increased by more than $1 trillion since 9/11, even though the annual risk of dying in a domestic terrorist attack is about 1 in 3.5 million. Using conservative assumptions and conventional risk-assessment methodology, they estimate that for these expenditures to be cost-effective "they would have had to deter, prevent, foil or protect against 333 very large attacks that would otherwise have been successful every year." Finally, they worry that this exaggerated sense of danger has now been "internalized": even when politicians and "terrorism experts" aren't hyping the danger, the public still sees the threat as large and imminent. As they conclude:

### China Cooperation

#### Plan text says nothing about sales or new coop with China means that building tech isn’t good enough to establish the relationship

#### US-China nuclear energy cooperation strong now – recent PUNT meeting proves

**NNSA 4/24/12** ("U.S., China Advance Nuclear Safety and Security Cooperation through Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technology (PUNT) Agreement," http://www.nnsa.energy.gov/mediaroom/pressreleases/punt42412)

WASHINGTON, D.C. – Anne Harrington, Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), and Hao Weiping, Deputy Director General of the Electric Power Department of the China National Energy Administration (NEA), co-chaired the 7th Joint Coordinating Committee meeting of the 1998 U.S.-China Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technology (PUNT) Agreement in Washington, D.C., on April 9–12, 2012. Both countries reviewed progress made under each of the five PUNT working groups, explored common interests, and identified next steps to initiate, advance, and strengthen technical collaborations in nuclear safety and security. “The United States is pleased to host the 7th meeting of the U.S.-China PUNT Joint Coordinating Committee,” said Harrington. “Our PUNT activities represent longstanding cooperation between the United States and China to advance peaceful uses of nuclear technology. As nuclear power expands around the world, the United States and China share an interest in ensuring this growth is carried out responsibly.” The Joint Coordinating Committee meets annually to manage and oversee bilateral technical cooperation pursued under the PUNT Agreement. The PUNT agreement is a formal government-to-government mechanism established to support the civilian development of nuclear energy in both countries while addressing nuclear security, safety, and nonproliferation issues. “China and the United States recognize the significant benefits of using nuclear power and actively support the development of civil nuclear applications without compromising nuclear safety, security, and nonproliferation objectives,” said Deputy Director General Hao. “Under the PUNT framework, both sides continue to promote effective and efficient measures to enhance peaceful uses of nuclear energy and strengthen public acceptance by advancing nuclear technology research and development, providing personnel training, assuring reliable nuclear fuel supply, developing spent fuel and radioactive waste management concepts, and implementing Nuclear Security Summit objectives.”

#### US-China relations are superficial – cooperation’s always fails, but war is impossible

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Shortly after US President Obama and Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard sealed the bilateral defense deal in November 2011 under which 2500 US marines will be stationed in Australia came Obama's announcement on January 5 2012 of the new strategic defense guidance entitled Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for the 21st Century Defence. The document claims that China's rise might have impact on the US economy and security, and that countries such as China and Iran continue to pursue asymmetric means of countering US power projection capabilities.1 Both the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense refuted these claims, arguing that not a shred of evidence exists to support such wild accusations.2 Many media reports nevertheless argue that competition between the United States and China amounts to a new Cold War.3 This article discusses characteristics and trends in Sino–US relations, and in this connection answers the specific question: How do the characteristics of Sino–US relations affect trends in their bilateral ties? How much longer can Sino–US relations continue to follow current trends? Where will strategic competition between China and the United States lead? Different Views of Trends in Sino–US Relations The conflict between China and the United States at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Talks gave rise to the mainstream view within US academic circles that Sino–US ties are worsening. Paul Pedrozo and Seth Cropsy argued that competition between China and the United States was a necessary outcome of China's naval modernization.4 Robert Kaplan, meanwhile, contended that China's growing military capacities and economic power made heightened tensions in Sino–US relations inevitable.5 Thomas Christensen holds that relations between the two countries will come under stress as China shifts towards a hard-line policy with respect to its sovereignty and territorial claims.6 While in 2010 US academics blamed China for the deterioration in Sino–US relations, Chinese scholars regarded the worsening of ties in 2011 as obviously a result of the Obama Administration's beefing-up of its pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region. Scholars are nonetheless split on whether the pivot constitutes a strategy adjustment or a tactical adjustment. Those arguing the former predict long-term competition between China and the United States; those who see it as a tactical adjustment regard the deterioration in Sino–US ties as temporary, that is to say, Obama's pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region is part of his 2012 electoral strategy that he will drop after the elections and revert to his 2009 policy towards China. We identify three distinct views regarding the future of Sino–US relations. Pessimists argue that Sino–US relations are entering a new Cold War period. Henry C. K. Liu suggests that a new Cold War is brewing between China and the United States, but that it is more geopolitically framed than ideologically based, albeit couched in residual ideological polemic.7 William Jones goes as far as to expect conflict between China and the United States to culminate in a third world war.8 Yongnian Zheng also considers that East Asia is headed towards a new Cold War dynamic that has prompted developments on the Korean Peninsula.9 Mearsheimer holds that it is not possible for China to rise peacefully. He argues that ‘if China continues its impressive economic growth over the next few decades, the United States and China are likely to engage in an intense security competition with considerable potential for war. Most of China's neighbours, to include India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Russia, and Vietnam, will join with the United States to contain China's power.’10 Lawrence S. Wittner even infers the possibility of nuclear war.11 Those more optimistic about the future of Sino–US relations are primarily Chinese scholars, who generally believe that it is possible for China and the United states to avoid a new Cold War. Wu Jianmin argues that China will not as a matter of national policy enact the role of a hegemon, but follow the historical trend of peace, development and cooperation and absolutely reject war, competition and conflict. Under no circumstances, therefore, will China enter into a new Cold War with the United States.12 Wang Jisi has long held that while China and the United States will not become allies, nor will a crisis in their ties arise of an extent amounting to Cold War.13 Wang argues that the structural contradictions that appeared between China and the United States in 2010 are attributable to the narrowing gap in their respective comparative capacities which, conversely, have driven them further apart in terms of mutual understanding. Major issues such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and the exchange rate have had escalating negative impact on Sino–US ties and created higher levels of strategic suspicion rather than mutual strategic trust.14 This implies that as long as the United States and China bolster strategic trust they can prevent their bilateral relationship from slipping into a Cold War scenario. As distinct from these pessimists and optimists, we, together with a number of colleagues, argue that United States’ pivot towards the Asia Pacific represents a strategy adjustment. Competition between China and the United States will consequently grow, but this does not meet the criteria for a Cold War.15 We characterize the United States and China as ‘superficial friends’, and argue that as such they have a highly volatile relationship, apparent in shifts between good and bad periods.16 As, at least for the meantime, China and the United States have no desire to abandon their strategy of superficial friendship, the conditions necessary for a Cold War are not present. For example, although Obama supports a new defense strategy whose focus is on containing China, he purposely avoided any mention of China at the time he announced this new policy at the Department of Defense.17 Moreover, four days after the announcement, Obama sent Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to China to seek Beijing's support of US sanctions against Iran.18 As China and the United States will not for the time being abandon their superficial friendship strategy, Sino–US relations will hence not teeter towards Cold War.

#### **Alt cause to energy relations - solar tariff kills broader energy cooperation**

Barbier 12

[Edward B. Barbier is the John S. Bugas Professor of Economics, University of Wyoming, 5/28/12, <http://chinausfocus.com/energy-environment/can-the-us-and-china-cooperate-over-climate-and-clean-energy/>]

One of the few bright spots in recent international negotiations to replace the expiring 1997 Kyoto Protocol on curbing global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions has been the framework agreement concluded at the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP17) that took place in Durban, South Africa in December 2011. In addition to extending the Kyoto Protocol, COP17 produced the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action as the foundation for a prospective and comprehensive climate change agreement in 2015. However, the Durban Platform is most notable for securing the tentative inclusion of the United States and China – the world's two biggest GHG emitters – who were not signatories to the Kyoto Protocol. The Durban Platform may indicate that closer bilateral trade and economic ties between China and the US is fostering their cooperation on **a number of global issues**, including climate change. International trade and capital relationships between the two countries certainly reflect their increasing close economic ties. Around 17% of imports to the US, totalling $323 billion, are from its largest trading partner China. US foreign direct investment in China is $50 billion annually, whereas China investment in the US is $790 million per year. As the world's two largest economies, China and the US are also impacting the global environment, especially climate. Since 1950, the US has been responsible for approximately 29% of energy-related carbon dioxide emissions, and China for about 8%. However, in 2007 China surpassed the US as the world’s top annual emitter of GHGs. The two countries are now responsible for 40% of global annual GHG emissions. Thus, it is possible that closer economic ties between the US and China are also fostering bilateral cooperation on climate change and other global environmental problems. Increased cooperation between the US and China could in turn contribute to the success of multilateral negotiations. As a result, the Durban Platform may signal that it is in the mutual interests of China and the US to take the lead in global cooperation over controlling climate change. However, cooperation between the US and China is less evident in the case the promotion of clean energy. Here, more parochial national economic interests seem to dominate the incentives arising from bilateral economic ties. For example, the Obama Administration recently announced tariffs of 31% and higher on solar panels imported from China. These tariffs are in addition to the existing US duties of 2.9% to 4.7% on Chinese solar panels, which were imposed in March 2012 due to Chinese subsidies to their panel industry. The reasons cited for the new tariffs is that Chinese solar panels are accused of being "dumped" – i.e. sold at below fair-market value – in the United States. Certainly, Chinese solar panel imports have had a huge impact on the US market. The US solar industry, which includes manufacturing, installation and services, employs around 100,000 people. But it is panel manufacturing that cannot compete with Chinese imports, which last year amounted to $3.1 billion and now accounts for half of the US market. In addition, some US solar panel manufacturers have transferred their operations to China, to take advantage of the lower costs and subsidies there. This current confrontation over trade in solar panels arises from major differences in the Chinese and US approaches to clean energy development. China views expansion of clean energy as a sound long-term industrial and export promotion policy. It aims to be the world market leader in solar panels, water heating and batteries, wind turbines, fuel-efficient cars, high-speed rail, biofuels, and other clean energy industries. For a number of years, China has targeted development of these industries through combining pricing incentives, research and development subsidies, advanced production technology and economies of scale. This strategy is based on first supplying China's huge domestic market for clean energy as a springboard for exporting cheap manufactures to the rest of the world. For example, China is both the global leader in cumulative installed capacity and in exports of solar water heating. In 2010, China surpassed the US in terms of cumulative installed capacity of wind power, and is pushing hard to be a leading exporter to the rest of the world. Solar panel manufacturing is now following a similar pattern. In contrast, the US takes, at best, a piecemeal approach to promoting clean energy. There is no long-term US strategy for energy, let alone for clean energy development. The 2008-9 stimulus package enacted by the Obama Administration included a number of short-lived incentives to spur energy efficiency and renewable energy expansion, some of which are still in place. But a long-term industrial policy for promoting clean energy through R&D subsidies and price incentives remains politically controversial. Instead, state and even local governments enact a variety of regulations and incentives, and private industry is left to respond to market forces. Given this policy climate, restricting Chinese solar panel imports that compete with US manufactures is seen as both politically popular and economically expedient. However, protecting domestic clean energy manufacturing is no substitute for a long-term clean energy policy for the United States. For one, it may be counter-productive. By raising substantially the costs of solar panels, the US tariffs on Chinese imports could increase dramatically the expense of installing solar energy nationally and curtail employment. But most importantly, the solar panel trade dispute could lead to similar confrontations with China over other clean energy imports, such as wind turbines, solar batteries and biofuels. If clean energy trade disputes lead to worsening bilateral economic relations, then China and the US may have less incentive to pursue other mutual interests, such as reducing GHG emissions. It would be highly ironic, if not tragic, if a trade disagreement over clean energy undermines the fragile beginnings of US and China cooperation over global climate change.

#### Plan doesn’t solve relations – two missing I/Ls

#### Political Will – alt causes like solar tariff mean that China wouldn’t want to cooperate

#### Practical obstacles – Their 1AC Kadak evidence takes out their coop advantage – it says the structural obstacle preventing US-China energy coop is visas – specifically indicates the aff can’t be done without it

Kadak, 8/13/2008 (Andrew – Ph.D. Professor of the Practice Nuclear Science and Engineering Department at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review, p. <http://www.uscc.gov/hearings/2008hearings/written_testimonies/08_08_13_wrts/08_08_13_kadak_statement>.

US China nuclear energy cooperation is limited. China has recently joined the Generation IV International Forum which is focused on the development of the next generation of nuclear plants. Its entry into this international collaboration took many years to materialize. China has been an active participant with the International Atomic Energy Agencies initiatives aimed at nuclear cooperation. At present, there are international agreements with the Westinghouse Electric Co. for the purchase of the AP 1000 nuclear plants and with the MIT Nuclear Engineering Department on development of the pebble bed reactor. One of the difficulties in establishing international collaborations with China, which I hope this Commission can address, is the problem of granting Chinese scientists and engineers visas to allow them to come to the United States to meet with researchers, utilities and companies in the nuclear area. The process of technology exchange with China requires months of effort to obtain visas with outcomes in terms of actual attendance at meetings in the United States not decided until the last minute and most of the times visas are rejected. What this means for the United States is that most international meetings with the Chinese must be held outside of the United States to our detriment. Based on my experience with the Daya Bay plants, it would be very helpful to have Chinese engineers, managers and operators visit US plants for benchmarking of good performers so that they can directly observe how we run our plants. Such visits are extremely difficult to arrange. How has that cooperation changed over the past five years, and what prospects exist for continued cooperation? **The cooperation with the United States over the past five years has not changed due to the problems of granting visas for Chinese nuclear scientists and engineers. Visits are infrequent and can never be assured**. As past president of the American Nuclear Society and current Chairman of the International Nuclear Societies Council, I **can testify to the difficulty of obtaining visas for distinguished Chinese scholars** to receive awards and present papers at our conferences. If this problem can be solved, it’s expected that a great deal more cooperation and communication can be established for the mutual benefit of both countries. These benefits include the sale of US commercial technology, collaborative research and development, particularly in technologies which the United States is not a leader such as high temperature gas reactors.

#### US-China transparency over energy issues increasing now - recent climate dialog proves

Moarif 6/14/12 (Sara, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, "TOWARD GREATER TRANSPARENCY BETWEEN U.S. AND CHINA," <http://www.c2es.org/blog/moarifs/toward-greater-transparency-between-us-china>)

Over the past five years, countries have been working through the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to strengthen the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions worldwide. Because these issues are especially important to the United States and China, C2ES has been partnering with Tsinghua University to convene informal discussions among MRV experts from both countries. In late 2010 with Tsinghua, we organized a workshop in Beijing on Reporting Practices Related to Climate Change and Other International Challenges. This initial gathering focused on MRV at the international level. Last week, we co-hosted a second workshop in Washington, D.C., on Domestic MRV of Climate Efforts. While the issues can quickly become highly technical, it’s important to remember why stronger measurement, reporting and verification are so important: MRV contributes to stronger greenhouse gas mitigation by building confidence among countries, helps them track national and international progress, and provides opportunities to learn from one another’s experiences. In his opening remarks, Professor Teng Fei of Tsinghua University characterized MRV at the domestic level and MRV of international action as two sides of the same coin. The workshop provided an excellent overview of MRV practices and challenges in both countries (we’ll be posting a more detailed summary soon). From the U.S. EPA, Kong Chiu provided an in-depth look at EPA’s new Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, while Jeremy Schreifels shared significant insights from MRV experience under non-GHG cap-and-trade programs. Clare Breidenich and Michael Gillenwater described MRV efforts under California’s renewable energy standard and GHG trading program. From the Chinese side, Teng Fei provided an excellent overview of energy data reporting and verification in China, important for monitoring the national energy intensity target; Renmin University’s Wu Jian gave a superb overview of pilot sulfur dioxide (SO2) control programs in China; Tsinghua’s Wu Jian provided an exceptionally useful overview of the status of China’s pilot GHG trading programs; and Wang Lan of the China Building Materials Academy gave valuable insight into how China’s cement sector is likely to be asked to measure and report emissions. A couple of simple but important lessons stood out from both the U.S. and Chinese experiences. The first was the importance of working across multiple, often overlapping, government programs. Georgetown’s Joanna Lewis and the World Bank’s Xueman Wang, in sharing their key takeaways from the workshop, pointed out the challenge of ensuring coherence among different MRV systems in China, given co-existing national targets (emissions intensity, energy intensity, and renewable energy) and the range of instruments needed at all levels of government to meet them. It was noted that California, with its various GHG-related policies, faces similar challenges. Lending a private sector perspective, Jeff Hopkins of Rio Tinto emphasized the importance of coherence across MRV systems to companies operating in various jurisdictions, each with different GHG-control policies. The second lesson was that measurement, reporting and verification systems continuously evolve and improve over time. As countries around the world are looking to implement significant climate policies, starting implementation sooner, even with a more modest MRV system, may trump having a “perfect” system in place. In both China and the U.S., experience and capacity have built up over time, with policy monitoring feeding back into stronger policy design and implementation– ultimately allowing for greater efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on environmental objectives. Apart from these concrete policy lessons, it was also clear that the international dialogue around MRV has become less political since our earlier workshop in Beijing, perhaps reflecting the progress made on MRV issues at the last two UNFCCC conferences in Cancún and Durban. Discussion at the workshop was frank, relaxed, open, and based on a genuine desire to learn. For us, it was an encouraging sign that measurement, reporting and verification can indeed be a source of stronger cooperation and climate action.

#### Energy transparency is impossible absent cooperation through the EITI

Crowshaw and Ye 12 (Heather and Wang, U.S.- China Partnership for Environmental Law, Vermont Law School & China University of Political Science & Law, "Bridging the Transparency Gap: Catalyzing Meaningful U.S.- China Participation in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative for Energy Security," [http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Croshaw\_WangYe\_JRP\_Final(0).pdf)](http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Croshaw_WangYe_JRP_Final%280%29.pdf%29) \*\* EITI = Extractuve Industries Transparency Initiative

The U.S. and China see each other as competitors in the global energy scramble, particularly in Africa and post-conflict countries. The rhetoric in the U.S. often paints a negative picture, whereas China views the U.S. as being greedy. As a result, the two countries have a slight mistrust of each other, especially when dealing with energy resources. Thus, EITI can help bridge the transparency gap between the involvements of the two countries in resource-rich states, as well as promote global energy security. First, for both U.S. and China, promoting EITI would improve data sharing for market for energy information to help lower transactions costs, and understand actions of other energy market players. 193 This platform would provide an opportunity to understand the global energy market so that corporations operating abroad will be able to better negotiate with host governments. Both countries want fair competition for energy supplies, so EITI can aid in level the playing field. Second, EITI will help both the U.S. and China avoid conflict both domestically and abroad due to their foreign relations policies. China wants to avoid social unrest, political protests, and “discontent over its foreign relations, including cooperation and conflict over energy supplies. …[the] Chinese do value multilateral cooperation on energy and environmental issues, but [are] also relatively uninformed about the exact nature of their foreign energy ties…” 194 With China, their SOE often operate as a surrogate foreign diplomat, even if they do have greater autonomy than in years past. They still have to abide by Beijing’s foreign policy, thus weighing down on their efficiency and competitiveness. Furthermore, China’s extractive companies are willing to work in very hostile and politically unstable areas, such as Sudan and South Sudan, where killings and kidnappings are not uncommon. 195 EITI would help with the political instability and improve the governance over the mineral resources where the public and companies can hold the managers responsible. Third, EITI can assist with diplomatic relations, especially over minerals that cross territorial lines. For instance, if China and Japan (or Vietnam, Philippines, etc.) had to resolve their dispute over territorial claims in the East China Sea, the two countries could form a joint venture to develop the natural gas and oil resources, and EITI would publish how much revenue each country receives for the natural resources. 196 That way, citizens and their respective national governments will know how much each country earns. The two governments and citizens can hold China and Japan accountable for any misappropriation of funds. Additionally, for the U.S., EITI could assist with the division over the Artic circle extractive resources between the Article circle nations and tribal groups through transparency of contracts, statistical information of transactions, publication of revenues, and other capacities to ensure smooth diplomatic relations. Finally, the U.S. and China can spearhead EITI to include minerals required for green technologies within their own EITI reports, and not just traditional carbon minerals. The U.S. and China can help other countries rich in these important low carbon minerals to include the revenues in their own EITI reports, or encourage non-EITI countries to join the initiative. Also, China could lead the way for the other BRIC countries— India, Brazil, and Russia— in declaring support for EITI as a way to improve global energy markets and secure access to current and future energy resources. Overall, as the two largest energy consumers in the world, both the U.S. and China have much work to do for bridging the transparency gap on EITI knowledge, changing misperceptions about the initiative, and supporting its implementation around the world. U.S.-China cooperation within EITI will help increase global energy security through improving access to market information, empowering the public, increasing community participation, promoting sustainable development, improving government accountability, reducing corruption, minimizing military involvement, and encouraging corporate best practices and due diligence both home and abroad. U.S. and China can work towards trust over energy issues through raising awareness and educating the public about EITI and how it can improve governance in the energy sector. EITI can improve energy relations between the two nations through transparency and accountability, where the public and corporations can have a voice in how their governments manage natural resources for the public good.

#### **No US-China war – economics**

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

#### No war – China abides by international law and keeps a low profile

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Keeping Low Profile China's strategy of keeping low profile constitutes the political foundation of the superficial friendship between the United States and China. After 1989, in the face of sanctions and blockades from the West, Deng Xiaoping told Chinese policy makers: ‘In short, my views about the international situation can be summed up in three sentences. First, we should observe the situation coolly. Second, we should hold our ground. Third, we should act camly. Don’t be impatient; it is no good to be impatient. We should be calm, calm and again calm, and quietly immerse ourselves in practical work to accomplish something – something for China.’48 Deng Xiaoping's counterstrategy was later summed up as ‘keeping a low profile’. It was in 1995 that then Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen first introduced this principle of Chinese policy to the world.49 In 1998, President Jiang Zemin summarized the policy as ‘observe calmly, cope with affairs calmly, never seek leadership, hide brightness and cherish obscurity, get some things done.’50 The white paper on China's Peaceful Development issued in 2011 notes that, ‘As a responsible member of the international community, China abides by international law and the generally recognized principles governing international relations, and eagerly fulfills its international responsibility. China has actively participated in reforming international systems, formulating international rules and addressing global issues. It supports the development of other developing countries, and works to safeguard world peace and stability.’51

#### Disputes are compartmentalized

**Weekend Australian 4** (2-21, Lexis)

Even as recently as last year, the Bush administration imposed sanctions on Chinese firms accused of selling weapons technology to other nations, including Pakistan. But it seems the US right now is content to take on faith that Beijing means what it says over non-proliferation. There are timely reasons for that. Next week comes another round of six-nation talks aimed at getting North Korea to abandon its nuclear program convenes in Beijing. The US is relying heavily on China's influence with its recalcitrant neighbour to help bring about the desired result. The US is also trying to persuade China to join the Proliferation Security Initiative, a plan that seeks to halt the international trade in weapons of mass destruction by, among other measures, stopping and searching ships at sea. That is why Bolton was in Beijing. At the same time, China is seeking US assistance to rein in the independence proclivities of Taiwanese President Chen Shui-bian, who faces an election on March 20. So it is in China's interests to play ball by, for example, applying appropriate gravitas to the nuclear secrets allegations coming out of Washington. As the week's events showed, the US and China have built sufficient ballast in their once fragile relationship to weather the occasional battering and to manage multiple and sometimes conflicting agendas, from trade and human rights to arms proliferation and Taiwan.

#### No Asian War –

#### A) Economics

Eskildsen 9 (Robert, Assistant Professor of Japanese History – Smith College “Whither East Asia? Reflections on Japan’s Colonial Experience in Taiwan”, The Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-22, http://japanfocus.org/-Robert-Eskildsen/2058)

The Meiji Restoration gave Japan the flexibility to pursue changes in the diplomatic status quo in East Asia, but the changes carried with them enormous risks. Domestically, Japan implemented radical institutional changes in order to conform more closely to Western norms, but doing so alienated important constituencies—farmers and samurai—and ultimately provoked armed rebellion. In foreign relations, Japan set out to learn the norms of Western diplomacy and use them to clarify a number of border relationships: with Russia in the north, Korea in the west, and China in the south—through a complex intermediate zone that included the Ryukyu archipelago and Taiwan. The process of redefining Japan’s borders in the west and south proved particularly troublesome and embroiled Japan in a sustained challenge to China’s diplomatic supremacy in East Asia that involved gunboat diplomacy, diplomatic coercion and armed conflict. Although it involved no clash with Chinese forces, the Taiwan Expedition was the earliest of these armed conflicts.Fast forward to the present, and we see that some of the issues that clouded the future of East Asia in the second half of the nineteenth century have contemporary analogues, although the geopolitical context has changed dramatically in the last 150 years. The biggest difference in the geopolitical context, of course, is that all the states in the region, with the possible exception of North Korea, are committed to operating within the international system and they have developed a measure of economic interdependence. These factors will mitigate the possibility of armed conflict in the future. On the other hand, nationalism, the legacies of Japanese imperialism, World War II and the Cold War, and China’s growing economic stature already exacerbate diplomatic conflicts, and they undoubtedly will continue to do so for many years to come. Against this geopolitical backdrop, three contemporary strategic conflicts stand out as particularly troublesome.

#### B) Multilateral structures check escalation

Desker 8 (Barry, Dean – S Rajaratnam School of International Studies, “Why War is Unlikely in Asia: Facing the Challenge from China”, 6-4, http://www.iiss.org/conferences/asias-strategic-challenges-in-search-of-a-common-agenda/conference-papers/fifth-session-conflict-in-asia/why-war-in-asia-remains-unlikely-barry-desker/)

War in Asia is thinkable but it is unlikely.  The Asia-Pacific region can, paradoxically, be regarded as a zone both of relative insecurity and of relative strategic stability.  On the one hand, the region contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of resulting in a major war.  The region is replete with border issues, the site of acts of terrorism (the Bali bombings, Manila superferry bombing, Kashmir, etc.), and it is an area of overlapping maritime claims (the Spratly Islands, Diaoyutai islands, etc).  Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance, sitting astride key sea lines of communication (SLOCS) and important chokepoints. Nevertheless, the Asia-Pacific region is more stable than one might believe.  Separatism remains a challenge but the break-up of states is unlikely.  Terrorism is a nuisance but its impact is contained.  The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearization of the peninsula.  Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict (especially after the KMT victories in Taiwan).  The region also possesses significant multilateral structures such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the nascent Six Party Talks forum and, in particular, ASEAN, and institutions such as the EAs, ASEAN + 3, ARF which ASEAN has conceived.

### Solvency

#### HTGRs are unsafe – linked to chemical production, causes spectacular accidents

IAEA 10 (International Atomic Energy Agency Vienna, 2010 “High Temperature Gas Cooled Reactor Fuels and Materials,” March 2010, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/TE_1645_CD/PDF/TECDOC_1645.pdf>)

In principal, all methods of hydrogen production, except for the photolytic processes, can be linked to a nuclear reactor that can deliver electricity and process heat, respectively. Not every type of nuclear plant, however, is as equally appropriate for coupling with a hydrogen production technique. Conventional light water reactors (LWRs) have too low a coolant exit temperature to be able to supply process heat; they rather could be employed for hydrogen production via the electrolytic water splitting process. This low temperature, alkaline electrolysis process would immediately be feasible. It is a well established technology and does not require being located in close vicinity to the nuclear plant. It would be economical only in the case of a cheap electricity source (e.g., off-peak). Much more appropriate are high temperature gas-cooled reactors (HTGRs) with helium coolant exit temperatures of up to 950°C. The achievement of high coolant exit temperatures for the direct utilization of process heat was impressively verified in the German AVR reactor under long-term operation, and most recently in the Japanese HTTR. The connection between nuclear generated process heat and a heat application plant is principally independent of the method of hydrogen production. The hot coolant transfers its heat to the chemical process via an intermediate heat exchanger (IHX). The main purpose of the intermediate circuit is to clearly separate the nuclear heat source from the chemical island. The IHX serves the safety related purpose of precluding the direct access of the reactor primary coolant to the chemical plant and, in the reverse direction, preventing product gases from penetrating the reactor building. Thus it is possible – and that is the intention – to design the chemical side as a purely conventional facility and to have routine maintenance operations performed under non-nuclear conditions. Of particular significance is the consideration of possible **accident** scenario**s** in such a **combined nuclear and chemical facility**. Apart from their own specific categories of accidents, a qualitatively new class of events will have to be taken into account, characterized by interacting influences. Problems to be covered by a relevant overall safety concept are: the question of safety of the nuclear plant in case of a **flammable gas cloud n explosion** on the chemical side, or vice versa; and the question of what influence an accident-induced release of radioactivity will have on the continued operation of the chemical plant. But there are also more frequently expected events involving thermo-dynamic feedback in case of a loss of heat source (nuclear) and heat sink (chemical), respectively. For the specific example of the HTTR coupled with a steam-methane reforming device, the hazardous potential has been identified and evaluated, and resulted in a relevant proposal for a safety concept.

#### Extinction

Wasserman 2 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, Earth Island Journal, Spring, www.earthisland.org/eijournal/new\_articles.cfm?articleID=457&journalID=63)

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack.  Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation?  If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could **obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations** must be shut down.

#### No solvency – waiting time for a license prevents even demonstration from solving

O’Connor, 11 – Policy Fellow in AEL’s New Energy Leaders Project (Dan, 1/4. “Small Modular Reactors: Miracle, Mirage, or Between?” <http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/small-modular-reactors-miracle-mirage-or-medium/>)

Judging only by this promising activity, it is tempting to dub the SMR a miracle. But the majority of these diverse designs have yet to be demonstrated. In fact, the demonstration stage of the South African project, Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (a HTR), stalled and faded in 2010 after losing government funding due to lack of customer interest. The importance of demonstration, especially in the highly-regulated US industry, cannot be overstated. But **even in the stages before the crucial demonstration step, skepticism over the SMR’s promises abounds.** The ASME EnComm noted regulatory, financial, operational, and logistical challenges. Treading the uncharted waters of Lego-like power plant construction will not be easy. In a traditional plant, one reactor provides heat for one or a few steam turbines. In an SMR-based plant, each module drives one turbine with its own controls and operators. As such, few of the costs associated with these systems scale down with reactor capacity. The turbines do not come in a complimentary plug-and-play form either – they would have to be built on site. And while decentralization enables partial operation and online refueling, it also introduces the challenge of module co-operation, the need for numerous highly-trained operator personnel, and brand new reviews by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). This goes without mentioning the urgent and increased need for a more dynamic national approach to waste storage. Licensing questions remain too. The one-time approval of a module before its mass production, bypassing a regulatory damper for each unit, is a highly-desirable advantage of SMR design. But if a utility would like to increase its capacity over two decades by incrementally adding more modules, will it face the choice between building licensed, though dated, technology or waiting again for a license to build with state of the art modules? Furthermore, as addressed in my past article, “Putting the Cart Before the Horse with Nuclear R&D” and its comments, the waiting time even for a traditional design license is considerable. With each new SMR innovation, from an individualized control room to coolant choice, the licensing duration increases by as much as a decade, pushing the vital demonstration step further away. Additional costs associated with these regulatory complications and non-scalable systems could combine to nullify the SMR’s affordability argument.

#### HTGRs are slow to build and exceedingly expensive – no widespread adoption

Ryan 11 (D.A., Masters in Mechanical Engineering and a PhD in solar energy systems, “A critical analysis of future nuclear reactors designs,” 8-11-11, <http://www.green-blog.org/2011/08/11/a-critical-analysis-of-future-nuclear-reactors-designs/>)

All in all my conclusion is that the case for future Generation IV nuclear reactors is much narrower than the supporters of nuclear energy would have you believe. While they do offer some advantages over LWR’s, notably in the area of safety, his comes with strings attached, notably higher capital costs. This is largely a result of the fact that many of these would need to be built from much more exotic materials, such as high temperature stainless steel alloys, Nickel alloys or Refractory materials, while the predominant material of choice in current reactors is steel (stainless and forged ferritic) and concrete. This materials requirement is itself an issue related to the **high temperatures** these alternative reactors would be required to operate at, not to mention the more aggressive and corrosive environment in some of them, notably the MSR proposals. Of course one to question whether these higher **construction costs** (and in some cases higher decommissioning costs) are justified. But overall it is my conclusions that: The CANDU does close off some of the safety loop holes associated with LWR’s, but it opens up a whole slew of new ones too and generally means higher rates of fuel consumption, lower thermal efficiency and increased amounts of nuclear waste being generated. Indeed, the Canadian government may well have exhausted its patience on this one, as they recently sold the CANDU reactor business for the bargain basement price of $15 million, as well as writing off several billion in outstanding debts. Not exactly a vote of confidence! To me it seems to be a case of the Fed’s picking up the CANDU and throwing it in at the deep end of the pool to see if it will sink or swim. I’ll leave you to guess what’s most likely to happen! The High Temperature Gas Reactor (HTGR) offers an order of magnitude improvement in safety as well as potentially better fuel economy and high thermal efficiency. However, it will likely come at the expense of much **higher construction** costs (and probably a **slower construction** rate depending on material choices, which again depends on operating temperature), higher decommissioning costs and possibly higher volumes of **nuclear waste** (that last point I’ll admit is debatable, see the my post for more on that one). While the HTGR is fairly safe from meltdown scenarios, one would have likely weathered the Fukushima tsunami with minor damage, it also opens up a host of other safety issues, notably the potential **fire risk** associated with that graphite core (again a debateable point, see my full article here on this for more info). The Gas cooled Fast Reactor (GcFR) offers the intriguing possibility of being able to transmute stockpiles of nuclear waste into less dangerous forms. However, it comes with a rather hefty price tag with a lot of R&D work still outstanding as the design is only in the early concept stage of development (read we don’t know if it even works yet!). In any event it will not eliminate the need for some geological storage facilities given the length of time it would take to develop and then build a sizeable number of said reactors, not to mention store the waste after its passed through the reactor. This, plus the hefty price tag associated with GcFR’s, could well make the whole idea uneconomic. Also the GcFR comes with some safety issues (it is not nearly as safe as the HTGR) and a severe proliferation risk. The Molten Salt Reactor (MSR or LFTR) does offer a number of unique options in terms of safety improvements and improved fuel economy, plus reduced waste streams. However, its ability to achieve these goals is often heavily overstated by its supporters. Much like the GcFR above the design is at a very early stage in development, with much research into it abandoned back in the 1970’s. Any MSR reactor and its associated Chemical Processing Plant (CPP) would likely be expensive to build and slow to construct (again given the narrow and exotic nature of the materials choice the design enforces on us). Getting a decent thermal efficiency out of the plant might be problematic, which worsens the economic case for them. Also while certainly safer than a LWR in terms LOCA scenarios, the MSR comes with its own particular safety problems, notably that graphite core (fire!), the risks of a leak of radioactive material out of the CPP, or arguably worse a release of potential toxic and highly lethal fluorine gas. So all in all there may be a case for MSR’s, but its unproven at the moment and likely a much narrower case that its supporters would have you believe. Indeed probably the biggest enemy of the MSR design is its own nutty cheerleaders who badly need to stay off the Kool-Aid. Casing point, without hours of my analysis article going online they were already running up vast blog strings of flaming trolls galore (see comments section of my page) or starting e-mailing me anonymously with various badly typed swear-word filled comments. I even picked up one or two stalkers trying to find out who I was and where I lived (yes really)! You also see the odd comment involving half baked megloamanic schemes (such as burning off the biosphere for uranium). While the best I can tell, the advocates of the other reactor designs I reviewed seem to have taken their punishment “like men”, the MSR fans reached for the tinfoil hat and the two-litre bottle of kool-aid. I shall leave it to the reader to decide who should be taken seriously! Small to medium sized modular reactors do offer a good deal more flexibility in terms of how nuclear power could be used and yet a further improvement in safety. However, they also comes with lower economies of scale and thus higher construction costs and worse a slower rate of reactor roll out (at least in the early days). We could claw back on these two issues by mass producing said reactors in large volumes but as I point out (again see the full article), it is far from proven whether that would be **economically viable** and whether there is in fact a market for large numbers of small reactors.

#### No adoption – decommissioning costs

Ryan 11 (D.A., Masters in Mechanical Engineering and a PhD in solar energy systems, “A critical analysis of future nuclear reactors designs,” 8-11-11, <http://www.green-blog.org/2011/08/11/a-critical-analysis-of-future-nuclear-reactors-designs/>)

Also as I outline, the case for small reactors would also require a major shift in public opinion, which post-Fukushima is unlikely to be forthcoming. Most of the reactor designs I’ve mentioned above would be wholly unsuitable for “mass” production, only a handful of PWR, BWR and HTGR designs would be feasible options. Worse still, by and large mass production means “dumbing down” our design, and that means accepting a reactor that’s much cheaper and easier to build but has a lower thermal efficiency, a higher rate of fuel consumption and ultimately produces larger volumes of nuclear waste compared to our “mega” reactors. With the exception of a small number of narrow cases, it’s difficult to envisage how this would offer an improvement on the current status quo. **Decommissioning costs**, the Elephant’s still in the room! Not only are the construction costs of many of these proposed reactors higher, but for some (but not all) the decommissioning costs would actually be higher and worse they will generate more nuclear waste from this process. This being a particular problem for graphite cored reactors such as the **HTGR** and the MSR. Other Graphite cored reactors are proving to be something of a nightmare to decommission, as I discuss in the section on HTGR’s. As far as the spent fuel waste is concerned, some of these proposed reactors will indeed produce less, but others will actually produce more of it, thought it’s probably important to clarify what we mean by “more” or “less”. For example, CANDU as I point out, produces about 7 times (by mass) the amount of nuclear waste than a LWR. However, I’m quite sure the CANDU supporters will point out that because the waste from a CANDU is less radioactive it can be packed up much more tightly, reducing the size of any waste storage pen (but can it be packed sufficiently tightly to overcome that 7 times greater output?). At the other end of the scale the HTGR’s have a very high rate of fuel burn up, and so would produce a lot less nuclear waste (pound for pound) than a LWR. However, the waste from a HTGR is contained within a graphite matrix which increases its volume to a much larger size than LWR waste. Hence one has to question which reactor we can claim “produces less waste”. In a similar vein some of the waste output from a MSR will be mixed up with fluoride salts, from which it will have to be separated before going into long term storage. Disposal of said wastes have been described as “technically challenging” although certainly doable. It’s estimated that it’s going to cost some $130 million to process the waste from one tiny 8 MWth test reactor which ran for just over 5 years. Again it begs the question which reactor can truly claim to have the “smaller” waste footprint and the “cheaper” clean up bill. Thorium….only for comic book heroes? The Thorium cycle, as covered throughout my little study, does offer the option of solving some of the long term fuel supply issues surrounding nuclear energy. But the level to which it will do this is fairly narrow, as Thorium fuelled reactors still need fissile isotopes, drawn ultimately from Uranium, for startup purposes. Failing this they require the use of expensive (and generally uneconomic) fast reactors and reprocessing of spent fuel. So yes, while Thorium could help stretch things out, it can only help a little bit, but not nearly as much as the supporters of Thorium reactors would have you believe. Thorium fuelled reactors would still generate substantial quantities of nuclear waste and come with a number of potential proliferation risks attached. Even the UK National Nuclear Laboratories (NNL) pours cold water over the idea. Brayton Cycle and Hydrogen Production….rumours of Rankine’s death have been greatly exaggerated A proposal common to all Generation IV reactors, and some renewable power plant proposals (notably geothermal), is to use Brayton cycle instead of the Rankine cycle for power generation. This would offer a substantial improvement in terms of energy efficiency, and furthermore could bring down the costs of installation. However, there is still some work to do on this issue, so I won’t write off the Rankine cycle just yet! Similarly, the higher material limits required to raise reactor operating temperatures up to the level necessary to utilize the Sulfur-iodine process and make hydrogen directly (using the reactors heat) could well render the whole idea uneconomic. If we want hydrogen (from nuclear) that badly, build a reactor with a lower operating temperature out of cheaper materials, generate electricity and hook it up to an electrolyser! Less efficient yes, but likely cheaper. And if we really want hydrogen on the cheap, ditch the reactor and use CSP or wind energy! Fusion? Finally, I also had a look at Fusion power . This is the great white hope of nuclear energy and it has to be said we are making progress, but it’s a case of slow and steady progress. Indeed I would question whether we are in a position yet to even estimate how long it will take for fusion power to become commercial available…if indeed ever! Recent news from ITER is not positive, its now not due to go online till 2026, which would imply a completion of experiments in 2046. And it will take sometime beyond that before we wind up with a viable working commercial fusion reactor. As I speculate (here), it would likely be the latter half of this century (or the beginning of the next one) before we start to see Fusion play any sort of major role in mass global power generation. Also the first generation of Fusion reactors will be dependant on supplies of Lithium for fuel, of which there is only a limited global supply available, something that limits the amount of energy which can ultimately be generated from Fusion reactors, probably to between 8-20% of global energy use depending on whose figures you believe. Where does the other 92-80% come from? And of course we have to contemplate the possibility that commercial Fusion energy never arrives. While speaking personally, I still have confidence that the necessary breakthroughs will be achieved according to a reasonable timetable, it would be foolish to blindly assume that they will. To build any nations energy strategy on the forlorn hope that fusion power will arrive on the scene by a certain date, makes about as much sense as selling your house and all your worldly goods because some preacher told you the world was going to end on a particular date. Curb your enthusiasm! All in all, my conclusions are that the case for future Generation IV nuclear reactors is much narrower than the supporters of nuclear energy would have you believe – even the case for Fusion doesn’t look that clear cut! And again I would note that this last point about Fusion is important, the way the nuclear energy supporters (and indeed many politicians and members of the public) go on you’d swear Fusion was already a slam dunk. Nothing could be further from the truth! Nuclear energy supporters need to curb they’re enthusiasm for nuclear energy and accept that due to the high capital costs of reactor construction and the limited fuel supplies it will always only ever be a small bit player in a big energy market, at least as far as the **current century** is concerned. It currently generates about 1.9 – 5.1% of global energy (depending on how you do your maths) and I don’t see how it can be expanded beyond that level, indeed if they manage to maintain this level I suspect they’ll be doing well. Even the most optimistic nuclear energy program we can draw up still has a substantial energy gap and something else will have to fill it. This of course means we’ll need to rely on renewables for substantially more energy than we currently get from it. Which means many nuclear energy supporters need to overcome their pathological hatred of renewables and if they are truly serious about combating climate change (as many claim to be) then they need to quit trying to throw the baby out with the bath water.

## Round 2 2NC vs. Wake LM

### States Solvency – General/Framing 2NC

#### Their solvency deficits are 90% spin --- judge this through a lens of sufficiency --- the CP results in the plan, even if it uses a different process. Most solvency is in implementation. “Signal” only matters at the margin. All their 1AC evidence says this is good enough to solve the case. Even if the plan is a little better, you should compare the counterplan vs. the status quo, not the plan --- so a small deficit is really none.

#### None of their evidence assumes the counterplan which fiats uniformity – that solves any possible solvency deficit.

#### 50 State action solves better

Milford 10 (Lewis – The founder and president of Clean Energy Group (CEG), “Federal Climate and Energy Legislation and the States: Legislative Principles and Recommendations for a New Clean Energy Federalism”, April, http://www.cleanenergystates.org/assets/Uploads/CEGCleanEnergyFederalismv3April2010.pdf)

States should and will remain the laboratories of experimentation and innovation on technology and economic development because most energy investment decisions are made at the state and/or local utility and customer level. 2. State and local clean energy development decisions are made closer to the markets, are often more politically durable and stable over time, and should be encouraged. 3. There is no simple, standard or optimal clean energy program design and practice that will achieve carbon stabilization; instead, all states and local jurisdictions should be given adequate federal resources and assistance to create and implement a diverse portfolio of finance, technology, and policy tools to create the necessary fifty state programs to advance a clean energy future. 4. There are many existing, experienced and “best practice” state-based, clean energy institutions that deserve continued and expanded support for their decade-long successes in these areas. 5. States can develop more nuanced and effective finance mechanisms that can leverage private sector development because they know their markets, their market players and their barriers to success. 6. Bottom-up, distributed solutions that the states can provide have always proved the most responsive and nimble solutions that best respect the ever changing demands of locally regulated state energy investment decisions, which are the hallmark of the US energy sector. 7. States should be given express authority to enact climate and clean energy policy and laws that are more stringent and aggressive than the federal programs.

### States Solvency – A2: Uniformity/Signal

#### CP solves 100% of their signal arguments –

#### A) Investors watch state policy with a close eye and states send national-wide signal – that’s Bickers.

#### B) None of their evidence assumes uniformity – that’s the overview.

#### Independently – state action is influential and the nuclear industry likes the CP

Bickers 8 (Richard, Editor – NPO, quarterly journal published by the Nuclear Energy Institute, “The Trickle-Up Effect,” Nuclear Policy Outlook, Second Quarter, www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook\_June.pdf)

The nuclear energy industry is embracing the role states play in determining energy policy by reaching out to educate, organize and advise. Much of the outreach focuses on the environmental benefits of nuclear energy and the development of new nuclear power plants. “States are not waiting for the federal government to take action,” said Marshall Cohen, NEI senior director for state and local government affairs. “We know nuclear energy has to be and will be a part of that eventual equation, but it is important for us to act together now and take a proactive approach on this issue and others at the state level.” In the Lone Star state, Nuclear Energy for Texans is a coalition of decision-makers who advocate an increased role for nuclear power in a state already below accepted levels for reserve electric capacity. The coalition leadership includes state and local elected officials, representatives of business and industry, academics, and the scientific and engineering communities. Exelon has chosen a site in Victoria County, Texas, for a potential new nuclear plant, NRG is planning two new reactors at the South Texas Project and Luminant is considering expanding its Comanche Peak nuclear plant in Glen Rose, Texas. “We must have an energy mix in place that allows Texas to stay competitive as the need for power is expected to grow 48 percent by 2030,” said Tom Forbes, the coalition’s president. The group “believes nuclear energy must be part of that mix.” NEI is working with various national organizations to ensure state policymakers continue to consider nuclear energy, including NCSL, the National Governors Association and regional governors’ groups, NARUC, National Association of Attorneys General, and the National Association of Regional Councils. “You can make things happen in the states and move issues forward,” said Mike McGarey, NEI’s director of state and local government affairs. “They really are the laboratories of democracy and they can be very influential in Washington.” But there are challenges. “The legislative cycle can be long. With term limits, it can be difficult. Just getting it out there and in front of the legislature can be a big step,” NCSL’s Savage said. Introduction of a bill “gets the conversation going,” she said. Term limits, turnover and the policy environment “change from session to session. It’s more a matter of sticking with it than of perfect timing. “Many have come to the realization that nuclear should be a piece of [the energy] puzzle. Conversations are starting to happen. More are open to it,” Savage said. During the exploratory stage, policymakers “are very interested in finding out what other states are doing. They are looking at their neighbors. Minnesota had a hearing in April. Indiana this summer convened an interim study committee on the issue. Kentucky also explored the issue,” Savage noted. For Maryland’s Jameson, education is the logical first step for lawmakers and the public alike. Once education begins, other states will observe what Jameson observes frequently in Annapolis. “We are seeing legislators standing up on the floor and speaking about the need for nuclear energy,” she said. “And those statements go out to the whole world via the Internet. That’s huge. “It is not easy when you are trying to provide regulatory action for a new plant” that keeps government, public and corporate interests in mind, Jameson said. “We are creating an environment that will not overly impede plans for bringing a project to fruition,” she noted. Jameson believes nuclear energy “has an advantage” as a clean-air baseload generation source. “The wind does not blow 24 hours a day and the sun does not shine 24 hours a day. But that nuclear power plant operates 24 hours a day.”

#### -- Links to the Aff –

#### Federal law isn’t uniform

Goldsmith 97 (Jack, Associate Professor – University of Chicago, “Federal Courts, Foreign Affairs, and Federalism”, Virginia Law Review, November, 83 Va. L. Rev. 1617, Lexis)

There is thus good reason to believe that an asymmetry in likely political branch responses privileges judicial mistakes in creating a federal common law of foreign relations. The doctrine also suffers from other serious problems. Its standard-like inquiries suggest that its promise of uniformity in federal foreign relations law is illusory. There is every reason to expect that judges who lack training and expertise in foreign relations will reach different conclusions about the foreign relations consequences of particular state acts. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that most of the federal common law of foreign relations is made by the relatively decentralized lower federal and state courts. Casual empiricism confirms the prediction of nonuniformity. The many cases in which judges federalize an issue under a foreign relations rubric are matched by many similar cases in which judges, because they view the foreign relations effects of applying state law differently, decide to apply state law. [307](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=30e57da0c4e98dad4748fc94bcd482ae&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=4c3bbc49db3765e390d1f2e67acc99c4" \l "n307" \t "_self)  [\*1695]  This means that both the source and the content of the law are uncertain in these cases - hardly the good the federal common law of foreign relations is thought to serve.

#### No impact – lack of uniformity doesn’t affect solvency

Calabresi 95 (Steven G., Assistant Professor – Northwestern University, Michigan Law Review, Lexis)

Responsiveness to Local Tastes and Conditions. The opening argument for state power is that social tastes and preferences differ, that those differences correlate significantly with geography, and that social utility can be maximized if governmental units are small enough and powerful enough so that local laws can be adapted to local conditions, something the national government, with its uniform lawmaking power, is largely unable to do. [66](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=ee7ca1d6fbb003c7a6ecec5c625b6564&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAk&_md5=89cd79e3cd743db7d961de6128b607f0" \l "n66" \t "_self) Consider here the following example offered by Professor McConnell: Assume that there are only two states, with equal populations of 100 each. Assume further that 70 percent of State A, and only 40 percent of State B, wish to outlaw smoking in public buildings. The others are opposed. If the decision is made on a national basis by a majority rule, 110 people will be pleased, and 90 displeased. If a separate decision is made by majorities in each state, 130 will be pleased, and only 70 displeased. The level of satisfaction will be still greater if some smokers in State A decide to move to State B, and some anti-smokers in State B decide to move to State A. [67](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=ee7ca1d6fbb003c7a6ecec5c625b6564&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzb-zSkAk&_md5=89cd79e3cd743db7d961de6128b607f0" \l "n67" \t "_self) As McConnell's example shows, federalism can produce, at least in some admittedly abstract situations, a net gain in social utility. This lends credence to the argument made above that federalism sometimes can alleviate the problem of raw majority rule, the key problem generated by democratic government.

### States Solvency – A2: Funding

#### States can fund the plan – none of their evidence is comparative – states use a “rate-based” system that puts the upfront capital costs onto taxpayers and they can adjust rates periodically to reduce risks – that’s Yasonek. Prefer it – it’s newer and comparative.

### States Solvency – A2: Federal Preemption

#### No preemption for nuclear power

Sedler 93 (Robert A., Professor of Law – Wayne State University, “The Uses of Federalism,” American University Journal of International Law & Policy, Vol. 8, http://www.auilr.org/pdf/8/8-23-8.pdf)

Latent federal supremacy exists in the sense that Congress can restrict or prohibit a particular exercise of state power by federal preemption. However, a strong respect for state sovereignty contributes to a reluctance on the part of Congress to preempt state regulation and, correspondingly, a reluctance on the part of the Court to find that Congress intended to do so. 7 Preemption will only be found where (1) Congress has expressly preempted certain kinds of state regulation in the text of the federal law,' (2) an exercise of state power directly conflicts with an exercise of federal power,' and (3) in limited circumstances where Congress has impliedly intended to "occupy the field," so as to leave no room for any state regulation." Thus, federal regulation rarely preempts state regulation. Accordingly, the principle of concurrent power remains operative. Just as the federal government can exercise its power throughout the United States, each state can exercise considerable power within the boundaries of that state. Because the American federal system is comprised of two sets of sovereigns with concurrent powers, there is a great deal of overlapping regulation.

[Continues to Footnote]

See, e.g., Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941) (holding that federal law dealing with the registration of aliens preempts all state alien registration laws). "Occupying the field" preemption can occur when state regulation affects an area in which the federal interest is dominant. Id. This type of preemption also occurs when both the character and goal of the law are federal in nature. Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947). The Supreme Court has held, for example, that although the comprehensive federal regulation of nuclear energy preempts all state nuclear safety regulation, it does not preempt the states from regulating the economic aspects of nuclear power. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 461 U.S. at 222. The Court has further held that states are not preempted from allowing tort recovery of compensatory and punitive damages for the harm caused by the escape of hazardous nuclear energy materials. Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp., 464 U.S. 238 (1984).

### A2: Perm – Do Both

#### -- Links to politics – includes immediate federal action. Perm doesn’t shield: state support is slow. Delay means it won’t take effect until after the vote.

#### -- Impossible – CP transfers authority to the states. The federal government can’t do it while transferring authority to the states – if they can – it’s intrinsic because it adds a new time element that is neither in the plan or counterplan – that’s a voting issue

#### Federal policies crowd out the states—reduces demand for state action

Adler 7 (Jonathan H – Professor of Law and Co-Director, Center for Business Law and Regulation, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, ., “WHEN IS TWO A CROWD? THE IMPACT OF

FEDERAL ACTION ON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION”, 31 Harv. Envtl. L. Rev. 67, Lexis)

A second potential negative indirect effect of federal regulation on state regulatory choices is crowding out. This occurs because federal regulation **may serve as a substitute for state-level regulation, thereby reducing the benefits of adopting or maintaining state-level protections**. Insofar as voters in a given state demand a certain level of environmental protection, there is no reason to expect states to duplicate federal efforts when a federal program satisfies that demand, particularly if a state has not already created such a program. If the federal floor is greater than or equal to the level of environmental protection demanded by a state's residents, **that state has no reason to adopt environmental regulations of its own** once the federal government has acted. To the extent that this effect occurs, it is separate from--perhaps even in addition to--the signaling effect described above. The claim here is not simply that states regulate less than they would absent federal regulation--although this claim is almost certainly true. Rather, the claim is that some states that would adopt regulations more protective than the federal floor, absent the imposition of federal regulation, have not done so due to federal regulation and may not do so in the future. If this hypothesis is correct, the net effect of federal environmental regulation in at least some states could be less environmental protection than would have been adopted had the federal government not intervened. To see how this could occur, recall that the demand for environmental regulation in any given jurisdiction tends to increase over time as wealth, [\*99] technical capability, scientific knowledge, and environmental impacts increase. n131 In any given state (as in the nation as a whole), there is an initial period ("Period A") during which the demand for a given type of environmental protection is relatively low. The costs of adopting environmental regulations in this period are greater than the benefits of adopting any such protections. These costs include the costs of developing, drafting, and passing legislation; the costs of creating a new policy program, drafting and implementing regulations, defending the regulations from any potential legal or administrative challenges, creating a means to monitor and enforce regulatory compliance; and so on. In addition, there are opportunity costs of devoting state resources and political capital to the cause of environmental protection as opposed to some other policy goal. As discussed earlier, the demand for environmental protection has tended to increase over time along with increases in living standards. n132 At the same time, increases in technical knowledge and administrative efficiency may lower the costs of a given regulatory program. Eventually, a state will enter a second period ("Period B") in which the benefits of a given environmental regulatory program are greater than the costs of initiating, implementing, and operating such a program. Absent any federal interference, the hypothetical state will not adopt environmental regulations in Period A, but will adopt such regulations in Period B. See Figure 3. This is the environmental transition discussed in Part I. In Period A, the demand for environmental protection is insufficient to justify the costs of implementing environmental protection measures. By Period B, however, the demand for environmental protection has risen due to increases in wealth and knowledge, among other factors. At the same time, increases in technical capacity and scientific understanding have reduced the cost of adopting environmental protections. As a result, in Period B a state will adopt Q[B] amount of environmental protection. n133 [\*100] The timing of Period A and Period B will vary from state to state. This is clearly the case as different states have enacted different environmental regulatory measures at different times--some before the adoption of federal environmental regulation, some after, and some not at all. Looking at the history of various environmental concerns, such as air quality, water quality, or wetlands, it is clear that many states moved from Period A to Period B for these environmental concerns at various times prior to the onset of federal regulations in the 1970s. In many other states, however, a federal regulatory floor was adopted before the onset of Period B. [\*101] For states that went through their environmental transition and entered Period B prior to the enactment of federal environmental protection, whether the adoption of a federal regulatory floor increased the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state depended upon whether preexisting state policies offered greater or lesser levels of protection than the relevant federal policies. For states in which the onset of Period B begins after the adoption of federal regulations, the enactment of a federal regulatory floor will, at the time of enactment, increase the aggregate level of environmental protection in that state. However, this may not be the case over time. In states that desire a greater level of protection than that provided by the relevant federal regulations, it is not clear that the existence of the federal regulatory floor will result in an equal or greater level of protection than would be adopted were it not for the federal regulations. This is because federal regulation will, **to some extent, act as a substitute for state regulation**. As a result, the adoption of federal regulation has the potential to reduce the demand for state regulation and, in some instances, even result in less aggregate regulation in a given state than would have been adopted absent federal intervention. In short, federal regulation can crowd out state regulation. **The potential for such a crowding-out effect is illustrated** in Figure 4. The existence of federal regulation will reduce the demand for state regulation by an amount equal to the extent to which federal regulation is a substitute for state regulation of the same environmental concern (Q[FReg]). This substitution effect will reduce the net benefit of adopting state-level environmental regulations from OCQ[B] to OC'Q'[B]. By reducing the net benefits of state-level environmental regulation in this manner, federal regulation has the potential to crowd out state-level environmental protections, even if the quantity of environmental protection demanded in the state is greater than that provided by the federal government. In such cases, the aggregate level of environmental protection will be lower with federal regulation than it would be without it. [\*102]

### AT: 50 State Fiat

#### 1. Counter-interpretation – States counterplan is justified if we have a solvency advocate for our mechanism. Makes it predictable and core ground, and guarantees literature for the Aff to research.

#### All 50 states should implement energy policies

Milford 10 (Lewis – The founder and president of Clean Energy Group (CEG), “Federal Climate and Energy Legislation and the States: Legislative Principles and Recommendations for a New Clean Energy Federalism”, April, http://www.cleanenergystates.org/assets/Uploads/CEGCleanEnergyFederalismv3April2010.pdf)

States should and will remain the laboratories of experimentation and innovation on technology and economic development because most energy investment decisions are made at the state and/or local utility and customer level. 2. State and local clean energy development decisions are made closer to the markets, are often more politically durable and stable over time, and should be encouraged. 3. There is no simple, standard or optimal clean energy program design and practice that will achieve carbon stabilization; instead, all states and local jurisdictions should be given adequate federal resources and assistance to create and implement a diverse portfolio of finance, technology, and policy tools to create the necessary fifty state programs to advance a clean energy future. 4. There are many existing, experienced and “best practice” state-based, clean energy institutions that deserve continued and expanded support for their decade-long successes in these areas. 5. States can develop more nuanced and effective finance mechanisms that can leverage private sector development because they know their markets, their market players and their barriers to success. 6. Bottom-up, distributed solutions that the states can provide have always proved the most responsive and nimble solutions **that best respect the ever changing demands of locally regulated state energy investment decisions**, which are the hallmark of the US energy sector. 7. States should be given express authority to enact climate and clean energy policy and laws that are more stringent and aggressive than the federal programs.

#### 2. Neg flex – we have to test the plan from all possible angles. Key to fairness and the search for the best policy option.

#### 3. Education – devolution is a key issue for energy policy – how we decide to approach distribution of resources has an important implications for making energy production effective

#### 4. Its fair and not topical. They can read signal advantages, disads to state action, “race to the bottom”, or impact-turn politics. Hard debate is good: forces strategic thinking and makes it more fun. And, lots of literature exists – 1NC Bryner evidence proves that scholars debate about the devolution of energy production

#### 5. Not a voter – reject the argument, not the team. Err Neg – they get first and last speech and strategic advantage of case selection. Have a high threshold for theory – or else it’s incentivized at the expense of topic education.

#### 6. Predictable – energy production is a core state issue – all our solvency evidence proves states are implementing a variety of energy programs now

### 2NC No Prolif

#### It’s not widespread – Hymans says that there are too many problems with startups or workers despite the efforts – this assumes their nuclear inevitability claims

#### Prefer our evidence – it’s predictive of dispersal of tech and knowledge

#### Prolif will be slow and limited – Yusuf ev says

#### Forecasts on prolif are over estimated because the projections are based on tech not intent –

#### Alarmism makes it slow – post Cold War the threat has greatly decreased

#### We’ve got empirics – their author exaggerate

Farley 11, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, (Robert, "Over the Horizon: Iran and the Nuclear Paradox," 11-16, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox))

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. Israel represents another case in which the benefits of nuclear weapons remain unclear. Although Israel adopted a policy of ambiguity about its nuclear program, most in the region understood that Israel possessed nuclear weapons by the late-1960s. These weapons did not deter Syria or Egypt from launching a large-scale conventional assault in 1973, however. Nor did they help the Israeli Defense Force compel acquiescence in Lebanon in 1982 or 2006. Nuclear weapons have not resolved the Palestinian question, and when it came to removing the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, Israel relied not on its nuclear arsenal but on the United States to do so -- through conventional means -- in 2003. Israeli nukes have thus far failed to intimidate the Iranians into freezing their nuclear program. Moreover, Israel has pursued a defense policy designed around the goal of maintaining superiority at every level of military escalation, from asymmetrical anti-terror efforts to high-intensity conventional combat. Thus, it is unclear whether the nuclear program has even saved Israel any money. 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. None of these lies are particularly dishonorable; they represent the normal course of diplomacy. But they are lies nevertheless, and serious analysts of foreign policy and international relations need to be wary of them. Nonproliferation is a good idea, if only because states should not waste tremendous resources on weapons of limited utility. Nuclear weapons also represent a genuine risk of accidents, especially for states that have not yet developed appropriately robust security precautions. Instability and collapse in nuclear states has been harrowing in the past and will undoubtedly be harrowing in the future. All of these threats should be taken seriously by policymakers. Unfortunately, as long as deception remains the rule in the practice of nuclear diplomacy, exaggerated alarmism will substitute for a realistic appraisal of the policy landscape.

#### No domino theory—nonproliferation has zero utility

Potter 8 William C. Potter is Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar Professor of Nonproliferation Studies and Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, Summer 2008, Divining Nuclear Intentions, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v033/33.1.potter.pdf

Hymans is keenly aware of the deficiency of past proliferation projections, which he attributes in large part to the “tendency to use the growth of nuclear capabilities, stances toward the non-proliferation regime, and a general ‘roguishness’ of the state as proxies for nuclear weapons intentions” (p. 217). Such intentions, he believes, cannot be discerned without reference to leadership national identity conceptions, a focus that appears to have been absent to date in intelligence analyses devoted to forecasting proliferation.49 Hymans is equally critical of the popular notion that “the ‘domino theory’ of the twenty-first century may well be nuclear.”50 As he points out, the new domino theory, like its **discredited Cold War predecessor,** assumes an oversimplified view about why and how decisions to acquire nuclear weapons are taken.51 Leaders’ nuclear preferences, he maintains, “are not highly contingent on what other states decide,” and, therefore, “**proliferation tomorrow will** probably **remain as rare as proliferation today**, with **no single instance of proliferation causing a cascade** of nuclear weapons states” (p. 225). In addition, he argues, the domino thesis embraces “an exceedingly dark picture of world trends by lumping the truly dangerous leaders together with the merely self assertive ones,” and equating interest in nuclear technology with weapons intent (pp. 208209). Dire proliferation forecasts, both past and present, Hymans believes, flow from four myths regarding nuclear decisonmaking: (1) states want the bomb as a deterrent; (2) states seek the bomb as a “ticket to international status”; (3) states go for the bomb because of the interests of domestic groups; and (4) the international regime protects the world from a flood of new nuclear weapons states (pp. 208216). Each of these assumptions is faulty, Hymans contends, because of its fundamental neglect of the decisive role played by individual leaders in nuclear matters. As discussed earlier, Hymans argues that the need for a nuclear deterrent is entirely in the eye of the beholder—a leader with an oppositional nationalist NIC. By the same token, just because some leaders seek to achieve interna tional prestige through acquisition of the bomb, it does not mean that other leaders “necessarily view the bomb as the right ticket to punch”: witness the case of several decades of Argentine leaders, as well as the Indian Nehruvians (pp. 211212). The case of Egypt under Anwar al-Sadat, though not discussed by Hymans, also seems to at this category. Hymans’s focus on the individual level of analysis leads him to discount bu reaucratic political explanations for nuclear postures, as well. Central to his argument is the assumption that decisions to acquire nuclear weapons are taken “without the considerable vetting that political scientists typically assume precedes most important states choices” (p. 13). As such, although he is prepared to credit nuclear energy bureaucracies as playing a supporting role in the ef forts by Australia, France, and India to go nuclear, he does not observe their influence to be a determining factor in root nuclear decisions by national lead ers. Moreover, contrary to a central premise of Solingen’s model of domestic political survival, Hymans ands little evidence in his case studies of leaders pursuing nuclear weapons to advance their political interests (p. 213). For ex ample, he argues, the 1998 nuclear tests in India were as risky domestically for Vajpayee as they were internationally (p. 214). Most provocatively, Hymans invokes an individual-centric mode of analysis to challenge the **necessity and utility** of a strong international nonproliferation regime. As discussed in a preceding section, he finds **no evidence** that the NPT regime prevented **any** of the **leaders who desired nuclear weapons from pursuing them**.

### 2NC Prolif Leadership Fails

#### They can’t solve nuclear leadership or proliferation – multiple reasons:

#### First – it’s an outdated tool – tech for proliferation is already widespread – US has limited influence and can hardly deter – that’s Weiss. Prefer our evidence – theirs assumes the peak of nuke power development when supply was limited.

#### 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.

#### Second – hypocrisy – US push for non-enriched nuclear power causes blowback of its contradictory stance – that’s Caldicott. States will use this as a tool to ignore the US.

#### Third – waste management – it shows that US has poor technology making the US an international standard for failed nuclear power – that’s Moniz.

#### US won’t exert prolif leadership

Cleary 12 (Richard Cleary, American Enterprise Institute Research Assistant, 8/13/12, Richard Cleary: Persuading Countries to Forgo Nuclear Fuel-Making, npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1192&tid=30)

The cases above offer a common lesson: The U.S., though constrained or empowered by circumstance, can exert considerable sway in nonproliferation matters, but often **elects not to apply the most powerful tools at its disposal for fear of jeopardizing other objectives**. The persistent dilemma of how much to emphasize nonproliferation goals, and at what cost, has contributed to cases of **nonproliferation failure**. The inconsistent or incomplete application of U.S. power in nonproliferation cases is most harmful when it gives the impression to a nation that either sharing sensitive technology or developing it is, or will become, acceptable to Washington. U.S. reticence historically, with some exceptions, to prioritize nonproliferation—and in so doing reduce the chance of success in these cases—does not leave room for great optimism about future U.S. efforts at persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making.

#### A distinctions why prolif leadership fails –

#### the aff can’t solve simply through benign tech transfer—IF economics were the only thing that drove nuclear plant decisions, then obviously there would never be prolif because it’s EXPENSIVE

Lewis 12 (Jeffrey Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation, 8/1/12, It's Not as Easy as 1-2-3, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/01/it\_s\_not\_as\_easy\_as\_1\_2\_3?page=full)

Creating market incentives to discourage the spread of enrichment and reprocessing seems like a reasonable thing to do - except that most **states make nuclear decisions on something other than a cost basis**. Nuclear power enthusiasts have been no strangers to wishful thinking, starting with claims that nuclear energy would be "too cheap to meter." Government decisions about nuclear power tend to **prioritize** concerns about **sovereignty** and keeping technological pace with neighbors. It is not hard to see national nuclear programs as something akin to national airlines - money-losing prestige projects that barely take market forces into account. Often, aspiring nuclear states look to countries like the United States and Japan as models. If such countries invest heavily in fuel-cycle services, developing states might **try to copy** them **rather than** simply **become** their **customers**.

### 2NC Nuclear Taboo

#### 1NC Wellen ev says pop culture made the taboo – deterrence is the real factor – if there’s not certainty of retaliatory response that increases the chances that a foe would use first strike

#### Nuclear taboo fails – doesn’t prevent escalation

Berry 10 (Ken Berry, Patricia Lewis, Benoît Pélopidas, Nikolai Sokov and Ward Wilson, “Delegitimizing Nuclear Weapons: Examining the validity of nuclear deterrence,” May 2010, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, <http://cns.miis.edu/opapers/pdfs/delegitimizing_nuclear_weapons_may_2010.pdf>)

In the end, it is possible that the belief in what we call the traditional legitimacy of nuclear weapons is but a reflection of the fear of uncertainty. Nuclear weapons have been with us for over six decades, and many have come to regard a non-nuclear world as a big unknown. What will happen when nuclear weapons disappear? Isn‘t a known danger better than an unknown? Maybe the new world will be better than the one we know, but what if it is more dangerous? These fears could sublimate themselves in the search for reasons to keep nuclear weapons around, if only for a bit longer. Of course the world will change without nuclear disarmament and dangers will wax and wane. We must understand, however, that this situation cannot continue indefinitely and that every year nuclear weapons continue to exist and enjoy a degree of legitimacy and value makes their spread – and perhaps their use – more likely. Indeed, time should not be considered as strengthening the taboo on the battlefield use of nuclear weapons for two reasons. First and foremost, **the taboo does not reduce the risk of accidents.** The last sixty-five years have already offered a significant series of events in which the absence of use was mostly due to luck. 22 Second, the case for the taboo has **only been made** convincingly for the United States. 23 Overall, this reluctance to use nuclear weapons could be portrayed more accurately as a tradition, or an informal regime, which needs to be nurtured. The distinction between taboo and tradition builds upon the following elements. First, social taboos like incest and cannibalism are not assessed by a **cost-benefit analysis**. Whereas decisions to threaten or use nuclear weapons, contemplated on several occasions, have included a cost-benefit approach. Second, a taboo implies an inevitable and severe punishment if broken. There is no formal punishment laid down for violation of the **so-called nuclear taboo**, although there is a wide perception that the use of such weapons would incur international condemnation and any moral high ground previously held by a country that used them would be lost. However, the threat of use of nuclear weapons was not condemned by the International Court of Justice‘s (ICJ‘s) 1996 advisory opinion, strongly suggesting that the taboo is at best incomplete and should be approached as a tradition. Like others, this tradition can be – and has indeed **been – contested** in recent years. 24

### 2NC No Risk

#### Nuclear terror isn’t a thing Walt –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

### 2NC Coop High Now

#### Energy coop now – they’ve had PUNT meetings over it as of April and have established a framework for peaceful uses of nuclear energy – assumes their internal links

### Superficial Friendship 2NC

#### Extend that US-China relations are superficial – the last 50 year have been defined as natural ups and downs – there’s no chance for conflict or effective cooperation – that’s Haixia.

#### Prefer our evidence – it provides the most holistic studies and explains the overall nature of relations. Their evidence is too old and not qualified.

### 2NC Plan doesn’t solve relations

#### Political Will – China is angry because our solar tarrifs kill their industry – that’s causing energy trade conflict now – that’s Barbier

#### Either you impacts inevitable b/c trade war now

#### or it proves energy issues don’t spark tension with China

#### Practical Obstacles – their Kadak ev says to establish the relationship fully they need visas – plan doesn’t solve that – too difficult and takes too long any ways

### 2NC Trasparency

#### China’s is becoming transparent – Moarif ev says that China is releasing reports on energy data – it cites the Fei report specifically – it’s less politically contentious to them now

## Round 2 1NR vs. Wake LM

### 2NC Transparency Alt Causes

#### 1NC Crowshaw & Ye says that energy transaparency is impossible without cooperation on EITI

#### 2 reasons

#### Data Sharing – we don’t have access to the numbers

#### Mineral – there is tension of trading

### No War 2NC

#### Economics – Shor ev says that China is the largest holder of US economy – that mitigates any physical conflict

#### International Sphere – China is active in peacemaking – they’ve been keeping a low profile while recognizing international norms and rules – means they won’t risk instability or chaos

#### Disputes are compartmentalized – Weekend Australian cites Taiwan and Bush sanctions

### 2NC No Asia War

#### EXTEND No Asian War –

#### A) Economics

Eskildsen 9 (Robert, Assistant Professor of Japanese History – Smith College “Whither East Asia? Reflections on Japan’s Colonial Experience in Taiwan”, The Asia-Pacific Journal, 3-22, http://japanfocus.org/-Robert-Eskildsen/2058)

The Meiji Restoration gave Japan the flexibility to pursue changes in the diplomatic status quo in East Asia, but the changes carried with them enormous risks. Domestically, Japan implemented radical institutional changes in order to conform more closely to Western norms, but doing so alienated important constituencies—farmers and samurai—and ultimately provoked armed rebellion. In foreign relations, Japan set out to learn the norms of Western diplomacy and use them to clarify a number of border relationships: with Russia in the north, Korea in the west, and China in the south—through a complex intermediate zone that included the Ryukyu archipelago and Taiwan. The process of redefining Japan’s borders in the west and south proved particularly troublesome and embroiled Japan in a sustained challenge to China’s diplomatic supremacy in East Asia that involved gunboat diplomacy, diplomatic coercion and armed conflict. Although it involved no clash with Chinese forces, the Taiwan Expedition was the earliest of these armed conflicts.Fast forward to the present, and we see that some of the issues that clouded the future of East Asia in the second half of the nineteenth century have contemporary analogues, although the geopolitical context has changed dramatically in the last 150 years. The biggest difference in the geopolitical context, of course, is that all the states in the region, with the possible exception of North Korea, are committed to operating within the international system and they have developed a measure of economic interdependence. These factors will mitigate the possibility of armed conflict in the future. On the other hand, nationalism, the legacies of Japanese imperialism, World War II and the Cold War, and China’s growing economic stature already exacerbate diplomatic conflicts, and they undoubtedly will continue to do so for many years to come. Against this geopolitical backdrop, three contemporary strategic conflicts stand out as particularly troublesome.

#### B) Multilateral structures check escalation

Desker 8 (Barry, Dean – S Rajaratnam School of International Studies, “Why War is Unlikely in Asia: Facing the Challenge from China”, 6-4, http://www.iiss.org/conferences/asias-strategic-challenges-in-search-of-a-common-agenda/conference-papers/fifth-session-conflict-in-asia/why-war-in-asia-remains-unlikely-barry-desker/)

War in Asia is thinkable but it is unlikely.  The Asia-Pacific region can, paradoxically, be regarded as a zone both of relative insecurity and of relative strategic stability.  On the one hand, the region contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of resulting in a major war.  The region is replete with border issues, the site of acts of terrorism (the Bali bombings, Manila superferry bombing, Kashmir, etc.), and it is an area of overlapping maritime claims (the Spratly Islands, Diaoyutai islands, etc).  Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance, sitting astride key sea lines of communication (SLOCS) and important chokepoints. Nevertheless, the Asia-Pacific region is more stable than one might believe.  Separatism remains a challenge but the break-up of states is unlikely.  Terrorism is a nuisance but its impact is contained.  The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearization of the peninsula.  Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict (especially after the KMT victories in Taiwan).  The region also possesses significant multilateral structures such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the nascent Six Party Talks forum and, in particular, ASEAN, and institutions such as the EAs, ASEAN + 3, ARF which ASEAN has conceived.

**Accidents Turn Extension**

**1NC IAEA ev says combination of hydrogen production and nuclear plants poses a unique risk for an accident – it can cause explosion of flammable gas clouds – that causes extinction because lethal clouds will wipe us out – that’s Wasserman**

**HTGRs are inherently unsafe – cause accidents and explosions**

**Schwartztrauber 10** (Keith, “Not So Fast with Thorium,” November-December 2010 Volume 98, Number 6 Page: 445 DOI: 10.1511/2010.87.445)

Robert Hargraves and Ralph Moir’s article “Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactors” (July–August) was a pleasure to read but stirred concern in me. I have studied many reactor concepts dating to the 1960s. The authors correctly note advantages to the thorium fuel cycle. Given the **commercial failures** of the thorium-based high-temperature gas-cooled reactor (**HTGR**) and the demise of the thorium-based Shippingport light-water breeder reactor (LWBR), however, I don’t envision the liquid fluoride thorium reactor concept playing a central role. The developmental, **technical**, **safety**, regulatory **and financial** challenges are probably insurmountable. U.S. nuclear reactors are constructed with solid fuel, metal cladding, water coolant, high integrity pressure vessels and piping, and concrete and steel pressure containments. For sound reasons, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission required their designers to assume that the system’s largest pipe could **instantly rupture** and release reactor coolant to the containment. It was assumed that large fractions of the reactor core fission products and any hydrogen generated would be released. In the case of the HTGR, this included potential graphite-water reactions (yielding hydrogen) and graphite-air reactions (**yielding fire**) in the core. With the liquid fluoride thorium reactors (LFTRs), a total loss of coolant is equivalent to a total loss of the liquid core, fuel and blanket materials to the containment. Since the liquid fluoride operates at temperatures of 800 degrees Celsius, it is quite likely that UF4, ThF4 and fission by-products would react with other materials to cause a **criticality event**, major fires **and**/or **explosions**. I find it hard to believe that anyone would endorse building new reactors using such a chemically complex, potentially unsafe, environmentally hazardous, and unproven technology.

**Condo**

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**—there was only 1 conditional advocacy, our interpretation is that you can have one condo, and it didn’t contradict with any of our other advocacies

**Prices**

**Not going for it – concede their uniqueness evidence that alt causes make price spikes inevitable – things that the plan can’t solve like cheap natural gas, and EPA regulations all cause price spikes regardless of their ability to solve manufacturing which doesn’t happen for a LONG LONG TIME**

**1NR - Overview**

**Russia war outweighs the aff – Romney will collapse relations with Russia because of he won’t cooperate on BMD and Putin hates him**

**It’s the only existential threat**

**Bostrum 2**, 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 their prolif leadership impact – Their Haynes evidence concedes that only OBAMA solve their HTGRS relations addon later in the flow, it says “the President wants to move forward with a civilian nuclear energy agreement with Russia”, Putin doesn’t want to cooperate with Romney**

**Prefer timeframe over magnitude, the election is in a month - we both inevitably get to extinction it’s just a question of who gets there first – so you should prefer our Romney collapses Russian relations in the short term scenario because the case debate proves that we have multiple avenues of cooperating with China**

**Romney election leads to China bashing --- results in a trade war**

**Palmer**, 3/27/**2012** (Doug, Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation-adviser, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328)

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney is looking at ways to **increase pressure on China** over what he sees as currency manipulation and unfair subsidy practices, a Romney campaign adviser said on Tuesday. "I think he wants to maximize the pressure," Grant Aldonas, a former undersecretary of commerce for international trade, said at a symposium on the future of U.S. manufacturing. Aldonas served at the Commerce Department under Republican President George W. Bush. Romney, the front-runner in the Republican race to challenge President Barack Obama for the White House in November, has promised if elected he would quickly label China a currency manipulator, something the Obama administration has **six times declined to do**. That would set the stage, under Romney's plan, for the **U**nited **S**tates to impose countervailing duties on Chinese goods to offset the advantage of what many consider to be China's undervalued currency. Last year, the Democratic-controlled Senate passed legislation to do essentially the same thing. However, the measure has stalled in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where leaders say they fear it could start a **trade war**, and the Obama administration has not pushed for a House vote on the currency bill. The U.S. Treasury Department on April 15 faces a semi-annual deadline to declare whether any country is manipulating its currency for an unfair trade advantage. The department, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has not cited any country since 1994, when China was last named. Asked if Romney was serious about declaring China a currency manipulator, Aldonas answered: "**He is**."

.

**1NR – Uniqueness**

**Group the uniqueness debate – our Silver evidence indicates that Obama has an 86% chance of winning while winning a 4.1% lead in the popular vote**

**And 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 uniqueness ev that Romney is winning isn’t from a statisiticain but an op-ed from a CFO of a company**

**Obama will win – jobs and swing states**

**Espo and Thomas October 5** (David and Ken, reporters at AP, <http://www.bradenton.com/2012/10/05/4227714/jobs-report-gives-obama-much-needed.html>, accessed: 5 October 2012, JT)

FAIRFAX, VA. — Mitt Romney was still celebrating his widely praised debate performance when the campaign lurched in a different direction.¶ Unemployment dropped last month to the lowest level since 2009, and suddenly it was President Barack Obama's turn to smile.¶ In a race dominated by the weak economy, Obama said Friday the creation of 114,000 jobs in September, coupled with a drop in unemployment to 7.8 percent, was "a reminder that this country has come too far to turn back now." Jabbing at his rival's plans, he declared, "We've made too much progress to return to the policies that caused this crisis in the first place."¶ But Romney saw little to like in the day's new government numbers.¶ "This is not what a real recovery looks like," the former Massachusetts governor and businessman said, an analysis echoed by other Republicans throughout the day. "We created fewer jobs in September than in August, and fewer jobs in August than in July, and we've lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs since President Obama took office," Romney added.¶ "If not for all the people who have simply dropped out of the labor force, the real unemployment rate would be closer to 11%," he said.¶ Incumbent and challenger alike campaigned in battleground states during the day, each man starting out in Virginia before the president headed for Ohio and Romney flew to Florida. Those three states, along with Colorado, Nevada, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, North Carolina and Iowa make up the nine battleground states where the race is likely to be decided. Among them, they account for 110 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.¶ Recent polls have shown Obama with leads in most if not all of them, although the impact of Wednesday night's debate and of the drop in unemployment could well change some public opinion.

**1NR - AT: Link N/U**

**Loan guarantees don’t thump – the deal hasn’t been finalized and the nuke industry itself doesn’t see it as an incentive**

**Fox Business 9/18/12** ("Top Nuclear Lobbyist Criticizes U.S. Loan Program," http://www.foxbusiness.com/news/2012/09/18/top-nuclear-lobbyist-criticizes-us-loan-program/)

The nuclear-power industry's top lobbyist on Tuesday **criticized** the **Obama** administration **for delays in granting a loan guarantee** to Southern Co. (SO), a public airing of frustration with private negotiations that have been ongoing for years.¶ The nuclear-power loan-guarantee program "is **still not being implemented effectively,"** Marvin Fertel, chief executive of the Nuclear Energy Institute, the industry's main trade group, said Tuesday. He called the lack of progress "appalling" and said the institute **was "perplexed**" that the Southern deal isn't yet complete.¶ Mr. Fertel said the deal, in which the Department of Energy would guarantee about $8.33 billion in financing for two new nuclear-power reactors at an existing plant in Georgia, "is almost zero risk to the government" because the utility was placing the financing on its own balance sheet.¶ Southern Co., which has been negotiating with the department for years, said Tuesday those talks are continuing, and there is no schedule for closing.¶ "The company will not agree to anything that's not in the best interest of its customers," said Southern Co. spokesman Steve Higginbottom. "The company's exceptional financial strength and 30-year history of safely operating nuclear plants make it a solid, credit-worthy candidate for the DOE loan guarantee."¶ The Department of Energy, in a statement from spokesman Damien LaVera, said it was negotiating not only with Southern but with two other Georgia utilities that own shares in the new plant.¶ "This is a complicated, first-of-its-kind deal involving three different borrowers. Each of these loans has different structures and may have different closing dates," Mr. LaVera said.¶ The statement didn't address Mr. Fertel's comments directly. Mr. LaVera said the department was "continuing to work closely with all parties involved."¶ The new reactors are already under construction, and Mr. Higginbottom said Southern Co. will raise capital privately if it doesn't receive federal financing.¶ The two sides reached a milestone in February 2010, when they disclosed agreement on initial terms of a loan guarantee. **But the deal still hasn't been finalized,** even though Southern Co. received a federal license for the facility in February 2012.

**No actual federal incentives for SMRs now and DOE grants haven’t been disbursed - doesn't thump the DA**

**Mulholland 9/24/12** (Jessica, Government Technology, "Mini-Nukes Advancing in South Carolina," http://www.govtech.com/transportation/Mini-Nukes-Advancing-in-South-Carolina.html)

South Carolina and its Savannah River Site (SRS), located in Aiken, along with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) announced three public-private partnerships to develop small, modular nuclear reactors (SMRs) technologies at the SRS facility in an effort to advance the next generation of nuclear energy technology. The agreement will "help leverage Savannah River's land assets, energy facilities and nuclear expertise to support potential private sector development, testing and licensing of prototype SMR technologies," the DOE said in a released statement.¶ Helen Belencan, the DOE’s deputy assistant manager for Infrastructure and Environmental Stewardship at the Savannah River Site, said the goal is “to apply the nuclear knowledge and expertise that we have from over 60 years of supporting the nation in its defense-type operation in nuclear material production and help these companies develop the technology and manufacturing capability in the United States so that the United States can take on a leadership role in the manufacturing of these small modular reactors.”¶ Ultimately, it is up to the private sector to develop both the technology and build the manufacturing capability, she says, and then to grow that market domestically and internationally.¶ [ Sponsored Paper: Electronic Signatures in the Cloud for State and Local Government ] ¶ At this time, the Savannah River Site is offering an opportunity to use its land assets to site a facility. It is not funding any development, Belencan said. The project occurring at the SRS also will provide a framework for land use and site services agreements that might advance these efforts. Those kinds of memorandums of agreements **do not in any way constitute federal funding commitments**; the DOE envisioned private-sector funding would be used to develop any potential projects on SRS land.¶ In the future, the DOE will focus on advancing SMRs in the United States. About $450 million "will be made available to support first-of-its-kind engineering, design certification and licensing for up to two SMR designs over five years, subject to congressional appropriations,” according to the DOE.¶ The proposals for this funding were received in May, and are now going through the merit review process to see which ones will most likely meet the objectives of being licensed by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and achieving commercial operation by 2022. **The DOE plans to announce the recipients later this year**.¶

**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.

**But it’s still too close to call – extend the Cook evidence, the next 10 days are key for Romney, post-debate he has momentum but super PACs and donors are still not sure if he has a chance or they should focus on congressional races – the plan is a key issue for Romney to campaign on to build on the momentum – their Beinart evidence is all rhetoric and no proof, yes Obama is enjoying good leads now but it’s disappearing, I think there’s a reason they didn’t include the date the article was published when they cited the card because it’s probably from AGES ago which means you should prefer our uniqueness from THIS WEEK**

**Uniqueness doesn't overwhelm the link -**

**Obama will win now but the race can quickly change – new political events can “rewrite” the election narrative to help Romney**

**Sabato et al 9/27/12** (Larry, Prof of Poli Sci @ UVA and Founder of Sabato's Crystal Ball, "Election Tilts Toward Obama, Senate Democrats," http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/election-tilts-toward-obama-senate-democrats/)

Three weeks after the Democratic National Convention, **we see little indication** that the lead President Barack Obama took after it has faded. Obama is leading Mitt Romney by about four percentage points nationally, according to an average of national horserace surveys, and his edge has trickled down to the swing states.¶ So with 40 days to go, we’re moving several toss-up states in the president’s direction. **Our changes push Obama over the magic 270 mark, but we are not calling the race**. First, the debates are yet to come. There is at least the possibility that, if Romney fares particularly well or Obama does poorly, the drift of this contest could change. Second, **other events** — international (a crisis) or domestic (dramatically poor economic numbers) — **could theoretically occur to re-write the narrative of the race**. So caution is always in order with almost six weeks to go, yet President Obama clearly leads at the moment.¶ Chart 1: Crystal Ball ratings changes, presidential race¶ Map 1: Updated Crystal Ball electoral map¶ These rating changes move five of our eight toss-up states into Obama’s column, **giving him 290 electoral votes** to Mitt Romney’s 206, with Colorado, Florida and New Hampshire as toss-ups (42 votes). Obviously, Romney needs to turn some of the blue on this map to red, or this race will be over. And much of Obama’s territory is unavailable to him: the states won by both Al Gore in 2000 and John Kerry in 2004 add up to 242 electoral votes on this map. Other than Wisconsin, Romney appears to have little chance of winning any of the other Gore/Kerry states. And the Badger State, despite Paul Ryan’s presence on the ticket, appears to be moving away from him as well.¶ Provided Romney wins the three toss-ups, he will then need to pry another 22 electoral votes from Obama. And that will be difficult: Of all the states at least leaning toward Obama in our ratings, the president’s smallest polling lead, based on the RealClearPolitics average from mid-day on Wednesday, was four points in Iowa.¶ Chart 2: RealClearPolitics polling averages in competitive presidential states¶ Our rating changes are based on polling, reporting and our own judgments about the individual races. They are not set in stone, and we wouldn’t be surprised if we switched some states in October or early November. Please keep that in mind. **Politics is a dynamic, not a static, business**.¶ Of course, if the current polls showing a decisive Obama victory turn out to be correct — and we have our doubts — then Democrats will win a lot more than we’re projecting in the Electoral College, the Senate, and the House.

**1NR – Link Wall**

**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**

**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.

**Link alone turns the case – public opposition undermines investment for nuclear power – kills the demonstration project, short circuiting spillover**

**C**ivil **S**ociety **I**nstitute, 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."

**Energy**

**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**."

**AT: Rels Resil**

**Romney will aggressively push human rights legislation on Russia.**

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

Russia has joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but the US is yet to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations. Moves to do so by repealing the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been stymied by the US election and efforts in Congress to tie such relations to legislation that would punish Russian officials deemed guilty of human rights abuses, including the arrest and death in custody of Sergei Magnitsky, a whistleblower. The Obama administration has taken action against those suspected of complicity in Mr Magnitsky's death, but in a **limited** and **low-profile manner**. It is not clear whether Mr Romney would be more forceful, because there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the argument. It seems likely that Mr Romney will back granting permanent normal trade relations soon after the election, but he might be more amenable to framing human rights legislation in ways that the Russian political class would regard as **unwarranted interference in Russian domestic affairs**.

## Round 3 1NC vs. Kansas FS

### **1**

####  “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 – they kill 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.

### 2

#### Obama will win now – Electoral College projections, national popular vote projections

Silver 10/4/12 (Nate, Founder @ Fivethirtyeight.com, "Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls," http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/)

It may be a bit fruitless to spend too much time worrying about the Wednesday afternoon FiveThirtyEight forecast when Wednesday night’s debate had the potential to change the election landscape. But for the sake of continuity, here goes. The FiveThirtyEight forecast had Mr. Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney. As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, a great deal of this comes down to Ohio. Historically, Ohio is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.

#### But the next 10 days are key - new issues that “shake up the race” are key to Romney’s chances

Cook 10/1/12 (Charlie, Founder of Cook Political Report, "Shades of 1996," <http://cookpolitical.com/story/4846>)

Public attitudes toward candidates and elections often start off in a fluid state. Then they gradually begin to jell, first reaching a semisolid state before hardening to rock-solid. This year’s presidential race isn’t over, but Mitt Romney’s current trajectory in the polls will not cross President Obama’s by Nov. 6—or maybe even Nov. 6 of next year. If something doesn’t happen to shake up the race, Romney will lose. Romney’s negatives, particularly in swing states, have grown to the point that if allowed to solidify, his opportunity to recover will vanish. The GOP nominee still has a chance to change the trajectory of the campaign, but the longer he takes, the smaller the payoff. Very few undecided voters are left in swing states; campaign pollsters say that maybe 4 or 5 percent of likely voters fit in this category. And no one would be surprised if some of the remaining undecided voters, after being subjected to saturation advertising for months—in some cases since June—throw up their hands and opt to stay home on Election Day. If the presidential race stays on its current course for another week or 10 days, Romney faces the very real prospect that Republican donors, super PACs, and other parts of the GOP support structure will begin to shift resources away from helping him and toward a last-ditch effort to win a Senate majority—which once seemed very likely—and to protect the party’s House majority. A year and a half ago, it looked like Republicans had a 65 to 70 percent chance of capturing the Senate. The 23 Democratic seats up for grabs, compared with just 10 for Republicans, offered the GOP many opportunities for gains, particularly in states that Democrats had captured from Republicans in 2006. Jennifer Duffy, senior Senate editor of *The Cook Political Report*, now argues that the range of possible Senate outcomes goes from Republicans picking up two or three seats to actually losing a seat or two. For the most part, the deterioration of the Senate outlook is unrelated to Romney’s problems at the top of the ticket, and it comes despite a strong effort by the National Republican Senatorial Committee. But there’s no denying that things are not looking so good for the red team in the Senate. Arguably, Republicans now have a chance against only one of the four most vulnerable Democratic Senate incumbents, with GOP Rep. Denny Rehberg now running even with [Jon Tester](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Montana](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Republican prospects to unseat Democrats [Claire McCaskill](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Missouri](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), [Bill Nelson](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Florida](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), and[Sherrod Brown](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) in [Ohio](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) are remote, at best. Top-tier recruits in open seats in [Hawaii](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) and [New Mexico](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) have not caught on despite strong campaign efforts, further undercutting GOP chances of securing a Senate majority. Two moderate Democrats running for open Senate seats in very Republican states are doing unexpectedly well: Democratic former state Attorney General Heidi Heitkamp is locked in a tight race in [North Dakota](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) with GOP Rep. [Rick Berg](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search), while Democratic [Rep. Joe Donnelly](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search) is in an equally close contest with Republican state Treasurer Richard Mourdock in[Indiana](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Republicans were heavily favored to win both seats early on; now both races are very tight. Duffy points to the last time this class of Senate seats was up, in 2006: Then, three Senate seats and control of the chamber were settled by 60,665 votes spread among three states, [Missouri](http://cookpolitical.com/state/MO/articles), [Montana](http://cookpolitical.com/state/MT/articles), and [Virginia](http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-shades-of-1996-20120927?mrefid=site_search). Of the 10 Senate races that *The Cook Political Report* rates as toss-ups, six are now in Democratic hands and four are in GOP hands. The range of possible outcomes is very wide. In the House, we have not yet seen any signs of deterioration for the GOP majority. Even if Democrats were to win every seat currently rated solid Democratic, likely Democratic, or lean Democratic, as well as every toss-up, they would still come up short of a majority. The canaries in the coal mine are GOP seats currently rated as lean Republican or likely Republican. *Cook Political Report* House Editor David Wasserman points out that with Democrats likely to lose perhaps 10 of their own seats, they would have to gross 35 seats to hit the 25 net seats necessary to win a majority. That’s a very tall order. House Republican strategists have been preaching the “balance message” to their candidates: If the top of the ticket starts to go south on them, then Republicans need to argue that the party must keep the House in GOP hands to have a firm check in place to balance against a second-term President Obama. The next week or 10 days are thus critical for Romney and the GOP. If things don’t turn around, a stampede could ensue reminiscent of 1996, when Republicans realized that Bob Dole was not going to defeat President Clinton. History could repeat itself.

#### 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 12, 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.

### 3

#### Electricity prices are declining in the status quo

**Burtraw 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.

#### But, 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

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.

### 4

#### Text: The fifty state governments of the United States should increase procurement contracts for small modular reactors deployed in the United States.

#### States solves upfront capital costs of nuclear power

Yanosek 12 (Kassia, Entrepreneur-in-Residence – Stanford University’s Steyer-Taylor Center for Energy Policy and Finance, “Financing Nuclear Power in the US,” Stanford Energy Journal, Spring, <http://energyclub.stanford.edu/index.php/Journal/Financing_Nuclear_Power_by_Kassia_Yanosek>)

Furthermore, capital costs are inherently high, ranging in the billions or tens of billions of dollars, and are compounded by financing charges during long construction times. Without government support, financing nuclear is currently not possible in the capital markets. Recently, Constellation Energy and NRG separately pulled the plug on new multi-billion dollar plants, citing financing problems. Projects, however, will get done on a one-off basis. Southern Company’s Vogtle Plant in Eastern Georgia is likely to be the sponsor of the first new generation to be constructed, taking advantage of local regulatory and federal support. Two new reactors of next-generation technology are in the permitting stage, which will bring online 2,200 megawatts (MW) of new capacity, and will cost $14 billion. The project will take advantage of tax credits and loan guarantees provided in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. What is the ideal financial structure for funding new nuclear generation? The simplest answer is “through the rate base.” This is typically accomplished by state-level legislation which allows utilities to pass the construction costs through to the ratepayers. The ideal mechanism, which exists in a few states, allows the utility to raise rates during plant construction and adjust rates periodically for delays or cost overruns. However, this structure is not possible in most markets. California, for example, has a moratorium where utilities are not legislatively authorized to recover rates for nuclear development. And even with a regulated territory, utilities often require additional financing to raise sufficient up-front funds for construction or to mitigate risks in markets where cost recovery through the rate base is not assured. Another option, which could be a complementary solution, is a project finance model, in which debt is raised at the project level and backstopped by long-term contracts with creditworthy parties. Even this would be complex, since project financing would require finding a suite of investors willing to take on the different risk/return profiles that exist at different stages of the project. In addition, federal and/or state-based financial support designed specifically for nuclear would still be critical.

#### And – the signal is the same

Bickers 8 (Richard, Editor – NPO, quarterly journal published by the Nuclear Energy Institute, “The Trickle-Up Effect,” Nuclear Policy Outlook, Second Quarter, [www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook\_June.pdf](http://www.nei.org/filefolder/Outlook_June.pdf))

States Put Singular Stamp on Energy Policy—With National Implications Spurred by federal legislation and public concern about energy costs, electricity supply and environmental issues, the pace of state and local government activity on energy policy in general— and nuclear power in particular—has skyrocketed in the past few years. Energy, environmental and economic concerns are coalescing, and states are taking action. “For most people, the federal government seems too removed from their daily lives,” said Del. Sally Jameson (D), a member of the Maryland House of Delegates since 2003. Her district straddles the nation’s capital and Calvert County, Md., home to Constellation Energy’s Calvert Cliffs nuclear plant. “Most people look to the state for policy. They know us one-on-one and state policy directly affects their lives. “The federal government is so huge that they believe they will get lost in it. At the state level,” she noted, “their voices are heard.” Looking to the future, the United States must maintain at least the current 30 percent share of non-emitting electric generating capacity if it is to meet its clean-air goals. Even with conservative assumptions about increases in electricity demand and a doubling of renewable energy production, the United States faces a challenge to maintain its current proportion of carbon-free electricity production. A substantial increase in nuclear energy is essential. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, which incorporated a wide range of measures to support current nuclear plants and provided important incentives for building new nuclear plants, reflects a national commitment to carbon-free energy sources. The legislation includes investment incentives to encourage construction of new nuclear plants, including production tax credits, loan guarantees and business risk protection for companies pursuing the first new reactors. Now, states are linking environment and energy in the policy calculus. “The view is that when the federal government isn’t taking the lead, the legislatures need to step up to the plate,” said Melissa Savage, program director for the Agriculture, Energy and Environmental Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). States are “repealing moratoriums, holding committee session study hearings, looking at changing regulations, and just getting the conversation started in some cases,” she noted. “We’re facing a pretty critical energy crunch in the country. The issue is starting to bubble back up,” Savage said. “In some states, it never went away.” Ten states have passed policies instituting some form of cost recovery assurance for nuclear plant construction. Three states have introduced and one has passed legislation requiring that nuclear energy be included in some form of clean or alternative energy portfolio. Six of the 13 states with moratoriums preventing new nuclear plants are considering removing those bans. Two states have passed local tax incentives for nuclear plants. For Maryland’s Jameson, the link between environmental and energy policy is a driving factor in policy formulation. “We are nearly surrounded by water in Maryland,” she said, pointing to the Chesapeake Bay, Atlantic Ocean and a network of rivers. “We are doing everything we can to limit harm to our waterways and environment because of climate change and global warming.” The state has taken a “fairly proactive approach” to addressing both environmental and energy issues in the face of a Maryland Public Service Commission warning that electricity customers could face power restrictions or rolling blackouts as early as 2011, she said. STATES AS POLICY LABORATORIES “It is one of the happy incidents of the federal system that a single courageous state may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country,” Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis wrote in 1932. Historically, state and local governments have led the way on issues as varied as child labor, the environment and social reform. And state governments indeed are serving as laboratories in the development of policy supporting nuclear energy. One such policy is the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, or RGGI, a cooperative effort by 10 Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Participating states have agreed to implement RGGI through a regional cap-andtrade program whereby participating states anticipate auctioning nearly the entire annual regional emissions budget, approximately 188 million tons of carbon dioxide. Each ton of carbon dioxide will constitute an “allowance.” The multi-state agreement treats all carbon-free sources of electricity, such as nuclear energy and renewables, equally in the framework for awarding monetary credits for greenhouse gas reduction. The RGGI states have agreed to participate in regional auctions for the allowances, beginning this September. Officials have scheduled a second auction in December.

### 5

#### Energy policy justified through security perpetuates inequalities, environmental degradation, and causes global destruction – must be examined prior to their enactment

Simpson 7 – Founding Convenor of the APSA Environmental Politics and Policy Group, Lecturer in the International Relations program at the University of South Australia where he coordinates courses on IR and Environmental Politics, Researcher (Full Member) in the Hawke Research Institute and a member of the UniSA Human Rights and Security Cluster Leadership Committee, Associate at the Indo-Pacific Governance Research Centre (IPGRC) at the University of Adelaide (Adam, 2007, "The Environment: Energy Security Nexus: Critical Analysis of an Energy 'Love Triangle' in Southeast Asia," Third World Quarterly, 28(3), JSTOR)

The pursuit of energy security has been a dominant policy objective and political tool for governments of various hues throughout the world. While there is no doubt that individuals have certain minimum energy require ments, the rhetoric of energy security has often been used as an excuse for governing elites to pursue centralised industrialisation and grandiose energy projects at the expense of marginalised populations. Mega-dams, gas pipelines and similar projects undertaken in majority, or less affluent, countries in the name of energy security and development are rarely vetted through a process of environmental or social impact assessment.' On the rare occasions when this does occur, the process is often a rubber-stamping exercise with little input from local communities. The situation is exacerbated when the political regime promoting or administering the project is particularly repressive or authoritarian in nature, such as in Burma.2 It is usually the case that the communities surrounding these projects are indigenous, dispossessed or otherwise marginalised and have little chance of mitigating the adverse effects that flow from the development, while most of the benefits are reaped in elite circles of the urban centres, where the development decisions are usually made. The interests of these elites, despite populist overtures, are largely antagonistic to the general populations, and this is reflected in development decision-making processes. Attempts by governments and developers either to enrich themselves or, at best, provide electricity for the urban middle classes invariably result in local ethnic minorities or indigenous peoples bearing the brunt of the environmental and social costs associated with the projects while having little input into the development process itself. While the discourse of national energy security is employed by dominant interests, the environmental security of the local communities can be severely undermined by a project but is rarely considered. Environmental security can be defined quite narrowly or understood more broadly to include the energy security deficit felt by many communities in majority countries, who often see no relief from the deficit when an energy project is completed. While the discourse of energy security is used to justify the project, communities living in its vicinity may remain without electricity following its completion and have other elements of their security, such as food, water or livelihood, undermined.4 In this situation it becomes pertinent to ask whose security whether it be 'energy', 'environmental' or 'financial' is being addressed by the project. Unfortunately, it is often the financial security of governing and business elites that determines project decision making at the expense of the environmental security of local communities.5 The transnational projects to be discussed here include a gas pipeline and various mega-dam projects in Southeast Asia. These projects are at various stages of their development but all relate to the purported pursuit of energy security by the dominant classes in Thailand and the supply thereof by their colleagues in Burma (or Myanmar) and Laos. In Thailand, former prime minister Thaksin Shinawatra and his Thai Rak Thai party used the rhetoric of economic nationalism to obtain acquiescence to major projects but, in reality, Thaksin and other plutocratic government elements ran much of the economy for their own profit, privatising benefits but socialising costs and risks.6 In Burma the corrupt military regime of the State Peace and Development Council (SPDc) has ensured energy exporting projects bring little but suffering to local communities, with transnational corporations and successive Thai governments also being complicit.7 The SPDC and the military dominate Burma's economy, through both state and individual interests, and following dubious privatisations since 1988 the 'iron glove of the military envelops the invisible hand of the private sector'.8 In Laos corruption is also rampant and the economy is tightly controlled by the state. The state, in turn, is a tool of the sole legal political entity, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, membership of which offers the best guarantee of wealth.9 In all three countries major political and economic interests are virtually indistinguish able, often co-operating with foreign transnational corporations and bodies such as the World Bank to promote large-scale energy projects. By the mid-1990s, however, the success of the environment and anti-dam movements in Thailand made it politically expedient for Thai businesses and governments-including the Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand (EGAT) to export the environmental and social problems associated with large dams and other energy pro ects to its more authoritarian neighbours while importing the electricity. 1 In Burma the completed Yadana gas pipeline to Thailand has resulted in significant human and environmental depredations against local ethnic minorities. The preparations being under taken for the Nam Theun 2 Dam in Laos and a series of dams on Burma's Salween River to export electricity to Thailand are already having similar impacts, for which recent studies of the Narmada Dams in India would provide a salutary lesson.11 These projects, at various stages of development, illustrate the vast chasm between the security interests of governing elites and those of the local indigenous or ethnic minority communities in these countries. These situations, juxtaposing energy projects with environmental destruc tion and human rights violations, have led to the new concept of 'earth rights', the nexus between human rights and environmental protection.12 Before examining these projects, a brief exposition on the nature of earth rights and environmental and energy security will assist in clarifying the location of this research within the field of critical security studies. The environment-energy security nexus Security is a contested concept, but the field of critical security studies has, since the late 1980s, challenged the state-centric focus of traditional cold war studies.13 Within this field environmental security has now been established as a significant area of interest.14 Barnett's definition of environmental insecurity considers the way in which 'environmental degradation threatens the security of people'.15 His added focus on the inequitable distribution of degradation resonates strongly with environmental justice theory. From this perspective, environmental security focuses more on human security than on threats to national security from environmental degradation or a securing 'of the environment itself.'6 Recent writings linking the concept of human security to that of environmental security have been concerned with 'social disruptions' as the principal source of insecurity.17 In this sense dislocation caused by major development projects such as dams may cause insecurity, but when this is linked to civil conflict the impacts are compounded. There is now a well established link between the exploitation of abundant resources and the propensity for civil strife, indicating that resource exploitation can be linked to both environmental degradation and human insecurity.'8 As my interest here relates to the majority world, one of the most useful concepts to emerge is that of 'earth rights'.' In addition to the benefit of its holistic inferences and simple terminology, most work on the concept is related to the majority world, where the interrelationships between environmental protection and human rights are most acute.20 Implicit in the notion of earth rights is that a degradation of environmental security reflects an erosion of human rights, and often vice versa. In their analysis of this concept Greer and Giannini have produced the most useful description thus far, arguing that: earth rights are those rights that demonstrate the connection between human well-being and a sound environment, and include the right to a healthy environment, the right to speak out and act topirotect the environment, and the right to participate in development decisions. In the projects that this paper investigates, it is these acknowledged rights to act in defence of the environment and the right to a healthy environment that are, for ethnic minority and indigenous communities living in the vicinity of the projects, most at risk. While a rights-based approach has been, to some extent, co-opted by institutions such as the World Bank, it can still provide a useful method of analysing development activities when employed from a critical perspective.22 In addition to theoretical developments in earth rights and environmental security, increased attention has also been given to energy security. It comes as no surprise, however, that discourses of energy security focus particularly on fossil fuels and large-scale electricity projects, given their centrality to military and industrial development. While this article examines this dominant energy discourse, it is only for the purposes of critical analysis. Although I examine cross-border energy projects in three countries, and therefore national issues do arise, it is the security impacts on local communities surrounding these projects that are of particular interest here. An important question to consider before discussing the impacts of these projects is, however, the reasons for the institutional and political momentum behind such large-scale undertakings in the first place. The industrial-scale development paradigm There are numerous reasons for the fixation, both academic and develop mental, on large-scale energy projects. Some relate to academic or government research funding opportunities, but this approach also fits neatly within the predominant large-scale and hierarchical, top-down development paradigm prescribed by financial institutions such as the IMF and World Bank. Much of the national development programmes throughout the 1980s and well into the 1 990s were undertaken within the 'Washington Consensus' model of neoliberal reform and structural adjustments. These policies exacerbated existing exploitative relationships between the North and South, with economic growth considered by these Bretton Woods institutions to be the only possible 'sustainable development', an approach considered to be 'Northern imperial ism, using the language of ecology'.24 The 'Post-Washington Consensus', which emerged within the World Bank and the IMF in response to an avalanche of criticism, revised the emphasis on pure neoliberalism, admitting a limited role for the state in development processes. Poverty and governance became key issues, but this approach continues to show an 'inability or unwillingness to address major issues pertaining to [political] power and its distribution both at the domestic and international levels'.25 In addition, the development modus operandi of the Bretton Woods institutions that produced poverty and inequality in the past is very much a part of the present.26 The World Bank has adopted a rights-based approach, but its interpretation of rights relates more to the rights of private enterprise than to those enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.27 Undoubtedly rhetoric at organisations such as the World Bank has changed; in terms of energy security there is now a focus on poverty reduction to be achieved through access to 'clean energy' sources. There is, however, a disconnect between World Bank rhetoric and its funding of major projects such as mega-dams that have proven to be environmentally and culturally destructive, while providing little in terms of energy security for local people. Despite some rhetorical revisionism, the discourse of energy security is still employed by government and business elites to justify top-down investments in large-scale energy projects, which require significant initial capital injections and subsequent industrial-scale capital returns. According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, this top-down approach to development has caused ecological destruction on a vast scale and tends to perpetuate, rather than ameliorate, inequalities.29 After decades of promoting capitalist industrialisation in the majority world, even the World Bank now recognises that inequality both within and between is increasing and can inhibit development. Nonetheless, the bank still cites 'ine uality of outcomes' as playing an important role in facilitating development.

#### Altenative – reject the affirmative’s security discourse – only resistance can generate genuine political thought

Neoclous 8 – Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, 2008 [Critique of Security, 185-6]

The only way out of such a dilemma, to escape the fetish, is perhaps to eschew the logic of security altogether - to reject it as so ideologically loaded in favour of the state that any real political thought other than the authoritarian and reactionary should be pressed to give it up. That is clearly something that can not be achieved within the limits of bourgeois thought and thus could never even begin to be imagined by the security intellectual. It is also something that the constant iteration of the refrain 'this is an insecure world' and reiteration of one fear, anxiety and insecurity after another will also make it hard to do. But it is something that the critique of security suggests we may have to consider if we want a political way out of the impasse of security. This impasse exists because security has now become so all-encompassing that it marginalises all else, most notably the constructive conflicts, debates and discussions that animate political life. The constant prioritising of a mythical security as a political end - as the political end constitutes a rejection of politics in any meaningful sense of the term. That is, as a mode of action in which differences can be articulated, in which the conflicts and struggles that arise from such differences can be fought for and negotiated, in which people might come to believe that another world is possible - that they might transform the world and in turn be transformed. Security politics simply removes this; worse, it remoeves it while purportedly addressing it. In so doing it suppresses all issues of power and turns political questions into debates about the most efficient way to achieve 'security', despite the fact that we are never quite told - never could be told - what might count as having achieved it. Security politics is, in this sense, an anti-politics,"' dominating political discourse in much the same manner as the security state tries to dominate human beings, reinforcing security fetishism and the monopolistic character of security on the political imagination. We therefore need to get beyond security politics, not add yet more 'sectors' to it in a way that simply expands the scope of the state and legitimises state intervention in yet more and more areas of our lives. Simon Dalby reports a personal communication with Michael Williams, co-editor of the important text Critical Security Studies, in which the latter asks: if you take away security, what do you put in the hole that's left behind? But I'm inclined to agree with Dalby: maybe there is no hole."' The mistake has been to think that there is a hole and that this hole needs to be filled with a new vision or revision of security in which it is re-mapped or civilised or gendered or humanised or expanded or whatever. All of these ultimately remain within the statist political imaginary, and consequently end up reaffirming the state as the terrain of modern politics, the grounds of security. The real task is not to fill the supposed hole with yet another vision of security, but to fight for an alternative political language which takes us beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois security and which therefore does not constantly throw us into the arms of the state. That's the point of critical politics: to develop a new political language more adequate to the kind of society we want. Thus while much of what I have said here has been of a negative order, part of the tradition of critical theory is that the negative may be as significant as the positive in setting thought on new paths. For if security really is the supreme concept of bourgeois society and the fundamental thematic of liberalism, then to keep harping on about insecurity and to keep demanding 'more security' (while meekly hoping that this increased security doesn't damage our liberty) is to blind ourselves to the possibility of building real alternatives to the authoritarian tendencies in contemporary politics. To situate ourselves against security politics would allow us to circumvent the debilitating effect achieved through the constant securitising of social and political issues, debilitating in the sense that 'security' helps consolidate the power of the existing forms of social domination and justifies the short-circuiting of even the most democratic forms. It would also allow us to forge another kind of politics centred on a different conception of the good. We need a new way of thinking and talking about social being and politics that moves us beyond security. This would perhaps be emancipatory in the true sense of the word. What this might mean, precisely, must be open to debate. But it certainly requires recognising that security is an illusion that has forgotten it is an illusion; it requires recognising that security is not the same as solidarity; it requires accepting that insecurity is part of the human condition, and thus giving up the search for the certainty of security and instead learning to tolerate the uncertainties, ambiguities and 'insecurities' that come with being human; it requires accepting that 'securitizing' an issue does not mean dealing with it politically, but bracketing it out and handing it to the state; it requires us to be brave enough to return the gift."'

### 1NC – Heg

#### Oil independence doesn’t solve heg - the U.S. is still vulnerable and we’d still have to protect the Middle East

**Nye 12** [Joseph S. Nye, a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, 7/11/12, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/energy-independence-in-an-interdependent-world>]

But one should not jump to conclusions. A balance of energy imports and exports is only a first approximation of independence. As I argue in my book The Future of Power, global interdependence involves both sensitivity and vulnerability. The US may be less vulnerable in the long run if it imports less energy, but oil is a fungible commodity, and the US economy will remain sensitive to shocks from sudden changes in world prices. In other words, a revolution in Saudi Arabia or a blockade of the Strait of Hormuz could still inflict damage on the US and its allies. So, even if America had no other interests in the Middle East, such as Israel or nuclear non-proliferation, a balance of energy imports and exports would be unlikely to free the US from military expenditures – which some experts estimate run to $50 billion per year – to protect oil routes in the region.

#### 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.

#### Forward deployment inevitable

#### 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.

#### 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.**

#### Cross apply their Fisher impact evidence

#### Primacy puts us on a collision course with Iran – turns your Middle East impact

**Layne 7** [Christopher Layne, 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, 2007 ["The Case Against the American Empire," American Empire: A Debate, Published by Routledge, ISBN 0415952034, p. 73-74]

*Iran* Because of the strategy of primacy and empire, the United States and Iran are on course for a showdown. The main source of conflict—or at least the one that has grabbed the lion’s share of the headlines—is Tehran’s evident determination to develop a nuclear weapons program. Washington’s policy, as President George W. Bush has stated on several occasions—in language that recalls his prewar stance on Iraq—is that a nuclear-armed Iran is “intolerable.” Beyond nuclear weapons, however, there are other important issues that are driving the United States and Iran toward an armed confrontation. Chief among these is Iraq. Recently, Zalmay Khalilzad, the U.S. ambassador to Iraq, has accused Tehran of meddling in Iraqi affairs by providing arms and training to Shiite militias and by currying favor with the Shiite politicians who dominate Iraq’s recently elected government. With Iraq teetering on the brink of a sectarian civil war between Shiites and Sunnis, concerns about Iranian interference have been magnified. In a real sense, however, Iran’s nuclear program and its role in Iraq are merely the tip of the iceberg. The fundamental cause of tensions between the United States and Iran is the nature of America’s ambitions in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. These are reflected in current U.S. grand strategy—which has come to be known as the Bush Doctrine. The Bush Doctrine’s three key components are rejection of deterrence in favor of preventive/preemptive military action; determination to effectuate a radical shake-up in the politics of the Persian Gulf and Middle East; and gaining U.S. dominance over that region. In this respect, it is hardly coincidental that the administration’s policy toward Tehran bears a striking similarity to its policy [end page 76] during the run-up to the March 2003 invasion of Iraq, not only on the nuclear weapons issue but—ominously—with respect to regime change and democratization. This is because the same strategic assumptions that underlay the administration’s pre-invasion Iraq policy now are driving its Iran policy. The key question today is whether these assumptions are correct.

#### Economics check Indo-Pak war

Tellis 2 (Ashley, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Orbis, Winter, p. 19)

In any event, the saving grace that mutes the potential for exacerbated competition between both countries remains their relatively strong economic constraints. At the Pakistani end, these constraints are structural: Islamabad simply has no discretionary resources to fritter away on an open-ended arms race, and it could not acquire resources for this purpose without fundamentally transforming the nature of the Pakistani state itself—which transformation, if it occurs successfully, would actually mitigate many of the corrosive forces that currently drive Islamabad’s security competition with India. [21](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808" \l "fn22#fn22) At the Indian end, these constraints may be more self-imposed. New Delhi commands a large pool of national resources that could be siphoned off and reallocated to security instruments, but the current weaknesses of the central government’s public finances and its reform program, coupled with its desire to complete the technological modernization programs that have been underway for many decades, prevents it from enlarging the budgetary allocations for strategic acquisitions at will. [22](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6W5V-44R2RMN-3&_user=1111158&_handle=V-WA-A-W-AV-MsSAYVA-UUA-U-AAWWZYDZDV-AAWUWZYVDV-WUAYUYVAZ-AV-U&_fmt=full&_coverDate=10%2F01%2F2002&_rdoc=3&_orig=browse&_srch=%23toc%236580%232002%23999539998%23279210!&_cdi=6580&view=c&_acct=C000051676&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=1111158&md5=a57af48126ec154c39015e0e91157808" \l "fn23#fn23) With these constraints on both sides, future nuclearization in India and Pakistan is more likely to resemble an "arms crawl" than a genuine Richardson-type "arms race." The strategic capabilities on both sides will increase incrementally but slowly—and in India will have further to go because of its inferior capabilities compared to China’s. This slowness may be the best outcome from the viewpoint both of the two South Asian competitors and the United States.

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.

Global nuclear war

**Ayson 10 (**Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (Robert,“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a **massive exchange** of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a **catalytic nuclear war** **between the superpowers** started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) **suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors.** Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and **confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack,** the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, **on a higher stage of alert.** In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response.

Primacy guarantees unstoppable emerging diseases

**Weber et al 7** [Steven - Professor of Political Science and Director of the Institute for International Studies at the University of California-Berkeley, et al., with Naazneen Barma, Matthew Kroenig, and Ely Ratner, Ph.D. Candidates at the University of California-Berkeley and Research Fellows at its New Era Foreign Policy Center, 2007 [“How Globalization Went Bad,” Foreign Policy, Issue 158, January/February, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Premiere, p. 52-53]

The same is true for global public health. Globalization is turning the world into an enormous petri dish for the incubation of infectious disease. Humans cannot outsmart disease, because it just evolves too quickly. Bacteria can reproduce a new generation in less than 30 minutes, while it takes us decades to come up with a new generation of antibiotics. Solutions are only possible when and where we get the upper hand. Poor countries where humans live in close proximity to farm animals are the best place to breed extremely dangerous zoonotic disease. These are often the same countries, perhaps not entirely coincidentally, that feel threatened by American power. Establishing an early warning system for these diseases—exactly what we lacked in the case of SARS a few years ago and exactly what we lack for avian flu today—will require a significant level of intervention into the very places that don’t want it. That will be true as long as international intervention means American interference. The most likely sources of the next ebola or HIV-like pandemic are the countries that simply won’t let U.S. or other Western agencies in, including the World Health Organization. Yet the threat is too arcane and not immediate enough for the West to force the issue. What’s needed is another great power to take over a piece of the work, a power that has more immediate interests in the countries where diseases incubate and one that is seen as less of a threat. As long as the United States remains the world’s lone superpower, we’re not likely to get any help. Even after HIV, SARS, and several years of mounting hysteria about avian flu, the world is still not ready for a viral pandemic in Southeast Asia or sub-Saharan Africa. America can’t change that alone.

Extinction

**Yu 9** (5/22/09, Victoria, Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science Writer, “Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate,” http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate)

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention** (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10

### 1NC – Prolif

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12 (Jacques, Associate Professor of International Relations – USC, North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb, Foreign Affairs, 4-16, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show)

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### **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.

#### Nuclear accidents risk extinction

**Caldicott 94** (Helen, Australian Physician, Nuclear Madness, p. 21)

As a physician, I contend that nuclear technology **threatens life on our planet with extinction.** If present trends continue, the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink will soon be contaminated with enough radioactive pollutants to post a potential health hazard far greater than any plague humanity has ever experienced. Unknowingly exposed to these radioactive poisons, some of us may be developing cancer right now. Others may be passing damaged genes, the basic chemical units that transmit hereditary characteristics, to future generations. And more of us will inevitably be affected unless we bring about a dramatic reversal of the world’s pronuclear policies

### 1NC – Solvency

#### Siting requirements blocks solvency

King 11 (Marcus, Ph.D., Center for Naval Analyses Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.Military Installations, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf)

A reactor owner/operator, typically a utility, will select a site and may apply for an early site permit from the NRC. They select a reactor design, (certified under a separate process), to construct on the site and then apply for a combined operating license. Construction begins after approval. With respect to the requirement to “consider the potential impact on the quality of life of personnel stationed at military installations at which a nuclear power plant is installed and ways to mitigate those impacts,” it is impossible to talk in specific terms without knowing details about which specific power plant is being considered and the specific locations being considered. In general terms, finding an appropriate site will be challenging. Part of the reason finding an appropriate site will be challenging is because the NRC site consideration process will force full consideration of these factors. Describing the NRC site assessment process is the best and most relevant information that can be provided with respect to this aspect of feasibility at this stage in the process. The NRC approval process described in this section will require that any potential impacts on the quality of life of personnel stationed at military installations at which a nuclear power plant is proposed will be fully consdered and that ways are planned to mitigate those impacts.

#### DoD won’t apply for NRC exemptions – that guts solvency and delays the project by 10 years

King 11 (Marcus, Ph.D., Center for Naval Analyses Project Director and Research Analyst for the Environment and Energy Team, LaVar Huntzinger, Thoi Nguyen, March 2011, Feasibility of Nuclear Power on U.S.Military Installations, www.cna.org/sites/default/files/research/Nuclear Power on Military Installations D0023932 A5.pdf)

The most basic licensing issue relates to whether NRC will have jurisdiction over potential nuclear reactor sites or whether DoD could be self-regulating. Our conversations with NRC indicate it is the only possible licensing authority for reactors that supply power to the commercial grid. However, DOE and DoD are authorized to regulate mission critical nuclear facilities under Section 91b of the Atomic Energy Act. There is some historical precedent for DoD exercising this authority. For example, the Army Nuclear Program was granted exception under this rule with regard to the reactor that operated aboard the Sturgis barge in the 1960s and 1970s [44]. It seems unlikely that DoD would pursue exemption under Section 91b in the future. 10 Regulating power plants is a function that lies beyond DoD's core mission. The Department and the military services are unlikely to have personnel with sufficient expertise to act as regulators for nuclear power plants, and it could take considerable time and resources to develop such expertise. Without NRC oversight DoD would bear all associated risks. The time required to obtain design certification, license, and build the next generation of nuclear plants is about 9 to 10 years. After the first plants are built it may be possible to reduce the time required for licensing and construction to approximately 6 years [45]. The timeline for certification, licensing, and construction projected by DOE for a small nuclear power plant based on an SMR is shown in figure 5 [46].

#### 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.

## Round 3 2NC vs. Kansas FS

### Not Procurement – 2NC Overview

#### Topical Affs must increase financial incentives – that requires the government doing something that motivates investment. That is distinct from the plan because procurement bypasses the investment process and just buys the technology – that’s Nelson.

#### Incentives are divided into three distinct categories – there is a difference between “financial incentives” and “nonfinancial incentives” – financial incentives actually promote investment in new technology, but nonfinancial incentives make a technology cost competitive by artificially creating a buyer for that technology – that’s Czinkota. Prefer it because it’s about investment strategy and has intent to define.

#### There’s a clear and fair list of topical affs: loans, loan guarantees, tax credits, rebates, direct grants are all topical incentive affs, not to mention every restriction they could have read.

#### Here’s evidence that there is a topical version of their plan – governmental definitions conclude you can use financial incentives to purchase new technology, but that is distinct from procurement.

DOE 7 (Department of Energy, “Regulatory Impact Analysis for Today's Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces and Boilers,” September, http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance\_standards/residential/pdfs/fb\_fr\_tsd/ria.pdf)

2.2 Non-Regulatory Policy Assumptions

2.2.1 No New Regulatory Action

The case in which no new regulatory action is taken with regard to residential furnace and boiler efficiency constitutes the base case scenario described in Chapter 10 of the Furnace and Boiler TSD. 1 This case defines the basis of comparison for all other scenarios. By definition, no new regulatory action yields zero energy savings and an NPV of zero dollars.

2.2.2 Financial Incentives Policies

DOE considered scenarios in which the Federal government would provide two types of financial incentives: **tax credits and rebates**. Tax credits could be granted to consumers who purchased target-level furnace and boiler equipment, or the government could issue tax credits to manufacturers to offset costs associated with producing such equipment. The government also could provide consumers with a cash rebate at the time of purchase. DOE’s evaluation of financial incentive policies used a comprehensive study of the potential for energy efficiency in California performed by Xenergy, Inc., which summarizes experience with various utility rebate programs. 2 Xenergy developed a re-parameterized, mixedsource information diffusion model to estimate market impacts induced by financial incentives for energy-efficient appliances. The basic premise of this mixed-source model is that information diffusion drives technology adoption. The model is formulated to characterize the influences of both internal and external sources of information on consumer behavior by superimposing two components in the equation, each capturing the effect of one of two different types of information source. The effects of these two types of information diffusion mechanisms are different. Internal sources of information influence consumers to purchase new products due mainly to word-of-mouth from early adopters, while external information sources influence consumers to change their adoption decisions as a result of marketing efforts and information coming from outside the consumer group. The mixed-source model describes a combined impact of the two information-source types, and specific parameterization determines consumer adoption behavior. (Appendix X of the TSD contains further details.) Xenergy’s model combined these two information diffusion mechanisms and generated a set of “implementation curves,” which Xenergy calibrated using evaluation data from utility rebate programs conducted in the1990s. Consumer response to rebate incentives appears to be a combination of the two information source types. The implementation curves illustrate the increased penetration of efficient equipment (i.e., increased market share) as a result of consumer response to benefit/cost (B/C) ratio changes induced by a specific rebate program. The implementation curves are used to depict various diffusion patterns based on perceived barriers to consumer purchase of high-efficiency equipment. There are implementation curves for varying levels of market barriers, from “no barriers” to “extremely high barriers.” These curves provide a means to study the impact of changing the B/C ratio, by reducing the initial equipment cost through financial incentives, on the consumer participation rate. To further understand the impacts of financial incentives policies, DOE used studies on forecasting the impact of consumer tax credits. 3, 4 This research differentiated the impact of tax credits into the “direct price effect,” which arises from the incremental equipment cost savings, and the “announcement effect,” which is independent of the rebate amount. The announcement effect derives from the credibility that a particular technology receives from its inclusion in an incentive program, as well as changes in product marketing strategy, and the resulting modifications in markups and pricing. DOE assumed that the direct price effect and the announcement effect would also apply to rebate programs, and that half of the increases in RIA-5 market penetration associated with rebates would be due to the direct price effect and half to the announcement effect. Consumer Rebates DOE modeled the impact of the consumer rebate policy by determining the increase in market penetration of target-level equipment relative to the base case. For non-weatherized gas furnaces, DOE estimated the impact of increasing the B/C ratio via a rebate that paid 26 percent of the incremental installed cost between a non-weatherized gas furnace meeting the base case efficiency level a and a unit meeting the target efficiency. DOE based the 26 percent rebate amount on rebate programs for condensing gas furnaces throughout the nation. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 The average rebate in these programs amounted to about 26 percent of the incremental installed cost for condensing furnaces. For gas boilers, DOE assumed that the rebate would cover 60 percent of the incremental installed cost between a boiler meeting the base case efficiency level and a unit meeting the target efficiency. It based this amount on the average rebate level in programs for 85 percent AFUE gas boilers, b which amounted to about 60 percent of incremental installed cost. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15 DOE assumed the rebates would remain in effect until they had transformed the market so that the market shift in efficiency shares seen in the first year of the program would be maintained throughout the forecast period (2015–2038). DOE first calculated the B/C ratio for the unit meeting the target level relative to the base case with no rebate. It then calculated another B/C ratio for the unit meeting the target level, with a rebate, relative to the base case unit. Because of the incremental cost reduction due to the rebate, the B/C ratio for the rebate policy unit is larger (see Table RIA.3). a The base case is a market weighted-average of units at several AFUE levels. b While the target level (82 percent) is lower than 85-percent AFUE for these rebate programs, DOE assumed that a rebate program could be designed to pay an equivalent percentage of the incremental installed costs of the targeted gas boilers. RIA-6 Table RIA.3 Benefit/Cost Ratios for Today's Standard and Rebate Policy Cases NWGF\* at 90% AFUE GB\*\* at 82% AFUE Benefit (Lifetime Operating Cost Savings) $524 $333 Incremental Installed Cost (Increased Installed Cost) $698 $168 B/C Ratio with no rebate 0.8 2.0 Rebate Amount Adjusted Incremental Installed Cost (Increased Installed Cost after Rebate) $180 $518 $101 $67 B/C Ratio for Rebate Policy Case 1.0 5.0 \*NWGF = non-weatherized gas furnace \*\*GB = gas boiler DOE then used the curves shown in Figures RIA.1, RIA.2, RIA.4, and RIA.5 to estimate the increased percentage of consumers who would purchase the units that meet the policy target levels if given a rebate incentive. For non-weatherized gas furnaces at a 90-percent AFUE standard level, DOE chose the “moderate barriers,” since 90 percent AFUE imposes an economic burden for a large fraction of southern customers. For gas boilers at the 82-percent AFUE standard level, DOE chose the “low barriers,” since these efficiency levels are a common product with relatively large market share in 2004. DOE also used the “low barriers” curve for the other product classes. Figures RIA.1 and RIA.2 show the penetration rates of target-level units as a function of B/C ratios. Using this method, DOE estimated that, for the non-weatherized gas furnace product class, the market share of equipment meeting the policy target due to a rebate policy would increase by 1.2 percent at a target level of 90-percent AFUE. For the gas boiler product class, DOE estimated that the market share of equipment meeting the policy target due to a rebate policy would increase by 19 percent for 82-percent AFUE units. To calculate the impacts of this policy, DOE adjusted the base case shipments projection in the NES model to reflect these percentage increases in market share of efficient furnace and boiler models. RIA-7 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% 0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 Participant Benefit-Cost Ratio Max mu i m Penetration Rate Moderate Barriers Curve Penetration Rate = 1.1% at B/C ratio of 0.8 Penetration Rate = 2.3% at B/C ratio of 1.0 Change of Penetration Rate = 1.2% Figure RIA.1 Market Penetration Curve for Non-Weatherized Gas Furnaces at 90 Percent AFUE Level 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100% 0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 Participant Benefit-Cost Ratio Max mi um Penetrat oi n Rate Low Barriers Curve Penetration Rate = 38% at B/C ratio of 2 Penetration Rate = 57% at B/C ratio of 5 Change of Penetration Rate = 19% Figure RIA.2 Market Penetration Curve for Gas Boilers at 82 Percent AFUE Level RIA-8 Consumer Tax Credits DOE assumed a consumer tax credit equivalent to the amount covered by rebates (i.e., 26 percent of the incremental cost between non-weatherized gas furnace base case equipment and equipment meeting the policy target levels, and 60 percent of the incremental cost for gas boilers). DOE estimated that the consumer participation rate would be lower than that for consumer rebates. Research on tax credits has shown that the time delay to the consumer in receiving a reimbursement via tax credit, plus the added transaction costs in tax return preparation, make the tax credit incentive less effective than a rebate received at the time of purchase. Based on previous analysis, 16 DOE assumed that only 60 percent of the customers who would take advantage of a rebate would take advantage of the tax credit. Using a similar approach as for the rebate policy, DOE estimated that the market share of target-efficiency gas furnace units would increase due to consumer tax credits by 0.7 percent over the base case at the 90-percent AFUE level. For gas boilers at 82-percent AFUE, the market share would increase by 12.5 percent. DOE assumed the impact of this policy would be to permanently transform the market so that the shipment-weighted efficiency gain seen in the first year of the program would be maintained throughout the forecast period. Manufacturer Tax Credits DOE assumed that a manufacturer tax credit program would effectively result in a lower price to the consumer by an amount equivalent to that provided by rebates (i.e., 26 percent of the incremental price difference for furnaces meeting base case efficiency levels and those meeting the policy targets, and 60 percent of the incremental price difference for boilers). Because these tax credits would go to manufacturers instead of consumers, DOE assumed that manufacturers would pass on the reduced costs, causing the direct price effect. However, DOE assumed that the announcement effect would not occur because the program would not be visible to the consumers. Since the direct price effect is approximately equivalent to the announcement effect, 3 DOE assumed that half of the consumers assumed to take advantage of consumer tax credits would purchase more-efficient products with a manufacturer tax credit program. As a result, DOE estimated that the market share of efficient non-weatherized gas furnaces would increase due to manufacturer tax credits by 0.4 percent over the base case at the 90-percent AFUE standard level and by 6.2 percent for gas boilers at the 82-percent AFUE standard level. DOE assumed the impact of this policy would be to permanently transform the market so that the shipment-weighted efficiency gain seen in the first year of the program would be maintained throughout the forecast period.

2.2.3 Voluntary Energy-Efficiency Targets

For a non-weatherized gas furnace target level of 90-percent AFUE, DOE assumed that the voluntary target would be achieved through manufacturer participation in a gradual phaseout of production of units below 90-percent AFUE. It assumed that this phaseout would increase from 2015. 17 RIA-9 For gas boilers at 82-percent AFUE, DOE modeled the voluntary efficiency target policy assuming expansion of existing Energy Star endorsement labeling programs conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency and DOE for these two products. 18 The Energy Star program sets minimum energy-efficiency specifications for various products, including furnace and boiler equipment. Energy Star encourages consumer adoption of these products through marketing to promote consumer label recognition, adoption of the specifications by various efficiency incentive programs, and manufacturer production and promotion of Energy Star-compliant appliances. For gas boilers, DOE estimated that an expanded Energy Star program that targeted 82- percent AFUE equipment could moderately increase the market share at these levels. In this case, DOE used estimates of the market impact of the existing Energy Star programs. 17, 19 For gas boilers, DOE assumed the programs resulting from this voluntary efficiency targets policy would increase projected market share of the targeted units above the penetration increases estimated by the Energy Star program by 75 percent for gas boilers at the 82-percent AFUE target level. The Energy Star level for gas boilers is 85-percent AFUE. Table RIA.4 shows the estimated market share increases from the voluntary efficiency target policy. RIA-10 Table RIA.4 Increased Market Share Penetration Levels from Voluntary Furnace and Boiler Programs for Targeted Efficiency Levels\* Year of Program Non-Weatherized Gas Furnaces and Mobile Home Furnaces Weatherized Gas Furnaces Oil Furnaces Gas Boilers Oil Boilers 90% AFUE 81% AFUE 82% AFUE 82% AFUE 83% & 84% AFUE 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 0% 0% 0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 4% 5% 5% 5% 6% 6% 6% 6% 7% 7% 7% 7% 8% 8% 8% 8% 8% 0% 0% 0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 4% 5% 5% 5% 6% 6% 6% 6% 7% 7% 7% 7% 8% 8% 8% 8% 8% 0% 0% 0% 1% 2% 3% 4% 4% 5% 5% 5% 6% 6% 6% 6% 7% 7% 7% 7% 8% 8% 8% 8% 8% 0% 3% 5% 8% 10% 13% 16% 18% 21% 23% 25% 26% 26% 26% 26% 26% 26% 26% 26% 27% 27% 27% 27% 27% 0% 2% 3% 5% 7% 8% 10% 12% 13% 15% 16% 17% 18% 18% 18% 18% 19% 19% 19% 19% 20% 20% 20% 20% \* The percentages in each column refer to shares of the eligible market in each case.

2.2.4 Early Replacement

Early replacement refers to the replacement of furnace and boiler units before the end of

their useful lives. The purpose of this policy is to replace old, inefficient equipment with higherefficiency units. In the 1990s, DOE studied the feasibility of a Federal program to promote early replacement of appliances under the Energy Policy Act of 1992. 20 This study identified policy options for early replacement that included a direct national early replacement program, replacement of Federally owned appliances, promotion through equipment manufacturers, consumer incentives, incentives to utilities, and building regulations. c The analysis concluded that, while cost-effective opportunities for early replacement exist, a widespread Federal early replacement program was not economically justified. Because premature retirement means that a unit may be replaced by an appliance less efficient than the eventual replacement would probably have been, energy savings would be smaller than anticipated. Early replacement programs could increase sales volatility in the long run by (continued...) RIA-11 cFor this analysis, DOE considered a program that targets the units in the stock that have efficiency levels lower than the policy target level and encourages their early replacement with products at the target efficiency level. Shipments not affected by the early replacement program have base case efficiency levels. Shipments to new construction in 2015 and beyond are not affected by this program. (Chapter 9 of the TSD describes the general approach for estimating replacements in each year; the NES model uses a retirement function that tracks the percentage of units retiring and surviving for each vintage.) DOE assumed that a portion of the furnace and boiler units in the existing stock in 2015, the first year of the analysis period, would be replaced by models meeting the target levels. It modeled this policy by assuming an increase of 20 percent (over the natural replacement rate based on units being replaced at the end of their useful lives) in the number of replaced units in the first year. It based this level on one of the cases in the report described above. DOE assumed that the program would last as long as it took to completely replace all of the eligible furnaces and boilers in the stock in the year that the program began (2015). The policy would create a jump in shipments of equipment meeting target AFUE levels relative to the base case in the early years of the program (see Figure RIA.3). As a result, more higher-efficiency units meeting the policy targets would be quickly brought into the equipment stock, leading to an immediate gain in the weighted-average equipment efficiency compared to the base case. However, unlike the other policy cases discussed, the weighted-average efficiency would drop back down to meet the levels in the base case as the eligible stock of equipment for early replacement became depleted. (...continued) encouraging a temporary increase in production followed by a lull in demand. Early replacement could be economical in localities with high energy cost conditions or environmental constraints, when replacement appliances are much more efficient than existing stock, or when a major technology breakthrough has recently occurred, creating the need for a ready market. RIA-12 c0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0 4.5 Total Sh pi ments (Mill ons i ) Base Case Early Replacement Scenario 1985 1990 1995 2000 2005 2010 2015 2020 2025 2030 2035 Figure RIA.3 Early Replacement Shipments Projections for Non-Weatherized Gas Furnaces

2.2.5 Bulk Government Purchases

DOE assumed that a bulk government purchase policy would encourage Federal, State, and local governments to purchase equipment meeting the target levels. Aggregating public sector demand could provide a market signal to manufacturers and vendors that some of their largest customers seek suppliers with products that meet an efficiency target at good prices. This program also could induce market pull” impacts through the effects of manufacturers and vendors achieving economies of scale for high-efficiency products. DOE assumed that government agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), would administer such a program. At the Federal level, this would be an enhancement to the existing Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP). FEMP has procurement guidelines for Federal government equipment purchasing, and Federal construction requirements include these guidelines for installing or replacing equipment. 21 DOE assumed that this policy would impact a subset of housing units for which government agencies purchase or influence the purchase of furnaces and boilers. This subset would mainly consist of public housing and housing on military bases. To represent this subset, DOE considered low-income households identified in the Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) from 2001 22 (see Chapter 11 of the TSD for a description of the low-income household sample). According to RECS 2001, 7.8 percent of the households with gas furnaces and 17.5 percent of those with gas boilers were classified as low-income. DOE assumed that these same percentages of furnace and boiler shipments would go to low-income households in RIA-13 each year. To estimate the market impact, DOE considered previous analysis of the bulk government purchasing policy in the residential air conditioner RIA, 23 where it assumed a fivepercent increase in market share of higher-efficiency units over the base case due to the policy. Since DOE envisions that the policy for furnaces and boilers would build on the existing FEMP program for gas furnaces, DOE assumed that the government purchase policy would likely cause a 10-percent increase in market share in each year. Thus, an additional 10 percent (above the base case) of shipments to eligible low-income households would meet the target levels through this policy. The result is an additional penetration of equipment meeting the target efficiency levels of 0.8 percent and 1.8 percent (10 percent respectively of the low-income households with gas furnaces and gas boilers).

#### It’s a voting issue for limits –

#### They allow for hundreds of small changes. Anything that makes renewable energy more economical becomes topical – that includes eliminating tariffs, moving the grid to remote areas, adjusting price structures, changing import quotas, and not to mentions adding restrictions to coal and natural gas because it would make solar power more profitable and removes a economical obstacle for solar. That independently makes the topic bidirectional.

#### Limits outweigh – they’re the vital access point for any theory impact – its key to fairness – huge research burdens mean we can’t prepare to compete – and its key to education – big topics cause hyper-generics, lack of clash, and shallow debate – and it destroys participation

Rowland 84 (Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

### AT: Reasonability

#### No litmus to test to what’s reasonable

#### Prefer stable definitions vs. judge intervention – reasonability causes a race to the bottom

#### Our impacts outweigh any impact to aff flexibility because the topic will become what tech the DOD can purchase

#### Preserving the mechanism financial incentives is a necessary check on small affs

#### Strict limits *enable* creativity. Beauty emerges from identifying constraints and working within them.

Flood 10 (Scott, BS in Communication and Theatre Arts – St. Joseph’s College, School Board Member – Plainfield Community School Corporation, and Advertising Agent, “Business Innovation – Real Creativity Happens Inside the Box”, http://ezinearticles.com/?Business-Innovation---Real-Creativity-Happens-Inside-the-Box&id=4793692)

It seems that we can accomplish anything if we're brave enough to step out of that bad, bad box, and thinking "creatively" has come to be synonymous with ignoring rules and constraints or pretending they just don't exist. Nonsense. Real creativity is put to the test within the box. In fact, that's where it really shines. It might surprise you, but it's actually easier to think outside the box than within its confines. How can that be? It's simple. When you're working outside the box, you don't face rules, or boundaries, or assumptions. You create your own as you go along. If you want to throw convention aside, you can do it. If you want to throw proven practices out the window, have at it. You have the freedom to create your own world. Now, I'm not saying there's anything wrong with thinking outside the box. At times, it's absolutely essential - such as when you're facing the biggest oil spill in history in an environment in which all the known approaches are failing. But most of us don't have the luxury of being able to operate outside the box. We've been shoved into reality, facing a variety of limitations, from budgets, to supervisors' opinions and prejudices, to the nature of the marketplace. Even though the box may have been given a bad name, it's where most of us have to spend our time. And no matter how much we may fret about those limits, inside that box is where we need to prove ourselves. If you'll pardon the inevitable sports analogy, consider a baseball player who belts ball after ball over 450 feet. Unfortunately, he has a wee problem: he can't place those hits between the foul lines, so they're harmful strikes instead of game-winning home runs. To the out-of-the-box advocates, he's a mighty slugger who deserves admiration, but to his teammates and the fans, he's a loser who just can't get on base. He may not like the fact that he has to limit his hits to between the foul poles, but that's one of the realities of the game he chose to play. The same is true of ideas and approaches. The most dazzling and impressive tactic is essentially useless if it doesn't offer a practical, realistic way to address the need or application. Like the baseball player, we may not like the realities, but we have to operate within their limits. Often, I've seen people blame the box for their inability or unwillingness to create something workable. For example, back in my ad agency days, I remember fellow writers and designers complaining about the limitations of projects. If it was a half-page ad, they didn't feel they could truly be creative unless the space was expanded to a full page. If they were given a full page, they demanded a spread. Handed a spread, they'd fret because it wasn't a TV commercial. If the project became a TV commercial with a $25,000 budget, they'd grouse about not having a $50,000 budget. Yet the greatest artists of all time didn't complain about what they didn't have; they worked their magic using what they did. Monet captured the grace and beauty of France astonishingly well within the bounds of a canvas. Donatello exposed the breathtaking emotion that lurked within ordinary chunks of marble. And I doubt that Beethoven ever whined because there were only 88 keys on the piano. Similarly, I've watched the best of my peers do amazing things in less-than-favorable circumstances. There were brilliant commercials developed with minimal budgets and hand-held cameras. Black-and-white ads that outperformed their colorful competitors. Simple postcards that grabbed the attention of (and business from) jaded consumers. You see, real creativity isn't hampered or blocked by limits. It actually flowers in response to challenges. Even though it may be forced to remain inside the box, it leverages everything it can find in that box and makes the most of every bit of it. Real creativity is driven by a need to create. When Monet approached a blank canvas, it's safe to say that he didn't agonize over its size. He wanted to capture something he'd seen and share how it looked through his eyes. The size of the canvas was incidental to his talent and desire. Think about the Apollo 13 mission. NASA didn't have the luxury of flying supplies or extra tools to the crew. They couldn't rewrite the laws of physics. Plus, they faced a rapidly shrinking timeline, so their box kept getting smaller and less forgiving. And yet they arrived upon a solution that was creative; more important, that was successful. The next time someone tells you that the real solution involves stepping outside the box, challenge him or her to think and work harder. After all, the best solution may very well be lurking in a corner of that familiar box.

#### Competing interpretations is best:

#### It’s the only objective standard – they allow for judge intervention and take the debate out of the hands of the debater.

#### Doesn’t cause a race to the bottom – we force debaters to be better at impacting standards which is true for any DA debate.

#### And – they aren’t reasonable – our limits and precision arguments all prove.

### 2NC Conditionality Good

#### C/I The negative gets 2 conditional advocacies . The squo is always an option.

#### 2AC strategic thinking - forces the 2ac to tailor their straight turns to what the CP can’t solve - this increases analytic education.

#### No argument irresponsibility --- its no different than them choosing not to go for a link turn on politics.

#### Structural aff bias justifies – persuasive value of the 2AR outweighs the strategic benefit of the block – neg flex key to overwhelm their specificity bias

#### Real world – policymakers have to protect their plans from the right and left ideas

#### 2NR checks – collapsing the strategy allows the 2AR frame the debate

#### And - One CP doesn’t solve

#### a. Still links to their offense - if one conditional advocacy is good, any disad to two or more is arbitrary.

#### b. Not a rational test of opportunity cost - if there are multiple costs to any policy you can’t just ignore some of them.

#### Reject the arg not the team

### Water wars

#### No water wars

Victor 7 (David G., Professor of Law – Stanford Law School and Director – Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “What Resource Wars?”, The National Interest, 11-12, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020)

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that water wars don't happen-usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny-the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker "climate" conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

#### -- Water scarcity spurs cooperation – not conflict

Deen 7 (Thalif, Staff – IPS, “Water Wars A Myth”, Inter Press Service, 8-25, Lexis)

"Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins," UNESCO concludes. The Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) says that 10- to 20-year-old arguments about conflict over water are still being recycled. "Such arguments ignore massive amounts of recent research which shows that water-scarce states that share a water body tend to find cooperative solutions rather than enter into violent conflict," the institute says. SIWI says that during the entire "intifada" -- the ongoing Palestinian uprising against Israel in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza -- the only thing on which the two warring parties continued to cooperate at a basic level was their shared waters. "Thus, rather than reaching for arguments for the 'water war hypotheses,' the facts seem to support the idea that water is a uniting force and a potential source of peace rather than violent conflict." SIWI said. Ghosh, co-author of the UNDP study, pointed out several agreements which were "models of cooperation", including the Indus Waters Treaty, the Israel-Jordan accord, the Senegal River Development Organisation and the Mekong River Commission. A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "No nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study, jointly co-authored by Aaron Wolf, Annika Kramer, Alexander Carius and Geoffrey Dabelko.

### 2NC No Prolif

#### It’s not widespread – Hymans says that there are too many problems with startups or workers despite the efforts – this assumes their nuclear inevitability claims

#### Prefer our evidence – it’s predictive of dispersal of tech and knowledge

#### Prolif will be slow and limited – Yusuf ev says

#### Forecasts on prolif are over estimated because the projections are based on tech not intent –

#### Alarmism makes it slow – post Cold War the threat has greatly decreased

#### We’ve got empirics – their author exaggerate

Farley 11, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, (Robert, "Over the Horizon: Iran and the Nuclear Paradox," 11-16, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox))

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. Israel represents another case in which the benefits of nuclear weapons remain unclear. Although Israel adopted a policy of ambiguity about its nuclear program, most in the region understood that Israel possessed nuclear weapons by the late-1960s. These weapons did not deter Syria or Egypt from launching a large-scale conventional assault in 1973, however. Nor did they help the Israeli Defense Force compel acquiescence in Lebanon in 1982 or 2006. Nuclear weapons have not resolved the Palestinian question, and when it came to removing the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, Israel relied not on its nuclear arsenal but on the United States to do so -- through conventional means -- in 2003. Israeli nukes have thus far failed to intimidate the Iranians into freezing their nuclear program. Moreover, Israel has pursued a defense policy designed around the goal of maintaining superiority at every level of military escalation, from asymmetrical anti-terror efforts to high-intensity conventional combat. Thus, it is unclear whether the nuclear program has even saved Israel any money. 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. None of these lies are particularly dishonorable; they represent the normal course of diplomacy. But they are lies nevertheless, and serious analysts of foreign policy and international relations need to be wary of them. Nonproliferation is a good idea, if only because states should not waste tremendous resources on weapons of limited utility. Nuclear weapons also represent a genuine risk of accidents, especially for states that have not yet developed appropriately robust security precautions. Instability and collapse in nuclear states has been harrowing in the past and will undoubtedly be harrowing in the future. All of these threats should be taken seriously by policymakers. Unfortunately, as long as deception remains the rule in the practice of nuclear diplomacy, exaggerated alarmism will substitute for a realistic appraisal of the policy landscape.

### 2NC Prolif Leadership Fails

#### They can’t solve nuclear leadership or proliferation – multiple reasons:

#### First – it’s an outdated tool – tech for proliferation is already widespread – US has limited influence and can hardly deter – that’s Weiss. Prefer our evidence – theirs assumes the peak of nuke power development when supply was limited.

#### There uniq says 40 countries want it – nothing will stop them from proliferating or buying from china

#### 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.

#### Second – 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.

#### Third – waste management – it shows that US has poor technology making the US an international standard for failed nuclear power – that’s Moniz.

#### US won’t exert prolif leadership

Cleary 12 (Richard Cleary, American Enterprise Institute Research Assistant, 8/13/12, Richard Cleary: Persuading Countries to Forgo Nuclear Fuel-Making, npolicy.org/article.php?aid=1192&tid=30)

The cases above offer a common lesson: The U.S., though constrained or empowered by circumstance, can exert considerable sway in nonproliferation matters, but often **elects not to apply the most powerful tools at its disposal for fear of jeopardizing other objectives**. The persistent dilemma of how much to emphasize nonproliferation goals, and at what cost, has contributed to cases of **nonproliferation failure**. The inconsistent or incomplete application of U.S. power in nonproliferation cases is most harmful when it gives the impression to a nation that either sharing sensitive technology or developing it is, or will become, acceptable to Washington. U.S. reticence historically, with some exceptions, to prioritize nonproliferation—and in so doing reduce the chance of success in these cases—does not leave room for great optimism about future U.S. efforts at persuading countries to forgo nuclear fuel-making.

### SMRs > Prolif

#### SMRs cause prolif – prefer our ev

####  Moor says there is no safeguarding or nuclear experience in developing countries – that increases risk of proliferation of attacks

#### Here’s more ev

**Makhijani and Boyd, 10** – electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, and Director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility (Arjun and Michele, September. “Small Modular Reactors: No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power.” IEER. http://ieer.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/small-modular-reactors2010.pdf)

In addition, the use of plutonium fuel or uranium enriched to levels as high as 20 percent—four to five times the typical enrichment level for present commercial light water reactors—presents serious proliferation risks, especially as some SMRs are proposed to be exported to developing countries with small grids and/or installed in remote locations. Security and safety will be more difficult to maintain in countries with no or underdeveloped nuclear regulatory infrastructure and in isolated areas. Burying the reactor underground, as proposed for some designs, would not sufficiently address security because some access from above will still be needed and it could increase the environmental impact to groundwater, for example, in the event of an accident.

#### 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.

### Accidents Turn 2NC

#### Extinction

Wasserman 2 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, Earth Island Journal, Spring, www.earthisland.org/eijournal/new\_articles.cfm?articleID=457&journalID=63)

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack.  Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation?  If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could **obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations** must be shut down.

#### A single accident turns the case – shuts down the nuclear industry

**Squassoni, 8** – senior fellow and director of the Proliferation Prevention Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, former senior associate at Carnegie (Sharon, 3/12. "Nuclear Power in a Warming World: Solution or Illusion?" Testimony to the House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming. http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=19981&prog=zgp&proj=znpp)

A few caveats with respect to projecting nuclear energy expansion are necessary. Nuclear energy is undoubtedly safer and more efficient now than when it began fifty years ago, but it still faces four fundamental challenges: waste, cost, proliferation, and safety. It is an inherently risky business. Most industry executives will admit that it will only take one significant accident to plunge the “renaissance” back into the nuclear Dark Ages. Because of this, estimates are highly uncertain. For example, the U.S. Energy Information Administration does not use its computer model to estimate nuclear energy growth because, among other things, key variables such as public attitudes and government policy are difficult to quantify and project. That said, estimates tend to extrapolate electricity consumption and demand from gross domestic product (GDP) growth, make assumptions about nuclear energy’s share of electricity production, and then estimate nuclear reactor capacity.

## Round 3 1NR vs. Kansas FS

### Realism

#### This double turns with the entire thesis of their prolif advantage – 45 countries are looking to acquire nuclear materials in the squo because they see that as being in their best interest, if it’s true that countries will ALWAYS do what’s in their best interest, then those that want to get nuclear weapons will get weapons regardless of the United States.

#### They can’t win that countries are getting nukes because they don’t think the NPT has credibility because India, Pakistan, China, Iran, North Korea all in the face of the NPT are acquiring weapons, it’s the opposite way, people are moving towards nukes because they don’t CARE About the NPT

#### This terminally means that prolif is inevitable and you can’t solve it

### 1NR Overview

#### Russia war outweighs the aff – Romney will collapse relations with Russia because of he won’t cooperate on BMD and Putin hates him

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum 2**, 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 their prolif leadership impact – US/Russia coop is key to tings like START and nuclear nonprolif initiatives

#### 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 reelection is key to check Asian conflict

**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.

#### Cross apply Fisher

### AT: Military Shield

#### 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.

### 1NR – Uniqueness

#### Group the uniqueness debate – our Silver evidence indicates that Obama has an 86% chance of winning while winning a 4.1% lead in the popular vote

#### And 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 ONLY uniqueness evidence cites the post-debate bump from Rasmussen but - even Rasmussen concedes, the debate hasn’t helped

Rasmussen 10/5/12 (Rasmussen Report, "Daily Presidential Tracking Poll," http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/politics/obama\_administration/daily\_presidential\_tracking\_poll)

The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for Friday shows President Obama attracting support from 49% of voters nationwide, while Mitt Romney earns the vote from 47%. One percent (1%) prefers some other candidate, and three percent (3%) are undecided. See daily tracking history.¶ These results are based upon nightly interviews and reported on a three-day rolling average basis. As a result, only about one-third of the interviews for today’s update were conducted after the presidential debate. The single night of polling conducted after the debate did show some improvement for Romney, but it remains to be seen whether that will continue or if it was merely statistical noise. Sunday morning’s update will be the first national polling based entirely upon post-debate interviews.¶ Matchup results are updated daily at 9:30 a.m. Eastern (sign up for free daily e-mail update).

#### Rasmussen electoral college projections put Obama ahead

Rasmussen 10/5/12 ("2012 Electoral College Scoreboard," http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/archive/2012\_electoral\_college\_scoreboard)

Rasmussen Reports - Electoral College Breakdown

Safe Romney 167

Likely Romney 14

Leans Romney 0

Toss-up 120

Leans Obama 0

Likely Obama 34

Safe Obama 203

#### Obama will win – jobs and swing states

Espo and Thomas October 5 (David and Ken, reporters at AP, <http://www.bradenton.com/2012/10/05/4227714/jobs-report-gives-obama-much-needed.html>, accessed: 5 October 2012, JT)

FAIRFAX, VA. — Mitt Romney was still celebrating his widely praised debate performance when the campaign lurched in a different direction.¶ Unemployment dropped last month to the lowest level since 2009, and suddenly it was President Barack Obama's turn to smile.¶ In a race dominated by the weak economy, Obama said Friday the creation of 114,000 jobs in September, coupled with a drop in unemployment to 7.8 percent, was "a reminder that this country has come too far to turn back now." Jabbing at his rival's plans, he declared, "We've made too much progress to return to the policies that caused this crisis in the first place."¶ But Romney saw little to like in the day's new government numbers.¶ "This is not what a real recovery looks like," the former Massachusetts governor and businessman said, an analysis echoed by other Republicans throughout the day. "We created fewer jobs in September than in August, and fewer jobs in August than in July, and we've lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs since President Obama took office," Romney added.¶ "If not for all the people who have simply dropped out of the labor force, the real unemployment rate would be closer to 11%," he said.¶ Incumbent and challenger alike campaigned in battleground states during the day, each man starting out in Virginia before the president headed for Ohio and Romney flew to Florida. Those three states, along with Colorado, Nevada, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, North Carolina and Iowa make up the nine battleground states where the race is likely to be decided. Among them, they account for 110 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.¶ Recent polls have shown Obama with leads in most if not all of them, although the impact of Wednesday night's debate and of the drop in unemployment could well change some public opinion.

### 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.

#### Spending costs Obama the election --- kills independent support which their 2AC Louis evidence says will swing the election

**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.

#### 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.

#### Women 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.

### Russia Rels

#### Romney will aggressively push human rights legislation on Russia.

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

Russia has joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but the US is yet to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations. Moves to do so by repealing the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been stymied by the US election and efforts in Congress to tie such relations to legislation that would punish Russian officials deemed guilty of human rights abuses, including the arrest and death in custody of Sergei Magnitsky, a whistleblower. The Obama administration has taken action against those suspected of complicity in Mr Magnitsky's death, but in a limited and low-profile manner. It is not clear whether Mr Romney would be more forceful, because there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the argument. It seems likely that Mr Romney will back granting permanent normal trade relations soon after the election, but he might be more amenable to framing human rights legislation in ways that the Russian political class would regard as unwarranted interference in Russian domestic affairs.

#### That undermines START and U.S./Russian relations.

**Rogin**, **4/24**/2012 (Josh, Kerry delays action on Magnitsky bill, Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/24/kerry\_delays\_action\_on\_magnitsky\_bill)

The Obama administration is on the record opposing the Magnitsky bill and believes that its passage could imperil U.S.-Russian cooperation on a range of issues. The Russian government has even threatened to scuttle the New START nuclear reductions treaty if the Magnitsky bill is passed, which would erase the signature accomplishment of the administration's U.S.-Russia reset policy. "Senior Russian government officials have warned us that they will respond asymmetrically if legislation passes," the administration said in its official comments on the bill last July. "Their argument is that we cannot expect them to be our partner in supporting sanctions against countries like Iran, North Korea, and Libya, and sanction them at the same time. Russian officials have said that other areas of bilateral cooperation, including on transit Afghanistan, could be jeopardized if this legislation passes." Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak said Monday at a lunch with reporters in Washington that passage of the Magnitsky bill would have a "significant negative impact" on the U.S.-Russia relationship and said it was unacceptable for the United States to interfere in the Magnitsky case, which he said was an internal Russian issue.

## Round 6 1NC vs. North Texas AS

### **T**

####  “Financial incentives” are funding for investors to develop a project – that excludes nonfinancial incentives like PPAs

**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 – purchase power agreements 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 – they kill 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.

### DOD Procurement CP

#### The United States Department of Defense should start a competitive procurement process to obtain a small modular nuclear reactor. The Nuclear Regulatory Committee should tailor existing regulations on licensing of small modular nuclear reactors that are compliant with non-proliferation guidelines and standards.

#### Procurement solves --- it optimizes military applications and generates innovation in nuclear technology.

**Andres and Breetz**, February **2011** (Richard – Professor of National Security Strategy at the National War College and senior fellow and Energy and Environmental Security and Policy Chair in the Center for Strategic Studies at the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, and Hanna – doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Small Nuclear Reactors for Military Installations: Capabilities, Costs, and Technological Implications, p. 7-8)

DOD as First Mover Thus far, this paper has reviewed two of DOD’s most pressing energy vulnerabilities—grid insecurity and fuel convoys—and explored how they could be addressed by small reactors. We acknowledge that there are many uncertainties and risks associated with these reactors. On the other hand, failing to pursue these technologies raises its own set of risks for DOD, which we review in this section: 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. By taking an early “first mover” role in the small reactor market, DOD could mitigate these risks and secure the long-term availability and appropriateness of these technologies for U.S. military applications. The “Valley of Death.” Given the promise that small reactors hold for military installations and mobility, DOD has a compelling interest in ensuring that they make the leap from paper to production. However, if DOD does not provide an initial demonstration and market, there is a chance that the U.S. small reactor industry may never get off the ground. The leap from the laboratory to the marketplace is so difficult to bridge that it is widely referred to as the “Valley Death.” Many promising technologies are never commercialized due to a variety of market failures— including technical and financial uncertainties, information asymmetries, capital market imperfections, transaction costs, and environmental and security externalities— that impede financing and early adoption and can lock innovative technologies out of the marketplace. 28 In such cases, the Government can help a worthy technology to bridge the Valley of Death by accepting the first mover costs and demonstrating the technology’s scientific and economic viability.29 Historically, nuclear power has been “the most clear-cut example . . . of an important general-purpose technology that in the absence of military and defense-related procurement would not have been developed at all.”30 Government involvement is likely to be crucial for innovative, next-generation nuclear technology as well. Despite the widespread revival of interest in nuclear energy, Daniel Ingersoll has argued that radically innovative designs face an uphill battle, as “the high capital cost of nuclear plants and the painful lessons learned during the first nuclear era have created a prevailing fear of first-of-a-kind designs.”31 In addition, Massachusetts Institute of Technology reports on the Future of Nuclear Power called for the Government to provide modest “first mover” assistance to the private sector due to several barriers that have hindered the nuclear renaissance, such as securing high up-front costs of site-banking, gaining NRC certification for new technologies, and demonstrating technical viability.32 It is possible, of course, that small reactors will achieve commercialization without DOD assistance. As discussed above, they have garnered increasing attention in the energy community. Several analysts have even argued that small reactors could play a key role in the second nuclear era, given that they may be the only reactors within the means of many U.S. utilities and developing countries.33 However, given the tremendous regulatory hurdles and technical and financial uncertainties, it appears far from certain that the U.S. small reactor industry will take off. If DOD wants to ensure that small reactors are available in the future, then it should pursue a leadership role now.

#### NRC regulations are modeled --- it’s the golden standard that other nations follow.

Lovering et. al, 12 [9/7/2012 (Jessica – policy analyst at the Breakthrough Institute, Ted Nordhaus – chairman at the Breakthrough Institute, and Michael Shllenberger – president of the Breakthrough Institute, Out of the Nuclear Closet, Foreign Policy, p. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/07/out\_of\_the\_nuclear\_closet?page=full]

Nuclear has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress for more than 60 years, but the enthusiasm is running out. The Obama administration deserves credit for authorizing funding for two small modular reactors, which will be built at the Savannah River site in South Carolina. But a much more sweeping reform of U.S. nuclear energy policy is required. At present, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has little institutional knowledge of anything other than light-water reactors and virtually no capability to review or regulate alternative designs. This affects nuclear innovation in other countries as well, since the NRC remains, despite its many critics, the global gold standard for thorough regulation of nuclear energy. Most other countries follow the NRC's lead when it comes to establishing new technical and operational standards for the design, construction, and operation of nuclear plants.

### Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win now – Electoral College projections, national popular vote projections

Silver 10/4/12 (Nate, Founder @ Fivethirtyeight.com, "Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls," http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/)

It may be a bit fruitless to spend too much time worrying about the Wednesday afternoon FiveThirtyEight forecast when Wednesday night’s debate had the potential to change the election landscape. But for the sake of continuity, here goes. The FiveThirtyEight forecast had Mr. Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney. As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, a great deal of this comes down to Ohio. Historically, Ohio is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.

#### But the next 10 days are key - new issues that “shake up the race” are key to Romney’s chances

Cook 10/1/12 (Charlie, Founder of Cook Political Report, "Shades of 1996," http://cookpolitical.com/story/4846)

Public attitudes toward candidates and elections often start off in a fluid state. Then they gradually begin to jell, first reaching a semisolid state before hardening to rock-solid. This year’s presidential race isn’t over, but Mitt Romney’s current trajectory in the polls will not cross President Obama’s by Nov. 6—or maybe even Nov. 6 of next year. If something doesn’t happen to shake up the race, Romney will lose. Romney’s negatives, particularly in swing states, have grown to the point that if allowed to solidify, his opportunity to recover will vanish. The GOP nominee still has a chance to change the trajectory of the campaign, but the longer he takes, the smaller the payoff. Very few undecided voters are left in swing states; campaign pollsters say that maybe 4 or 5 percent of likely voters fit in this category. And no one would be surprised if some of the remaining undecided voters, after being subjected to saturation advertising for months—in some cases since June—throw up their hands and opt to stay home on Election Day. If the presidential race stays on its current course for another week or 10 days, Romney faces the very real prospect that Republican donors, super PACs, and other parts of the GOP support structure will begin to shift resources away from helping him and toward a last-ditch effort to win a Senate majority—which once seemed very likely—and to protect the party’s House majority. A year and a half ago, it looked like Republicans had a 65 to 70 percent chance of capturing the Senate. The 23 Democratic seats up for grabs, compared with just 10 for Republicans, offered the GOP many opportunities for gains, particularly in states that Democrats had captured from Republicans in 2006. Jennifer Duffy, senior Senate editor of *The Cook Political Report*, now argues that the range of possible Senate outcomes goes from Republicans picking up two or three seats to actually losing a seat or two. For the most part, the deterioration of the Senate outlook is unrelated to Romney’s problems at the top of the ticket, and it comes despite a strong effort by the National Republican Senatorial Committee. But there’s no denying that things are not looking so good for the red team in the Senate. Arguably, Republicans now have a chance against only one of the four most vulnerable Democratic Senate incumbents, with GOP Rep. Denny Rehberg now running even with Jon Tester in Montana. Republican prospects to unseat Democrats Claire McCaskill in Missouri, Bill Nelson in Florida, andSherrod Brown in Ohio are remote, at best. Top-tier recruits in open seats in Hawaii and New Mexico have not caught on despite strong campaign efforts, further undercutting GOP chances of securing a Senate majority. Two moderate Democrats running for open Senate seats in very Republican states are doing unexpectedly well: Democratic former state Attorney General Heidi Heitkamp is locked in a tight race in North Dakota with GOP Rep. Rick Berg, while Democratic Rep. Joe Donnelly is in an equally close contest with Republican state Treasurer Richard Mourdock inIndiana. Republicans were heavily favored to win both seats early on; now both races are very tight. Duffy points to the last time this class of Senate seats was up, in 2006: Then, three Senate seats and control of the chamber were settled by 60,665 votes spread among three states, Missouri, Montana, and Virginia. Of the 10 Senate races that *The Cook Political Report* rates as toss-ups, six are now in Democratic hands and four are in GOP hands. The range of possible outcomes is very wide. In the House, we have not yet seen any signs of deterioration for the GOP majority. Even if Democrats were to win every seat currently rated solid Democratic, likely Democratic, or lean Democratic, as well as every toss-up, they would still come up short of a majority. The canaries in the coal mine are GOP seats currently rated as lean Republican or likely Republican. *Cook Political Report* House Editor David Wasserman points out that with Democrats likely to lose perhaps 10 of their own seats, they would have to gross 35 seats to hit the 25 net seats necessary to win a majority. That’s a very tall order. House Republican strategists have been preaching the “balance message” to their candidates: If the top of the ticket starts to go south on them, then Republicans need to argue that the party must keep the House in GOP hands to have a firm check in place to balance against a second-term President Obama. The next week or 10 days are thus critical for Romney and the GOP. If things don’t turn around, a stampede could ensue reminiscent of 1996, when Republicans realized that Bob Dole was not going to defeat President Clinton. History could repeat itself.

#### 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 12, 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. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### Electricity Prices DA

#### Electricity prices are declining in the status quo

**Burtraw 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. 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.

#### PPAs undermine innovation and market development.

Wesoff 10, 5/12/2010 (Eric, Anatomy of a Power Purchase Agreement, Greentech Solar, p. http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/anatomy-of-a-power-purchase-agreement/)

Two of the major challenges to adoption of renewable energy include the barrier of high upfront costs. Power purchase agreements go a long way toward solving this problem, but they have their own set of flaws and advantages. Today's panel explored the state of PPAs. Marc Roper, the VP of Sales at PPA firm Tioga Energy, was the panelist most deeply entrenched in the PPA industry. Tioga works on PPAs for distributed generation in the several hundred kilowatts to multiple megawatts range. Roper said, "It's hard to be an innovator as a PPA provider -- we have to minimize technology risk. We are going to be at the tail end of the adoption curve." He added that new solar technology like "tracking, exotic materials, new types of electronics [like microinverters] -- we are a little less likely to adopt those." Most of those technologies will have to get to market through other means than PPAs.

#### That subsidizes cost and causes SMR models that shifts the cost to electrical grid

Cooper 9, November 2009 (Mark – Senior Fellow for Economic Analysis at the Institute for Energy and the Environment at Vermont Law School, All Risk, No Reward for the Taxpayers and Ratepayers: The Economics of Subsidizing the ‘Nuclear Renaissance’ with Loan Guarantees and Construction Work in Progress, p. http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/11\_03\_09\_Cooper%20All%20Risk%20Full%20Report.pdf)

Subsidies for Nuclear Reactor Construction Harms Taxpayers and Ratepayers Attempting to circumvent the sound judgment of capital markets, advocates of loan guarantees and construction work in progress claim that they lower the financing costs of nuclear reactors and are good for consumers, but shifting risk does not eliminate it and taxpayers and ratepayer will pay the price. • Because the subsidy induces the utility to choose an option that is not the least-cost option available, ratepayers will bear a higher burden. • Subsidies induce the utility to undertake risky behaviors that they would not otherwise have engaged in. When those undertakings go bad, the costs of the failures will be born by taxpayers and ratepayers in the form of expenditures on facilities that do not produce a flow of goods and services. • If the pre-approval process for loan guarantees and/or construction work in progress reduces scrutiny over cost escalation and overruns, ratepayers will end up paying a higher price than anticipated. • Even with subsidies, these projects are so risky and large that they tend to have adverse impacts on the utility’s financial rating, which results in substantial increases in the cost of service. • For cash-strapped consumers, taking after-tax dollars out of their pockets is a severe burden. If taxpayers and ratepayers have a higher discount rate than the utility rate of return, they would be better off having the present use of their money. There is a high probability that some or all of these factors will impose high costs on taxpayers and ratepayers (as described in Exhibit ES-2).

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring" and sparks US economic growth

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 – Prolif

#### Countries that want to proliferate will do so no matter what, just because the US becomes a nuclear leader doesn’t discourage those countries from wanting nukes

#### No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12 (Jacques, Associate Professor of International Relations – USC, North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb, Foreign Affairs, 4-16, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show)

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Don’t replace older reactors which means meltdowns are still inevitable

#### Meltdowns don’t cause extinction

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.

#### Meltdowns don’t cause lasting damage

Bosselman, 07 - Professor of Law Emeritus, Chicago-Kent College of Law (Fred, “The New Power Generation: Environmental Law and Electricity Innovation: Colloquium Article: The Ecological Advantages of Nuclear Power,” 15 N.Y.U. Envtl. L.J. 1, 2007)

In 1986, an explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in the Ukraine **caused the** release **of** large **amounts of** radiation into the atmosphere. 247 Initially, the Soviet government released little information about the explosion and tried to play down its seriousness, but this secrecy caused great nervousness throughout Europe, and fed the public's fears of nuclear power all over the  [\*46]  world. 248 Now **a comprehensive analysis of the event and its aftermath has been made**: In 2005, a consortium of United Nations agencies called the Chernobyl Forum released its analysis of the long-term effects of the Chernobyl explosion. 249 The U.N. agencies' study found that the explosion caused fewer deaths than **had been** expected. 250 Although the Chernobyl reactor was poorly designed and badly operated 251 and lacked the basic safety protections found outside the Soviet Union, 252 **fewer than seventy deaths so far have been attributed to the explosion**, mostly plant employees and firefighters who suffered acute radiation sickness. 253 **The** Chernobyl **reactor**, like many Soviet reactors, was in the open rather than in an American type of pressurizable containment structure, which would have prevented the release of radiation to the environment if a similar accident had occurred. 254 [\*47] Perhaps **the most surprising finding of the** U.N. agencies' **study was that "**the ecosystems around the Chernobyl site are now flourishing. The [**Chernobyl** exclusion zone] **has become a wildlife sanctuary**, and it looks like the nature park it has become." 255 Jeffrey McNeely, the chief scientist of the World Conservation Union, has made similar observations: Chernobyl has now become the world's first radioactive nature reserve... . 200 wolves are now living in the nature reserve, which has also begun to support populations of reindeer, lynx and European bison, species that previously were not found in the region. While the impact on humans was strongly negative, **the** wildlife is adapting and **even** thriving on the site of **one of the** 20th century's worst environmental disasters. 256 Mary Mycio, the Kiev correspondent for the Los Angeles Times, has written a fascinating book based on her many visits to the exclusion zone and interviews with people in the area. 257 She notes that the fear that radiation would produce permanent deformities in animal species has not been borne out after twenty years; the population and diversity of animals in even some of the most heavily radiated parts of the exclusion zone is similar to comparable places **that are** less radioactive. 258

### 1NC – Water Wars

#### Desalination can’t solve water shortages – comparative costs

Cooley et al 6 [Heather Cooley is a Research Associate in the Water and Sustainability Program. Her research interests include conservation, privatization, climate change, and California water. Ms. Cooley holds a B.S. in Molecular Environmental Biology and an M.S. in Energy and Resources from the University of California at Berkeley. Prior to joining the Institute, Ms. Cooley worked at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory on climate and land use change. Dr. Peter H. Gleick is co-founder and President of the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security in Oakland, California. Dr. Gleick works on the hydrologic impacts of climate change; sustainable water use, planning, and policy; and international conflicts over water resources. Dr. Gleick received a B.S. from Yale University and an M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley. In 2003 he received a MacArthur Foundation Fellowship for his work on water issues. He serves on the boards of numerous journals and organizations and was elected an Academician of the International Water Academy in Oslo, Norway in 1999. In 2001, he was appointed to the Water Science and Technology Board of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. In 2006, he was elected a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Gary Wolff, P.E., Ph.D., is Principal Economist and Engineer. Dr. Wolff received his B.S. in Renewable Energy Engineering Technology from Jordan College in 1982, his M.S. in Civil and Environmental Engineering from Stanford University in 1984, and his Ph.D. in Resource Economics from the University of California at Berkeley in 1997. His professional career has included solar energy construction contracting, water quality regulation for the State of California, serving as design engineer at a wastewater treatment plant, founding and serving as president of a small engineering consulting firm, holding a post-doctoral fellowship at the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and holding a visiting professorship at the Graduate School of International Policy Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He is former chair of the East Bay Municipal Utility District Demand Management Advisory Committee; a former member of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Desalination Research Project Executive Committee; and a member of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, the state regulator of ambient water quality in the nine-county Bay Area. DESALINATION, WITH A GRAIN OF SALT A CALIFORNIA PERSPECTIVE. The Pacific Institute. June 2006.]

Perhaps the greatest barrier to desalination remains its high economic cost compared to alternatives, including other sources of supply, improved wastewater reuse, and especially more efficient use and demand management. We do not believe that the economic evaluations of desalination commonly presented to regulators and the public adequately account for the complicated benefits and costs associated with issues of reliability, quality, local control, environmental effects, and impacts on development. In general, significant benefits and costs are often excluded from the costs presented publicly. California should pursue less costly, less environmentally damaging water-supply alternatives first. Is desalination the ultimate solution to our water problems? No. Is it likely to be a piece of our water management puzzle? Yes. In the end, decisions about desalination developments will revolve around complex evaluations of local circumstances and needs, economics, financing, environmental and social impacts, and available alternatives. We urge that such decisions be transparent, honest, public, and systematic.

#### Tech is obsolete and nuclear power consumes more water – turns the impact

Smith 11 [Gar Smith. Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War. NUCLEAR ROULETTE THE CASE AGAINST A “NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE.” June 2011. http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf]

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today. But nuclear desalination is another False Solution. The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology. Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate. 154 Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce highpurity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit. 155 Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156

#### Water scarcity spurs cooperation – not conflict

Deen 7 (Thalif, Staff – IPS, “Water Wars A Myth”, Inter Press Service, 8-25, Lexis)

"Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins," UNESCO concludes. The Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) says that 10- to 20-year-old arguments about conflict over water are still being recycled. "Such arguments ignore massive amounts of recent research which shows that water-scarce states that share a water body tend to find cooperative solutions rather than enter into violent conflict," the institute says. SIWI says that during the entire "intifada" -- the ongoing Palestinian uprising against Israel in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza -- the only thing on which the two warring parties continued to cooperate at a basic level was their shared waters. "Thus, rather than reaching for arguments for the 'water war hypotheses,' the facts seem to support the idea that water is a uniting force and a potential source of peace rather than violent conflict." SIWI said. Ghosh, co-author of the UNDP study, pointed out several agreements which were "models of cooperation", including the Indus Waters Treaty, the Israel-Jordan accord, the Senegal River Development Organisation and the Mekong River Commission. A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "No nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study, jointly co-authored by Aaron Wolf, Annika Kramer, Alexander Carius and Geoffrey Dabelko.

#### No water wars

Victor 7 (David G., Professor of Law – Stanford Law School and Director – Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “What Resource Wars?”, The National Interest, 11-12, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020)

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that water wars don't happen-usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny-the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker "climate" conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

#### -- History and best studies prove

Wolf 99 (Aaron, Assistant Professor of Geography – University of Wisconsin, “Conflict and Cooperation Along International Waterways”, 11-1, http://www.gci.ch/GreenCrossPrograms/waterres/middleeast/wolf.html

There are 268 international rivers, covering almost one half of the total land surface of the globe, and untold numbers of shared aquifers. Water has been a cause of political tensions between Arabs and Israelis; Indians and Bangladeshis; Americans and Mexicans; and all ten riparian states of the Nile River. Water is the only scarce resource for which there is no substitute, over which there is poorly-developed international law, and the need for which is overwhelming, constant, and immediate. As a consequence, "water" and "war" are two topics being assessed together with increasing frequency. This paper investigates the reality of historic water conflict and draws lessons for the plausibility of future "water wars." The datasets of conflict are explored for those related to water only seven minor skirmishes are found in this century; no war has ever been fought over water. In contrast, 145 water-related treaties were signed in the same period. These treaties, collected and catalogued in a computerized database along with relevant notes from negotiators, are assessed for patterns of conflict resolution. War over water seems neither strategically rational, hydrographically effective, nor economically viable. Shared interests along a waterway seem to overwhelm water's conflict-inducing characteristics. Furthermore, once cooperative water regimes are established through treaty, they turn out to be tremendously resilient over time, even between otherwise hostile riparians, and even as conflict is waged over other issues. These patterns suggest that the more valuable lesson of international water is as a resources whose characteristics tend to induce cooperation, and incite violence only in the exception.

#### Status quo solves desalination

Economic Times, 12 (Neenu Abraham, ET Bureau, 6/5. “Low-cost desalination solutions & other tech innovations can add a lot of sparkle to water.” http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-06-05/news/32055849\_1\_desalination-reverse-osmosis-drinking-water)

Paradoxically, this comes at a time when India-born professor of chemical engineering at New Jersey Institute of Technology, DrKamalesh K Sirkar, has just won a patent for a low-cost desalination technique, that not only brings down capital costs but also assures safe and good source of water. Less than 1% of the municipality water in India comes from desalination plants, according to SVK Babu, director, Veolia Water India, whose company has initiated a project in Nagpur which treats river water and meets the drinking water needs of 2.5 million people there. Traditional desalination plants have been energy-intensive and hence costly, making it unfeasible to be implemented in India. "Desalination involves the removal of dissolved salts from water. The minimum energy needed for desalination is 0.8 kWh/m3 for seawater at 25 degrees Celsius. This is the theoretical minimum. Taking into account inefficiencies of various components, it will require more than three to five times that energy in real world conditions," says Chris Scott, managing director (Middle East, India & Africa) of Black & Veatch. The $2.3-billion company is involved in improving water supply to 3.5 million people in Kerala through its project with the Kerala Water Authority. It also helped out with the decontamination of ground water in over one lakh wells in West Bengal, says Scott. The good news is that more and more futuristic technologies are being readied in research labs to make desalination and water treatment processes more energy-efficient. Dr Sirkar's patented system, for one, which is based on direct-contact membrane distillation, can deliver about 80 litres of drinking water per 100 litres of seawater. A comparable system would reclaim only 41 litres from the same amount of salt water. The advantage is that the heat needed for desalination is low. For countries like India, he says, "heat is generated as a by-product in many industries like nuclear power plants, industrial waste plants and by solar voltaic plants. One way of cutting energy costs is by installing desalination units at nuclear or industrial sites where heat is generated." This would ensure an almost net-zero (that is no extra power is consumed from external sources) situation, says Dr Sirkar. While riding piggy-back on heat-generating plants is being considered a pliable solution for the future, many companies like General Electric are focusing on the membranes used to process water. GE's sea water membrane desalination system is currently used to meet the water needs of 20% of the population of Hammas of Algeria. "GE's ultra-low energy membranes help in reverse-osmosis technologies. Efforts are on to make these membranes more energy-efficient. A lot of research is going into the chemicals which are coated on the membranes," says Erik Hanson, global product management leaders (water and process Technologies), GE Power & Water. GE's latest product, based on its research, is expected to be unveiled in the first week of July in Singapore. Investments in desalination plants with membrane technology is expected to grow to $4.7 billion from $3.3 billion in 2010 -- a 6% compound annual growth rate versus just 1% for thermal desalination, according to Morgan Stanley Smith Barney's Global Investment Committee's report.

#### Turn – nuclear power increases water scarcity

**Sovacool and Cooper, 7** – Senior Research Fellow for the Virginia Center for Coal and Energy Research, and founder of the Network for New Energy Choices (Ben and Chris, June. “Renewing America: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)”, http://www.newenergychoices.org/dev/uploads/Renewing%20America\_NNEC\_Final.pdf)

If projected electricity demand is met using water-intensive fossil fuel and nuclear reactors, America will soon be withdrawing more water for electricity production than for farming. Perhaps the most important—and least discussed—advantage to a federal RPS is its ability to displace electricity generation that is extremely water-intensive. The nation’s oil, coal, natural gas, and nuclear facilities consume about 3.3 billion gallons of water each day.244 In 2006, they accounted for almost 40 percent of all freshwater withdrawals (water diverted or withdrawn from a surface- or ground-water source), roughly equivalent to all the water withdrawals for irrigated agriculture in the entire United States.245 A conventional 500 MW coal plant, for instance, consumes around 7,000 gallons of water per minute, or the equivalent of 17 Olympic-sized swimming pools every day.246 Older, less efficient plants can be much worse. In Georgia, the 3,400 MW Sherer coal facility consumes as much as 9,913 gallons of water for every MWh of electricity it generates. Data from the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) also confirms that every type of traditional power plant consumes and withdraws vast amounts of water. Conventional power plants use thousands of gallons of water for the condensing portion of their thermodynamic cycle. Coal plants also use water to clean and process fuel, and all traditional plants lose water through evaporative loss. Newer technologies, while they withdraw less water, actually consume more. Advanced power plant systems that rely on re-circulating, closed-loop cooling technology convert more water to steam that is vented to the atmosphere. Closed-loop systems also rely on greater amounts of water for cleaning and therefore return less water to the original source. Thus, while modern power plants may reduce water withdrawals by up to 10 percent, they contribute even more to the nation’s water scarcity. Nuclear reactors, in particular, require massive supplies of water to cool reactor cores and spent nuclear fuel rods. Because much of the water is turned to steam, substantial amounts are lost to the local water table entirely. One nuclear plant in Georgia, for example, withdraws an average of 57 million gallons every day from the Altamaha River, but actually “consumes” (primarily as lost water vapor) 33 million gallons per day from the local supply, enough to service more than 196,000 Georgia homes. With electricity demand expected to grow by approximately 50 percent in the next 25 years, continuing to rely on fossil fuel-fired and nuclear generators could spark a water scarcity crisis. In 2006, the Department of Energy warned that consumption of water for electricity production could more than double by 2030, to 7.3 billion gallons per day, if new power plants continue to be built with evaporative cooling. This staggering amount is equal to the entire country’s water consumption in 1995

#### Public opposition blocks the use of nuclear for desalination

Cooley et al, 6 – (Heather, with Peter H. Gleick, and Gary Wolff, June. “DESALINATION, WITH A GRAIN OF SALT.” Pacific Institute. http://www.pacinst.org/reports/desalination/desalination\_report.pdf)

San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and MWDOC are considering the option of building a 50-100 MGD (190,000-380,000 m3/d) desalination plant at Camp Pendleton. The plant would use the intake and outfall structure from Unit 1 of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, which is being decommissioned. A pre-feasibility/fatal flaw assessment was conducted in 2005, and a detailed feasibility study is currently underway. The product water, which would be split equally between the project partners, provides a new supply source and would improve system reliability. Camp Pendleton also has the right to receive desalinated water via SDCWA (SDCWA 2005). Because the proposed desalination plant would be co-located with a nuclear power plant, public perception remains a formidable obstacle. To complicate this matter, the site is being used to store nuclear waste until a remote federally approved nuclear waste site opens (Jimenez 2004)

### 1NC – Solvency

#### 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 – licensing issues, 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.

#### Lack of nuclear workforce capacity kills solvency – no qualified workers and they can’t be trained in time to solve

**Retief, 10** – Product Manager, Bentley Systems, Incorporated (Hilmar, December. “Knowledge Management: Solving the Nuclear Industry’s Brain Drain: How to Capture and Manage Your Company’s Institutional Knowledge for Immediate Action.” A Bentley White Paper. http://ftp2.bentley.com/dist/collateral/docs/assetwise/wp\_knowledge-management\_hilmar-retief.pdf)

As the nuclear renaissance takes shape, many organizations in this industry face a shortage of skills and knowledge due to retiring baby boomers. These retirements threaten nuclear facility bottom lines and compromise the safety and reliability of plant operations. The heyday of global nuclear development drew top talent from the best universities and an abundant pool of engineering and nuclear knowledge workers. However, in the United States, there hasn’t been a new nuclear power plant come online since the mid-1980s. This latency in the evolution of nuclear power not only reduced the number of university programs dedicated to nuclear, but also discouraged new engineers from pursuing disciplines in the nuclear field. The global freeze on new nuclear plant development during this same period further limited the amount of new talent entering the industry. Today, the new emphasis on green energy, smaller carbon footprints, and reducing the ecological impact and cost of fossil fuels is reviving the nuclear industry, resulting in more demand for nuclear professionals and an increased awareness of the need to maintain, sustain, and increase the nuclear knowledge base. But the growth of the industry will be impeded unless viable solutions are implemented to capture and apply the knowledge of the existing nuclear workforce. In 2006, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) published a report titled Risk Management of Knowledge Loss in Nuclear Industry Organizations. The report states that the U.S. is facing a ‘graying’ workforce in which literally half the current workers will reach retirement age within the next five years. And the bad news doesn’t stop there. It goes on to say that, “The lead time required to produce an individual capable of safely operating the complex nuclear systems and technologies may exceed the time frame available until substantial retirement of the existing workforce begins.”

## Round 6 2NC vs. North Texas AS

### 2NC Conditionality Good

#### C/I The negative gets 2 conditional advocacies . The squo is always an option.

#### 2AC strategic thinking - forces the 2ac to tailor their straight turns to what the CP can’t solve - this increases analytic education.

#### No argument irresponsibility --- its no different than them choosing not to go for a link turn on politics.

#### Structural aff bias justifies – persuasive value of the 2AR outweighs the strategic benefit of the block – neg flex key to overwhelm their specificity bias

#### Real world – policymakers have to protect their plans from the right and left ideas

#### 2NR checks – collapsing the strategy allows the 2AR frame the debate

#### And - One CP doesn’t solve

#### a. Still links to their offense - if one conditional advocacy is good, any disad to two or more is arbitrary.

#### b. Not a rational test of opportunity cost - if there are multiple costs to any policy you can’t just ignore some of them.

#### Reject the arg not the team

### Procurement CP Overview

#### CP solves case via different mechanism – DOD should procure SMRs – it optimizes military application and generates innovation in nuclear tech – Andres & Breetz ev says that unless we procure – commercial designs get locked in resulting in ineffective military tech – DOD is also a good first mover to spur the industry

#### The NRC regulations are modeled – it’s the global golden standard to other countries nuclear capabilities- that’s Lovering

#### The plan is a Power Purchase Agreement – that’s bad

#### Imposes higher electricity prices because DOD still relies on civilian grids

#### Avoids regulations – means countries don’t modelbecause they have nothing to follow us by – cross x proves that they have no specific means of exerting influence – NRC key to them having our tech specs

### CP Avoids the Net Benefit 2NC

#### The CP is distinct from the plan ---

#### PPAs are privately owned.

Department of Energy – Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, 2/24/2011 (Federal Renewable Energy Project Implementation: From RFP to Project Closeout, p. http://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/pdfs/rewebinar\_projectimp\_qa.pdf)

Q: How often does an agency own the project versus third-party ownership, and what are some reasons/ considerations for each? A: Agencies own the project if they use appropriations. Under a power purchase agreement (PPA), there is always private ownership. Under ESPCs and utility energy service contracts (UESCs), there is typically Federal ownership; however, there is a move, especially for large renewable projects, to have private ownership. The benefit of private ownership is that private companies are eligible for the Federal investment tax credit, accelerated depreciation, and any other available tax incentives. The DOE IDIQ contract, Section H.2, allows for private ownership. It may be simpler to have Federal ownership for small renewable projects that are bundled with energy efficiency under an ESPC or UESC.

#### Procurement means it’s owned by the DOD.

### AT: Perm – Do Both

#### Magnifies the link to the DA --- if the DOD has its own SMR at each base, they won’t need to buy any of the energy from the utilities. This means that the negotiated price is lower which increases the amount of money the nuclear power companies have to make up.

#### No double-solvency --- procurement alone is sufficient to solve the aff --- buying power just adds costs and only has a risk of spiking electricity prices.

#### The perm must be two distinct agreements --- otherwise it severs the agreement to purchase power from a supplier. Reject it because it creates a moving target and kills neg ground.

### AT: Perm – Do the CP

#### Severs --- the plan includes a distinct agreement to purchase power from a utility or supplier that the CP does not include. The CP causes the DOD to own the energy.

#### Financial incentives aren’t procurements.

**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.

#### Severance is a voting issue --- it skews neg ground, makes it impossible to generate competition and makes the aff a moving target.

### Solvency – Industry 2NC

#### The plan leads to bad designs by crushing innovation --- that’s the 1NC Wesoff evidence.

#### Bad designs turn the case --- it hurts wider development.

**Wang**, 1/20/**2012** (Ucilia – contributor to Forbes, Feds to Finance Small Nuclear Reactor Designs, Forbes, p. http://www.forbes.com/sites/uciliawang/2012/01/20/feds-to-finance-small-nuclear-reactor-designs/)

Just because small nuclear reactors promise many economic and environmental benefits (they don’t produce dirty air like coal or natural gas power plants do) doesn’t mean they can be developed and made more quickly or cheaply, however. Technology companies also will have to prove that their small nuclear reactors can be just as safe if not safer than the conventional, large-scale nuclear reactors today. The Fukushima nuclear power plant disaster in Japan has shown that a misstep in designing and operating a nuclear plant can have a far greater and more devastating impact than a mistake in running other types of power plants. That means nuclear power companies — and the government — will have to do a lot more to prove that nuclear power should remain an important part of the country’s energy mix.

### Econ Impact – 2NC

#### Impact outweighs and turns the case –

#### A. Magnitude – US collapse goes global and draws in every major country – treaties increase the probability of draw in and guarantees escalation.

#### B. Timeframe – decline causes lash out and outward pressure to secure economic gains – that’s Auslin.

### Econ Outweighs – Probability

#### Probability -- conflict now is highly likely given other economic stressors

Mootry 9 (Primus, B.A. Northern Illinois University “Americans likely to face more difficult times” - The Herald Bulletin, http://www.theheraldbulletin.com/columns/local\_story\_282184703.html?keyword=secondarystory)

These are difficult times. The direct and indirect costs associated with the war on Iraq have nearly wrecked our economy. The recent $700 billion bailout, bank failures, and the failure of many small and large businesses across the nation will take years — perhaps decades — to surmount. Along with these rampant business failures, we have seen unemployment rates skyrocket, record numbers of home foreclosures, an explosion of uninsured Americans, and other economic woes that together have politicians now openly willing to mention the "D" word: Depression. These are difficult days. We have seen our international reputation sink to all time lows. We have seen great natural disasters such as hurricanes Ike and Katrina leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens stripped of all they own or permanently dislocated. In all my years, I have never seen a time such as this. To make matters worse, we are witnessing a resurgence of animosities between the United States and Russia, as well as the rapid growth of India and China. As to the growth of these two huge countries, the problem for us is that they are demanding more and more oil — millions of barrels more each week — and there is not much we can say or do about it. In the meantime, if America does not get the oil it needs, our entire economy will grind to a halt. In short, the challenges we face are complex and enormous. Incidentally, one of the factors that makes this time unlike any other in history is the potential for worldwide nuclear conflict. **There has never been a time in** the long **history** of man **when**, through his own technologies — and his arrogance — he can destroy the planet. Given the tensions around the world, **a mere spark could lead to global conflagration.**[This evidence has been gender paraphrased].

### Uniqueness Wall – 2NC

#### Group the uniqueness debate –

#### Electricity prices are on the decline and will remain low for the next years – the natural gas boom means that current supply is already meeting demand – that’s Burtraw. Prefer our evidence –

#### A. Predictive – it assumes rising demands for the next 20 years, their evidence is a snapshot and doesn’t occur for future changes.

#### B. More qualified – Burtraw is an expert is the electricity sector – their evidence is from a random news outlet.

#### Uniqueness determines the direction of the link – the only chance for consequence is a scenario where the plan increases prices. It means there’s no chance of their link turn being offense.

### Electricity Link 2NC

#### The plan causes an inefficient model of SMR to be developed because PPAs undermine the incentive to modernize --- that’s the 1NC Wesoff evidence.

#### That inefficiency shifts costs of the flawed technological model and overruns to the ratepayers --- that raises electricity prices. That’s the 1NC Cooper ev.

#### The PPA cannot cover all the costs --- SMRs tend to underestimate costs so negotiations will be lopsided.

### Grid Addon

#### Relies on solving

#### Not specific to SMRs

#### New developments sure up grid stability – solves blackouts

Kemp 12 -- Reuters market analyst (John, 4/5/12, "COLUMN-Phasors and blackouts on the U.S. power grid: John Kemp," http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/05/column-smart-grid-idUSL6E8F59W120120405)

The hoped-for solution to grid instability is something called the North American SynchroPhasor Initiative (NASPI), which sounds like something out of Star Trek but is in fact a collaboration between the federal government and industry to improve grid monitoring and control by using modern communications technology. More than 500 phasor monitoring units have so far been installed across the transmission network to take precise measurements of frequency, voltage and other aspects of power quality on the grid up to 30 times per second (compared with once every four seconds using conventional technology). Units are synchronised using GPS to enable users to build up a comprehensive real-time picture of how power is flowing across the grid (www.naspi.org/Home.aspx and). It is a scaled-up version of the monitoring system developed by the University of Tennessee's Power Information Technology Laboratory using inexpensive frequency monitors that plug into ordinary wall sockets. Tennessee's FNET project provides highly aggregated data to the public via its website. The systems being developed under NASPI provide a much finer level of detail that will reveal congestion and disturbances on individual transmission lines and particular zones so that grid managers can act quickly to restore balance or isolate failures ().

#### No impact to blackouts – empirically proven

Birch, 10/1/12 – former foreign correspondent for the Associated Press and the Baltimore Sun who has written extensively on technology and public policy (Douglas, “Forget Revolution.” Foreign Policy. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/01/forget\_revolution?page=full)

Much of the concern has focused on potential attacks on the U.S. electrical grid. "If I were an attacker and I wanted to do strategic damage to the United States...I probably would sack electric power on the U.S. East Coast, maybe the West Coast, and attempt to cause a cascading effect," retired Admiral Mike McConnell said in a 2010 interview with CBS's 60 Minutes. But the scenarios sketched out above are not solely the realm of fantasy. This summer, the United States and India were hit by two massive electrical outages -- caused not by ninja cyber assault teams but by force majeure. And, for most people anyway, the results were less terrifying than imagined. First, the freak "derecho" storm that barreled across a heavily-populated swath of the eastern United States on the afternoon of June 29 knocked down trees that crushed cars, bashed holes in roofs, blocked roads, and sliced through power lines. According to an August report by the U.S. Department of Energy, 4.2 million homes and businesses lost power as a result of the storm, with the blackout stretching across 11 states and the District of Columbia. More than 1 million customers were still without power five days later, and in some areas power wasn't restored for 10 days. Reuters put the death toll at 23 people as of July 5, all killed by storms or heat stroke. The second incident occurred in late July, when 670 million people in northern India, or about 10 percent of the world's population, lost power in the largest blackout in history. The failure of this huge chunk of India's electric grid was attributed to higher-than-normal demand due to late monsoon rains, which led farmers to use more electricity in order to draw water from wells. Indian officials told the media there were no reports of deaths directly linked to the blackouts. But this cataclysmic event didn't cause widespread chaos in India -- indeed, for some, it didn't even interrupt their daily routine. "[M]any people in major cities barely noticed the disruption because localized blackouts are so common that many businesses, hospitals, offices and middle-class homes have backup diesel generators," the New York Times reported. The most important thing about both events is what didn't happen. Planes didn't fall out of the sky. Governments didn't collapse. Thousands of people weren't killed. Despite disruption and delay, harried public officials, emergency workers, and beleaguered publics mostly muddled through. The summer's blackouts strongly suggest that a cyber weapon that took down an electric grid even for several days could turn out to be little more than a weapon of mass inconvenience. "Reasonable people would have expected a lot of bad things to happen" in the storm's aftermath, said Neal A. Pollard, a terrorism expert who teaches at Georgetown University and has served on the United Nation's Expert Working Group on the use of the Internet for terrorist purposes. However, he said, emergency services, hospitals, and air traffic control towers have backup systems to handle short-term disruptions in power supplies. After the derecho, Pollard noted, a generator truck even showed up in the parking lot of his supermarket. The response wasn't perfect, judging by the heat-related deaths and lengthy delays in the United States in restoring power. But nor were the people without power as helpless or clueless as is sometimes assumed. That doesn't mean the United States can relax. James Lewis, director of the technology program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, believes that hackers threaten the security of U.S. utilities and industries, and recently penned an op-ed for the New York Times calling the United States "defenseless" to a cyber-assault. But he told Foreign Policy the recent derecho showed that even a large-scale blackout would not necessarily have catastrophic consequences.

### No Solve

#### Nuclear power can’t solve energy security – takes too long and can’t replace oil

**Scientific American, 9** (Katherine Ling, 3/27. “Nuclear Power Cannot Solve Climate Change.” Greenwire, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=nuclear-cannot-solve-climate-change)

The report argues that nuclear energy is not likely to have a significant effect on energy security, either. It will take at least two decades to convert the world's car fleet from oil to electricity. Transportation is the only sector where nuclear energy can significantly replace oil. In addition, uranium and nuclear fuel come from only a few countries – Canada, Australia, Russia, the United States and France – making nations without resources or technologies as dependent on foreign sources of energy as before, the report notes. Worse still, it says, the need for fuel may drive more nations to develop their own uranium enrichment facilities, raising the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

#### Can’t solve energy security – transportation’s key and transition will take too long

Miller, 12 – Energy Consultant and Professional Engineer (John, 7/16. “U.S. Energy Security and the Next Energy Crisis.” http://theenergycollective.com/node/93716)

**Immediate Solutions to U.S. Energy Security**– 70% of all U.S. petroleum is consumed by the Transportation Sector.  The ultimate solution to U.S. energy security is reducing the need for petroleum by making all forms of transportation substantially more efficient (CAFE), replacing most private/commercial vehicles with hybrids and electric vehicles (HEV/EV’s), replacing petroleum use with alternative fueled vehicles (AFV’s), increased renewable biofuels and possibly encouraging Residents to significantly reduce annual miles traveled (AMT).  Based on the progress made in all these areas over the past 30 years, the U.S. will realistically require well over another 30 years to accomplishing some of these envisioned improvements.  During the interim the U.S. must continue to use petroleum fuels to support the economy and the current average Resident’s standard of living.  Effective and immediate U.S. energy security improvement in the interim will require eliminating the need for the highest risk oil imports from all OPEC and possibly some non-OPEC countries.  This can be reasonably accomplished by maximizing oil imports from the most secure non-OPEC countries, further expanding domestic oil production, replacing petroleum with commercially proven alternative fuels such as natural gas, and more significantly reducing consumption.

#### Nuclear power doesn’t solve energy security – foreign involvement in development

Koplow, 9 – founder of Earth Track, Inc., and has worked on natural- resource subsidy issues for more than 20 years, mainly in the energy sector (Doug, 7/9. “Nuclear Power as Taxpayer Patronage: A Case Study of Subsidies to Calvert Cliffs Unit 3.” Nonproliferation Policy Education Center. http://www.npolicy.org/article.php?aid=179)

The new reactors (Constellation discusses just Calvert Cliffs 3 at the site, but is clear their plans include a number of additional reactors around the country) are to be developed and built by a new corporate joint venture. Though complicated, getting a picture of the corporate structure (outlined in Figure 1) is important in providing context to the new reactor plan. Four significant findings are evident. First, the firm has adopted a joint venture approach to building new reactors in order to spread risks. This is a logical structure, one that has been adopted by all of the new build nuclear projects underway. Second, the corporate structure remains in flux, having already been through a series of important modifications in despite the young age of the venture. These shifts are likely to continue in response to significant changes in market conditions or public policy circumstances. Third, the growing role of foreign governments in the US nuclear "renaissance" can be seen clearly through the evolution in Constellation's deal structure. This involvement certainly weakens claims that nuclear power boosts domestic energy security.

### 2NC –Warming Irreversible/Inevitable

#### Climate change will continue for the next 1000 years - the ANI evidence indicates that even if we stopped ALL emissions, the temperature increases to the point where it would cause extinction. That makes their impacts inevitable

### Water Wars

#### \*Water wars won’t escalate between India and Pakistan – they’ve already weathered the perfect storm and other issues cause tension

Alam 2, PhD in political geography from Durham University on the negotiations between India and Pakistan and a trained mediator 2002 (Undala “Questioning the water wars rationale: a case study of the Indus Waters Treaty” December 1. http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-2567100/Questioning-the-water-wars-rationale.html)

The water wars rationale forecasts war between countries dependent upon a shared water resource if there is water scarcity, competitive use and the countries are enemies due to a wider conflict. Following this rationale, a war should have occurred between India and Pakistan over the Indus basin waters. Instead, the countries negotiated an international water treaty and have maintained it for over 40 years through two wars and the nuclear era. In trying to explain India and Pakistan's successful cooperation over water, as recommended by Biswas (1992), the author has had unique access to the Indus basin files in the World Bank's archives (see Alam 1998). (2) The water wars rationale Drawing heavily on the situation in the Middle East, the water wars rationale reasons that given water's critical role (3) in a country's survival if there is water scarcity amidst a wider conflict, and enemy states depend on same shared resources, each country will try to ensure that it has the access to water that it needs. Controlling access to water is vital for national security and, therefore, highly political. Under a wider conflict, the spectre of an enemy controlling another country's water supply is untenable. This means that each country might wage war to safeguard its supply (Gleick 1993a). In other words, because water is scarce, vital, a security issue and demand is outstripping supply, states will go to war with their competitors to secure supplies. This implies that '"[w]ater [w]ars" are, unfortunately, likely to be of more and more common occurrence in the future' (Young et al. 1994). Water wars are understood to be international wars between states triggered and sustained solely over issues arising from access to water. This is to distinguish them from water-related conflicts within countries, and water used as a weapon. The concept derives from the Middle East's increasing demand for water due to urbanization, industrialization, increasing populations, consumerism and irrigated agriculture (Postel 1992; Falkenmark and Lindh 1993; Gleick 1993a; Richards and Waterbury 1996; Biswas 1997), and the political nature of water use in the region (Naff and Matson 1984; Starr and Stoll 1988; Anderson 1988 1994; Beschorner 1992; Bulloch and Darwish 1993; Gleick 1993c; Guyatt 1998; Naff 1994; Haddad and Mizyed 1996; Medzini 1996; Waterbury 1997; Soffer 1999). Expecting a water war in the Indus basin Following the water wars rationale, India and Pakistan should have gone to war over the Indus waters. All the ingredients were present -- two enemies engaged in a wider conflict; a riparian completely dependent upon the Indus waters; water scarcity despite large average runoffs; and poverty preventing the construction of infrastructure to offset this scarcity (Alam 1998; Ali 1967; Alvi 1962; Government of Pakistan 1953a 1953b 1958a 1958b 1958c; Gulhati 1973; Lilienthal 1966 1976; Michel 1967; Shivananda 1961). The enmity between India and Pakistan has its roots in the movement to gain independence from Great Britain. The principal fault line ran along religious lines and placed Hindus against Muslims. The process by which the British partitioned the Indian sub-continent in 1947 into independent India and Pakistan helped to fuel this animosity. In particular, the issue of Kashmir has persistently aggravated Indo-Pakistan relations. Partition led to a number of disputes between the countries, for example, over refugee property and currency exchange rates. Over the latter issue, Pakistan even spoke of an economic war fuelled by the belief that 'there is a large element in India that does not accept the partition of India, that is still talking and planning to undo what they insist was a mistake' (Lilienthal 1966). Another source of Indo-Pakistan tensions was the Indus waters dispute.

#### \*Desalination can’t solve water shortages – comparative costs

Cooley et al 6 [Heather Cooley is a Research Associate in the Water and Sustainability Program. Her research interests include conservation, privatization, climate change, and California water. Ms. Cooley holds a B.S. in Molecular Environmental Biology and an M.S. in Energy and Resources from the University of California at Berkeley. Prior to joining the Institute, Ms. Cooley worked at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory on climate and land use change. Dr. Peter H. Gleick is co-founder and President of the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security in Oakland, California. Dr. Gleick works on the hydrologic impacts of climate change; sustainable water use, planning, and policy; and international conflicts over water resources. Dr. Gleick received a B.S. from Yale University and an M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley. In 2003 he received a MacArthur Foundation Fellowship for his work on water issues. He serves on the boards of numerous journals and organizations and was elected an Academician of the International Water Academy in Oslo, Norway in 1999. In 2001, he was appointed to the Water Science and Technology Board of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. In 2006, he was elected a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. Gary Wolff, P.E., Ph.D., is Principal Economist and Engineer. Dr. Wolff received his B.S. in Renewable Energy Engineering Technology from Jordan College in 1982, his M.S. in Civil and Environmental Engineering from Stanford University in 1984, and his Ph.D. in Resource Economics from the University of California at Berkeley in 1997. His professional career has included solar energy construction contracting, water quality regulation for the State of California, serving as design engineer at a wastewater treatment plant, founding and serving as president of a small engineering consulting firm, holding a post-doctoral fellowship at the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and holding a visiting professorship at the Graduate School of International Policy Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He is former chair of the East Bay Municipal Utility District Demand Management Advisory Committee; a former member of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Desalination Research Project Executive Committee; and a member of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, the state regulator of ambient water quality in the nine-county Bay Area. DESALINATION, WITH A GRAIN OF SALT A CALIFORNIA PERSPECTIVE. The Pacific Institute. June 2006.]

Perhaps the greatest barrier to desalination remains its high economic cost compared to alternatives, including other sources of supply, improved wastewater reuse, and especially more efficient use and demand management. We do not believe that the economic evaluations of desalination commonly presented to regulators and the public adequately account for the complicated benefits and costs associated with issues of reliability, quality, local control, environmental effects, and impacts on development. In general, significant benefits and costs are often excluded from the costs presented publicly. California should pursue less costly, less environmentally damaging water-supply alternatives first. Is desalination the ultimate solution to our water problems? No. Is it likely to be a piece of our water management puzzle? Yes. In the end, decisions about desalination developments will revolve around complex evaluations of local circumstances and needs, economics, financing, environmental and social impacts, and available alternatives. We urge that such decisions be transparent, honest, public, and systematic.

#### \*Tech is obsolete and nuclear power consumes more water – turns the impact

Smith 11 [Gar Smith. Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War. NUCLEAR ROULETTE THE CASE AGAINST A “NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE.” June 2011. http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf]

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today. But nuclear desalination is another False Solution. The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology. Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate. 154 Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce highpurity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit. 155 Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156

#### \*Water scarcity spurs cooperation – not conflict

Deen 7 (Thalif, Staff – IPS, “Water Wars A Myth”, Inter Press Service, 8-25, Lexis)

"Despite the potential problem, history has demonstrated that cooperation, rather than conflict, is likely in shared basins," UNESCO concludes. The Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) says that 10- to 20-year-old arguments about conflict over water are still being recycled. "Such arguments ignore massive amounts of recent research which shows that water-scarce states that share a water body tend to find cooperative solutions rather than enter into violent conflict," the institute says. SIWI says that during the entire "intifada" -- the ongoing Palestinian uprising against Israel in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza -- the only thing on which the two warring parties continued to cooperate at a basic level was their shared waters. "Thus, rather than reaching for arguments for the 'water war hypotheses,' the facts seem to support the idea that water is a uniting force and a potential source of peace rather than violent conflict." SIWI said. Ghosh, co-author of the UNDP study, pointed out several agreements which were "models of cooperation", including the Indus Waters Treaty, the Israel-Jordan accord, the Senegal River Development Organisation and the Mekong River Commission. A study sponsored by the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars points that despite newspaper headlines screaming "water wars are coming!", these apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history. "No nations have gone to war specifically over water resources for thousands of years. International water disputes -- even among fierce enemies -- are resolved peacefully, even as conflicts erupt over other issues," it says. The study also points out instances of cooperation between riparian nations -- countries or provinces bordering the same river -- that outnumbered conflicts by more than two to one between 1945 and 1999. Why? "Because water is so important, nations cannot afford to fight over it. Instead, water fuels greater interdependence. By coming together to jointly manage their shared water resources, countries can build trust and prevent conflict," argues the study, jointly co-authored by Aaron Wolf, Annika Kramer, Alexander Carius and Geoffrey Dabelko.

#### \*No water wars

Victor 7 (David G., Professor of Law – Stanford Law School and Director – Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “What Resource Wars?”, The National Interest, 11-12, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020)

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict ranks extremely low on the list because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that water wars don't happen-usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny-the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker "climate" conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.

#### \*History and best studies prove

Wolf 99 (Aaron, Assistant Professor of Geography – University of Wisconsin, “Conflict and Cooperation Along International Waterways”, 11-1, http://www.gci.ch/GreenCrossPrograms/waterres/middleeast/wolf.html

There are 268 international rivers, covering almost one half of the total land surface of the globe, and untold numbers of shared aquifers. Water has been a cause of political tensions between Arabs and Israelis; Indians and Bangladeshis; Americans and Mexicans; and all ten riparian states of the Nile River. Water is the only scarce resource for which there is no substitute, over which there is poorly-developed international law, and the need for which is overwhelming, constant, and immediate. As a consequence, "water" and "war" are two topics being assessed together with increasing frequency. This paper investigates the reality of historic water conflict and draws lessons for the plausibility of future "water wars." The datasets of conflict are explored for those related to water only seven minor skirmishes are found in this century; no war has ever been fought over water. In contrast, 145 water-related treaties were signed in the same period. These treaties, collected and catalogued in a computerized database along with relevant notes from negotiators, are assessed for patterns of conflict resolution. War over water seems neither strategically rational, hydrographically effective, nor economically viable. Shared interests along a waterway seem to overwhelm water's conflict-inducing characteristics. Furthermore, once cooperative water regimes are established through treaty, they turn out to be tremendously resilient over time, even between otherwise hostile riparians, and even as conflict is waged over other issues. These patterns suggest that the more valuable lesson of international water is as a resources whose characteristics tend to induce cooperation, and incite violence only in the exception.

#### \*Status quo solves desalination

Economic Times, 12 (Neenu Abraham, ET Bureau, 6/5. “Low-cost desalination solutions & other tech innovations can add a lot of sparkle to water.” http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-06-05/news/32055849\_1\_desalination-reverse-osmosis-drinking-water)

Paradoxically, this comes at a time when India-born professor of chemical engineering at New Jersey Institute of Technology, DrKamalesh K Sirkar, has just won a patent for a low-cost desalination technique, that not only brings down capital costs but also assures safe and good source of water. Less than 1% of the municipality water in India comes from desalination plants, according to SVK Babu, director, Veolia Water India, whose company has initiated a project in Nagpur which treats river water and meets the drinking water needs of 2.5 million people there. Traditional desalination plants have been energy-intensive and hence costly, making it unfeasible to be implemented in India. "Desalination involves the removal of dissolved salts from water. The minimum energy needed for desalination is 0.8 kWh/m3 for seawater at 25 degrees Celsius. This is the theoretical minimum. Taking into account inefficiencies of various components, it will require more than three to five times that energy in real world conditions," says Chris Scott, managing director (Middle East, India & Africa) of Black & Veatch. The $2.3-billion company is involved in improving water supply to 3.5 million people in Kerala through its project with the Kerala Water Authority. It also helped out with the decontamination of ground water in over one lakh wells in West Bengal, says Scott. The good news is that more and more futuristic technologies are being readied in research labs to make desalination and water treatment processes more energy-efficient. Dr Sirkar's patented system, for one, which is based on direct-contact membrane distillation, can deliver about 80 litres of drinking water per 100 litres of seawater. A comparable system would reclaim only 41 litres from the same amount of salt water. The advantage is that the heat needed for desalination is low. For countries like India, he says, "heat is generated as a by-product in many industries like nuclear power plants, industrial waste plants and by solar voltaic plants. One way of cutting energy costs is by installing desalination units at nuclear or industrial sites where heat is generated." This would ensure an almost net-zero (that is no extra power is consumed from external sources) situation, says Dr Sirkar. While riding piggy-back on heat-generating plants is being considered a pliable solution for the future, many companies like General Electric are focusing on the membranes used to process water. GE's sea water membrane desalination system is currently used to meet the water needs of 20% of the population of Hammas of Algeria. "GE's ultra-low energy membranes help in reverse-osmosis technologies. Efforts are on to make these membranes more energy-efficient. A lot of research is going into the chemicals which are coated on the membranes," says Erik Hanson, global product management leaders (water and process Technologies), GE Power & Water. GE's latest product, based on its research, is expected to be unveiled in the first week of July in Singapore. Investments in desalination plants with membrane technology is expected to grow to $4.7 billion from $3.3 billion in 2010 -- a 6% compound annual growth rate versus just 1% for thermal desalination, according to Morgan Stanley Smith Barney's Global Investment Committee's report.

#### \*Public opposition blocks the use of nuclear for desalination

Cooley et al, 6 – (Heather, with Peter H. Gleick, and Gary Wolff, June. “DESALINATION, WITH A GRAIN OF SALT.” Pacific Institute. http://www.pacinst.org/reports/desalination/desalination\_report.pdf)

San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and MWDOC are considering the option of building a 50-100 MGD (190,000-380,000 m3/d) desalination plant at Camp Pendleton. The plant would use the intake and outfall structure from Unit 1 of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, which is being decommissioned. A pre-feasibility/fatal flaw assessment was conducted in 2005, and a detailed feasibility study is currently underway. The product water, which would be split equally between the project partners, provides a new supply source and would improve system reliability. Camp Pendleton also has the right to receive desalinated water via SDCWA (SDCWA 2005). Because the proposed desalination plant would be co-located with a nuclear power plant, public perception remains a formidable obstacle. To complicate this matter, the site is being used to store nuclear waste until a remote federally approved nuclear waste site opens (Jimenez 2004)

## Round 6 1NR vs. North Texas AS

### 1NR Overview

#### Russia war outweighs the aff – Romney will collapse relations with Russia because of he won’t cooperate on BMD and Putin hates him

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum 2**, 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 water wars – cooperation key to disbursement and agreements

#### 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

#### GOP victory leads to China bashing over multiple issues – causes sanctions

Gerstein 11 (Josh – Politico, “The GOP's China syndrome”, 11/22, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html>)

Mitt Romney says America is at war with China — a “trade war” over its undervalued currency. “They’re stealing our jobs. And we’re gonna stand up to China,” the former Massachusetts governor declared in a recent Republican presidential debate, arguing that the United States should threaten to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. When Romney steps on stage tonight for another debate, this one devoted to foreign policy, that kind of China-bashing is likely to be a favorite theme. With a moribund economy and relatively little traction for other international issues, the threat posed by cheap Chinese imports and Chinese purchases of U.S. debt is an irresistible target. The problem, China experts are quick to point out, is that those attacks often fly in the face of the business interests Republicans have traditionally represented, not to mention the record many of the candidates have either supporting trade with China — or actively soliciting it. Just last year, for example, Romney slammed President Barack Obama for growth-killing protectionism after he put a 35 percent tariff on Chinese tires because of a surge of cheap imports. And, Romney wrote in his book, “No Apology: The Case for American Greatness,” “Protectionism stifles productivity.” And though Texas Gov. Rick Perry predicted at a debate this month that “the Chinese government will end up on the ash heap of history if they do not change their virtues,” a picture posted on the Internet shows a smiling Perry on a trade mission to Shanghai and Beijing posing with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi after presenting him with a pair of cowboy boots. Nor has Perry been shy about encouraging Chinese investments in Texas: In October 2010, he appeared at the announcement of a new U.S. headquarters for Huawei Technologies to be located in Plano, Texas, despite lingering concerns among U.S. security officials that Huawei-made telecommunications equipment is designed to allow unauthorized access by the Chinese government. “There’s a certain pandering going on,” said Nicholas Lardy of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who adds that the GOP rhetoric is squarely at odds with the views of the U.S. establishment, which believes a showdown with China over the trade issue “will make things worse, not better.” Not all of the 2012 GOP presidential hopefuls have taken to publicly pummeling Beijing. The only bona fide China expert in the group, former Ambassador to China Jon Huntsman, has criticized Romney for being cavalier and simplistic in his talk of tariffs. “You can give applause lines, and you can kind of pander here and there. You start a trade war if you start slapping tariffs randomly on Chinese products based on currency manipulation,” Huntsman said at a recent debate. “That doesn’t work.” Former Sen. Rick Santorum also rejected the idea of slapping tariffs on Beijing if it won’t buckle on the currency issue. “That just taxes you. I don’t want to tax you,” Santorum said. Newt Gingrich says he wants to bring a world of hurt down on Beijing for alleged Chinese cyberattacks on the U.S. and theft of intellectual property, though he’s vague about how. “We’re going to have to find ways to dramatically raise the pain level for the Chinese cheating,” the former house speaker declares. And Herman Cain talks of a threat from China, but says the answer is to promote growth in the U.S. “China’s economic dominance would represent a national security threat to the USA, and possibly to the rest of the world,” Cain wrote in May in the Daily Caller. “We can outgrow China because the USA is not a loser nation. We just need a winner in the White House.” Romney’s rhetoric has been particularly harsh. “It’s predatory pricing, it’s killing jobs in America,” he declared at the CNBC debate earlier this month, promising to make a formal complaint to the World Trade Organization about China’s currency manipulation. “I would apply, if necessary, tariffs to make sure that they understand we are willing to play at a level playing field.” The Romney campaign insists those tariffs are entirely distinguishable from the tire duties Obama imposed in 2009. “The distinction between Obama’s tire action and what Gov. Romney is proposing is simple,” said a Romney aide who did not want to be named. “President Obama is not getting tough with China or pushing them unilaterally, he is handing out political favors to union allies. [Romney’s] policy focuses on fostering competition by keeping markets open and the playing field level.” Romney, who helped set up investment bank Bain Capital, has long been a favorite of Wall Street, so his stridency on the China trade issue has taken some traditional conservatives — for whom free trade is a fundamental tenet — by surprise. National Review said Romney’s move “risk[ed] a trade war with China” and was “a remarkably bad idea.” In fact, many business leaders give Obama good marks for his China policy. “What the Obama administration has done in not labeling China as a ‘currency manipulator’ is correct,” said one U.S. business lobbyist who closely follows U.S.-China trade issues and asked not to be named. “We’re very leery of a tit-for-tat situation,” he added, while acknowledging that the anti-China rhetoric is “good politics.”

#### That causes a US-China trade war – escalates to conflict and collapses global trade

**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. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may formally label China as a "currency manipulator," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead one step closer to a trade war between China and the U.S. Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "They are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt and. If this happens, says Barker, "all bets are off." He adds, "The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be catastrophic, and what could prove to be a mild long wave [economic] winter season this time around could plunge into a global depression." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "If trade wars are allowed to get under way in these final years of a long wave winter, this decline will be far deeper and darker than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire world will suffer," writes Barker.

### 1NR – Uniqueness

#### Group the uniqueness debate – our Silver evidence indicates that Obama has an 86% chance of winning while winning a 4.1% lead in the popular vote

#### And 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.

#### Silver doesn’t conclude neg – says that we need to wait for the jobs report

#### Obama will win now – Friday’s jobs report indicates an improving economic situation, helping his case for re-election

Silver 10/5/12 (Nate, Founder @ FiveThirtyEight.com, "Jobs News Makes Obama's Case Easier," http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/jobs-news-makes-obamas-case-easier/#more-35589)

Thus, the threshold for what counts as an economically and politically significant jobs report ought to be fairly high. Not every month’s report can or should be a “game-changer.” Indeed, the public has often reacted more calmly to both good and bad monthly jobs reports than the political cognoscenti do.¶ Was Friday’s jobs report, which showed 114,000 jobs added in September and the unemployment rate dropping to 7.8 percent, strong enough to be one of the exceptional cases?¶ My view is that the answer is yes: this report really does warrant some attention.¶ The reported payrolls growth figure for September, 114,000 jobs, was incredibly close to consensus forecasts of about 115,000 jobs added. But everything else about the report considerably beat expectations. Jobs figures were revised upward by 40,000 in July, and by 46,000 in August. Combined with the jobs growth in September, that means the economy added 200,000 more jobs than we thought previously.¶ The unemployment rate is calculated through a separate survey — one of households rather than business establishments. The data from the household survey tends to be even noisier than that from the establishment survey.¶ But unlike last month, when a decline in the unemployment rate was caused by the exit of workers from the labor force, the household survey also reflected genuinely good news in September. According to that survey, 413,000 workers joined the labor force in September. But 873,000 more people became employed, causing the unemployment rate to fall to 7.8 percent.¶ If the September numbers resulted in part from statistical variance, it is certainly possible that there will be some payback in the October report, which will be released the Friday before the Nov. 6 election.¶ But it is also possible that the strength shown in the government’s report on Friday reflects it playing catch up. The firm ADP, which tracks private-sector payrolls, had reported that an average of 170,000 private-sector jobs had been created each month so far this year. The ADP reports are much maligned because they do not always match the government’s payroll figures over the short run. But in the long run, the numbers tend to converge.¶ Furthermore, there has been a fairly consistent pattern of upward revisions to the government’s jobs reports recently.¶ The jobs numbers are certainly not enough to change the basic story of a slow economic recovery, and it will take many years for the economy to get back to full employment.¶ However, the jobs numbers are one of the more hopeful signs for the economy on balance. An average of 146,000 jobs have been created per month over the past year, or closer to 157,000 with the government’s anticipated benchmark revisions accounted for.¶ Those aren’t great numbers by any means, and would translate to an annualized growth rate of 1.4 percent. But over the past 25 years, payroll jobs have grown at an annualized rate of 1.1 percent, or the equivalent of about 125,000 jobs added per month given today’s population. By this measure, it’s been a fairly average economic year, although certainly not enough to make up for the productivity that was lost from the economy in 2008 and 2009.¶ The rate of jobs growth is now just slightly behind the one that was enough to re-elect George W. Bush in 2004, when an average of 168,000 jobs were created between January and September 2004.¶ Although the unemployment rate remains stubbornly high, the recent trajectory now looks more favorable. Unemployment has fallen by 0.7 percent since December 2011, to 7.8 percent from 8.5 percent.¶ Historically, there has been no relationship at all between the unemployment rate on Election Day and the incumbent’s performance.¶ However, there has been a relationship between the change in the unemployment rate in the months leading up to the election and how well the incumbent does. The decline in unemployment under Mr. Obama this year since December is the largest in an election year since Ronald Reagan’s re-election bid, when it declined to 7.3 percent in Sept. 1984 from 8.3 percent in Dec. 1983.¶ The drop in unemployment alone is no guarantee of re-election — there was also a considerable drop in unemployment in 1976, and Gerald Ford lost.¶ However, the FiveThirtyEight economic index, which accounts for the payrolls numbers along with six other economic data series, would project a narrow re-election for Mr. Obama by about 3 percentage points — similar to Mr. Bush’s margin over John Kerry in 2004. Especially with the Friday jobs report, the economic numbers now seem just strong enough to make the incumbent a favorite for re-election, based on the way the public has evaluated their presidents historically.¶ I’m less inclined to predict what immediate effect the numbers will have on the polls — whether Friday’s news outweighs, for instance, Mr. Obama’s poor performance in Wednesday night’s debate. Mr. Obama did not win the election on Friday any more than he lost it on Wednesday.¶ But for the first time in a long while, Mr. Obama should be happy if the discussion turns toward the economy.

#### Their ONLY uniqueness evidence cites the post-debate bump from Rasmussen but - even Rasmussen concedes, the debate hasn’t helped

Rasmussen 10/5/12 (Rasmussen Report, "Daily Presidential Tracking Poll," http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/politics/obama\_administration/daily\_presidential\_tracking\_poll)

The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for Friday shows President Obama attracting support from 49% of voters nationwide, while Mitt Romney earns the vote from 47%. One percent (1%) prefers some other candidate, and three percent (3%) are undecided. See daily tracking history.¶ These results are based upon nightly interviews and reported on a three-day rolling average basis. As a result, only about one-third of the interviews for today’s update were conducted after the presidential debate. The single night of polling conducted after the debate did show some improvement for Romney, but it remains to be seen whether that will continue or if it was merely statistical noise. Sunday morning’s update will be the first national polling based entirely upon post-debate interviews.¶ Matchup results are updated daily at 9:30 a.m. Eastern (sign up for free daily e-mail update).

#### Rasmussen electoral college projections put Obama ahead

Rasmussen 10/5/12 ("2012 Electoral College Scoreboard," http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/archive/2012\_electoral\_college\_scoreboard)

Rasmussen Reports - Electoral College Breakdown

Safe Romney 167

Likely Romney 14

Leans Romney 0

Toss-up 120

Leans Obama 0

Likely Obama 34

Safe Obama 203

#### Obama will win – jobs and swing states

Espo and Thomas October 5 (David and Ken, reporters at AP, <http://www.bradenton.com/2012/10/05/4227714/jobs-report-gives-obama-much-needed.html>, accessed: 5 October 2012, JT)

FAIRFAX, VA. — Mitt Romney was still celebrating his widely praised debate performance when the campaign lurched in a different direction.¶ Unemployment dropped last month to the lowest level since 2009, and suddenly it was President Barack Obama's turn to smile.¶ In a race dominated by the weak economy, Obama said Friday the creation of 114,000 jobs in September, coupled with a drop in unemployment to 7.8 percent, was "a reminder that this country has come too far to turn back now." Jabbing at his rival's plans, he declared, "We've made too much progress to return to the policies that caused this crisis in the first place."¶ But Romney saw little to like in the day's new government numbers.¶ "This is not what a real recovery looks like," the former Massachusetts governor and businessman said, an analysis echoed by other Republicans throughout the day. "We created fewer jobs in September than in August, and fewer jobs in August than in July, and we've lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs since President Obama took office," Romney added.¶ "If not for all the people who have simply dropped out of the labor force, the real unemployment rate would be closer to 11%," he said.¶ Incumbent and challenger alike campaigned in battleground states during the day, each man starting out in Virginia before the president headed for Ohio and Romney flew to Florida. Those three states, along with Colorado, Nevada, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, North Carolina and Iowa make up the nine battleground states where the race is likely to be decided. Among them, they account for 110 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.¶ Recent polls have shown Obama with leads in most if not all of them, although the impact of Wednesday night's debate and of the drop in unemployment could well change some public opinion.

### 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.

#### Spending costs Obama the election --- kills independent support which their 2AC Louis evidence says will swing the election

**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.

### AT: Doesn’t affect voters

#### 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."

#### Energy will be a key issue in the election --- Obama is vulnerable.

**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.”

### 1NR – rels resil

#### Romney will aggressively push human rights legislation on Russia.

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

Russia has joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but the US is yet to grant Russia permanent normal trade relations. Moves to do so by repealing the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been stymied by the US election and efforts in Congress to tie such relations to legislation that would punish Russian officials deemed guilty of human rights abuses, including the arrest and death in custody of Sergei Magnitsky, a whistleblower. The Obama administration has taken action against those suspected of complicity in Mr Magnitsky's death, but in a limited and low-profile manner. It is not clear whether Mr Romney would be more forceful, because there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the argument. It seems likely that Mr Romney will back granting permanent normal trade relations soon after the election, but he might be more amenable to framing human rights legislation in ways that the Russian political class would regard as unwarranted interference in Russian domestic affairs.

#### That undermines START and U.S./Russian relations.

**Rogin**, **4/24**/2012 (Josh, Kerry delays action on Magnitsky bill, Foreign Policy, p. http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/24/kerry\_delays\_action\_on\_magnitsky\_bill)

The Obama administration is on the record opposing the Magnitsky bill and believes that its passage could imperil U.S.-Russian cooperation on a range of issues. The Russian government has even threatened to scuttle the New START nuclear reductions treaty if the Magnitsky bill is passed, which would erase the signature accomplishment of the administration's U.S.-Russia reset policy. "Senior Russian government officials have warned us that they will respond asymmetrically if legislation passes," the administration said in its official comments on the bill last July. "Their argument is that we cannot expect them to be our partner in supporting sanctions against countries like Iran, North Korea, and Libya, and sanction them at the same time. Russian officials have said that other areas of bilateral cooperation, including on transit Afghanistan, could be jeopardized if this legislation passes." Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak said Monday at a lunch with reporters in Washington that passage of the Magnitsky bill would have a "significant negative impact" on the U.S.-Russia relationship and said it was unacceptable for the United States to interfere in the Magnitsky case, which he said was an internal Russian issue.

## Round 8 1NC vs. Houston AR

### T

#### “Restrictions” are direct governmental limitations --- excludes trade restrictions like the aff

Viterbo 12 (Annamaria, Assistant Professor in International Law – University of Torino, PhD in International Economic Law – Bocconi University and Jean Monnet Fellow – European University Institute, International Economic Law and Monetary Measures: Limitations to States' Sovereignty and Dispute, p. 166)

In order to distinguish an exchange restriction from a trade measure, the Fund chose not to give relevance to the purposes or the effects of the measure and to adopt, instead, a technical criterion that focuses on the method followed to design said measure. An interpretation that considered the economic effects and purposes of the measures (taking into account the fact that the measure was introduced for balance of payments reasons or to preserve foreign currency reserves) would have inevitably extended the Fund's jurisdiction to trade restrictions, blurring the boundaries between the IMF and the GATT. The result of such a choice would have been that a quantitative restriction on imports imposed for balance of payments reasons would have fallen within the competence of the Fund. After lengthy discussions, in 1960 the IMF Executive Board adopted Decision No. 1034-(60/27).46 This Decision clarified that the distinctive feature of a restriction on payments and transfers for current international transactions is "whether it involves a direct governmental limitation on the availability or use of exchange as such\*.47 This is a limitation imposed directly on the use of currency in itself, for all purposes.

####  “Energy production” is the creation of an asset

Noyes 5 (Tom, Vice Chair of the Executive Committee – Sierra Club, “Economics and the Environment, Part 1,” TommyWonk, 12-8, http://www.tommywonk.com/2005/12/economics-and-environment-part-1.html)

Sometimes the ways in which we describe economic activities do not provide a clear understanding of what it is we're doing. For instance, if we wish to be precise, we wouldn't use the phrase "energy production." Most of what we call "energy production" involves burning something. A ton of coal is an asset. Smoke coming out a smokestack is not an asset. Setting fire to an asset is not production. It can be economically useful by keeping us warm or converting iron ore to steel, but it is not, strictly speaking, production, defined as the creation of an asset. This simple rephrasing of what happens when we light a fire leads to useful insights into economics and the environment. Consider the similar phrase, "timber production." A tree standing in a forest may not be considered to have any economic value. But when a logger cuts down the tree, it becomes an asset as soon as it hits the ground and is hauled off to the lumber mill.

**Violation --- Aff reduces indirect restrictions on ownership of the means of energy production, not restrictions on production itself.**

**Voting issue --- for limits --- restriction by effect explodes the topic: any law that changes relative economics could increase production --- they make thousands of new unpredictable cases topical and force the Neg to research outside of core energy policy --- makes preparation impossible**

### Devolution CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should grant the authority for the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review foreign investment in wind power to the 50 U.S. states and relevant sub-national territories.  The 50 U.S. states and relevant sub-national territories should limit the review of foreign investment in wind power to cases in which national security, not economic competition, is a factor.  We'll clarify.

#### Devolving control of regulating energy solves better and promotes more efficient production

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

Devolution theory calls for increased policy authority and discretion to be delegated to state governments in order to improve the efficiency of public policies, ensure they effectively resolve specific problems, and foster political accountability. Devolution also gives different communities the opportunity to strike their own balance among the competing policy objectives of economic growth and reducing environmental risks. n10 Devolution to regulated industries promises to reduce the cost of regulation, create incentives for sources of pollution to find the most efficient and effective means of reducing emissions, encourage reductions that go beyond minimum mandates, and allow for flexibility in business decision making. Devolution to citizens is championed as a way to get the public involved in regulatory initiatives that will change the behavior of citizens. Reducing emissions through energy conservation and increased use of [\*5] mass transit, for example, require major commitments on the part of citizens to change their behavior, and that commitment cannot simply be mandated from the top down. Other forms of participatory policy making have been proposed to respond to the demands of citizens for a role in decisions that affect their health and quality of life.¶ Advocates of devolution argue that the current federal regulatory structure is plagued by burdensome procedures and a cumbersome chain of command. The combination of environmental statutes, EPA regulations, and guidance documents result in an impenetrable pyramid of paperwork, planning, and reports. A tremendous amount of effort at all levels of governments is required to manage this process. Compliance with these requirements often replaces energy and resources that could be used to actually reduce pollution and improve environmental quality. Accountability is difficult to identify since so many policy makers compete and jostle for influence, that citizens do not know who to hold accountable when environmental goals are not achieved. Federal officials lay claim to credit for issuing ambitious environmental goals, while state and local officials bear the brunt of criticism for imposing regulatory burdens. The EPA seeks vainly to develop and impose national requirements on conditions that vary widely throughout the nation. n11¶ Critics have identified a host of problems with centralized, command and control regulation: it has not only failed to remedy many environmental problems and threats, but it has engendered significant opposition because of the restraints on freedom it imposes, the costs and burdens of compliance, and the apparent ease by which some businesses are able to escape liability and responsibility for their actions. n12 There are real limits to the power of government to promote and ensure the preservation of air, water, land, and other resources. Government agencies alone cannot accomplish these environmental goals, but must be combined with clear and effective economic incentives and with a widely held ethic of care for the land and resources on which all life is so dependent. But the dominant role the federal government plays in environmental policy making focuses too much attention on Washington, and fails to encourage more local efforts. n13¶ Other critics of the current structure of regulatory federalism argue that some state and local governments had a long tradition of ambitious environmental regulation and enacted ambitious pollution control legislation well before Congress or the executive branch acted. The first clean air laws in the United States were enacted by cities in the 1880s, [\*6] some 75 years before the first federal program aimed at air pollution. n14 Many states passed water pollution laws in the 1920 and 30s, and by 1948, every state had an environmental protection agency. n15 While it is true that many federal initiatives for air and water pollution predated the 1970 Earth Day, when the modern era of environmental regulation began, states are not newcomers to environmental regulation. Nor is federal regulation a clear success story. Federal environmental policy has been, in many areas, problematic, and has threatened environmental quality. Federal subsidies for road building in national forests, grazing on public lands, the development of fossil fuels, and the emptying of rivers and streams into reservoirs for irrigation, for example, have taken a tremendous toll on natural systems and resources and have encouraged waste, unsustainable consumption, and pollution. n16 One of the consequences of environmental federalism has been to place limitations on more aggressive state regulations. A major impetus for federal air pollution regulation, for example, was a concern by the auto industry that states would impose different emission standards on new vehicles; this fear of having to meet a maze of state regulatory requirements prompted Detroit to lobby for federal regulation of new vehicle emissions. n17 Another example, from the mid-1990s, is the development of federal emission standards for hazardous emissions from coke ovens that were less stringent than those devised in some states, such as Pennsylvania, where environmental advocates had pushed for and won more ambitious limits. n18¶ One way of responding to this debate over policy devolution is to try to sort out federal/local roles in environmental policy on a statute-by-statute basis. In the case of air pollution, for example, some regulatory goals require efforts that go beyond the capacity of individual states. The Clean Air Act provides for regional efforts to deal with the long-range transport of ozone pollution from motor vehicles and with haze in national parks and wilderness areas. Pollution problems that cross state [\*7] boundaries and involve interstate transfers can be similarly addressed by several states working together, under the EPA's umbrella. The EPA can maintain responsibility for emission standards for products that are sold in national and international markets, such as motor vehicles. n19 In other areas of implementation, such as permitting, inspection, enforcement, and monitoring, however, the EPA could cut back significantly what it does and help direct political accountability to state and local governments for local environmental quality. It could provide technical assistance, draft model state environmental laws, and disseminate more information about environmental problems and conditions and about innovative policy efforts. n20 The EPA could take on fewer tasks, and then perform those functions more expeditiously.¶ The debate over policy devolution is difficult to resolve in ways that provide clear guidance for what specific policies should be pursued at what level of government. Devolution is not without risks. Political boundaries often conflict with the extension of ecosystems and environmental effects spill over political borders. Urban air pollution problems, for example, are a function of local sources as well as those that are transported long distances. Policy devolution in one area, such as the formulation of local air pollution clean up programs, as is currently provided for by law, must be combined with regional and national programs to deal with the transport of air pollution and emissions from motor vehicles. The goal of giving communities the choice of what mix of risk reduction and economic growth strategies to pursue conflicts with the expectations of a national commitment to protect the health of all Americans, regardless of where they live. There may be some backsliding in some states as more autonomy is delegated to them, and polluting industries may find ways to exercise their political clout more ambitiously in local governments in ways that reduce their regulatory obligations. Proponents of less environmental regulation, of unbridled economic growth and consumption may use devolution arguments to pursue their anti-government agenda. But, in the long run, a more ambitious, pollution-preventing approach to regulation requires more participation and involvement by those whose behaviors are targeted for change, and state and local-level government forums are required for citizens, industry officials, and policy makers to work closely together. Any losses in short-run regulatory stringency (if that is an accurate description of current regulatory efforts) will likely be offset by more fundamental, long-term gains.¶ Despite these problems there is significant support for devolution in environmental policy making. There is clearly some role in environmental [\*8] policy making for all levels of government. International commitments require national legislation, but state and local governments can also contribute to implementation of these agreements. Interstate commerce and pollution flows also require at least a multi-state response. Beyond that, there is a compelling case for allowing states to tailor the implementation of national goals to meet differing ecological, economic, social, and political differences. n21 Economic theories suggest that decentralization of decisionmaking "increases social well-being as compared with a centralized solution requiring more uniform level of public services across all jurisdictions" because of the resultant freedom of people to choose for themselves how to balance competing concerns. n22 Competition among businesses and among states is essential in encouraging innovation, experimentation, and improved policy making. Progressives have also joined the call for devolution, arguing that shifts in power to states can be harnessed to enact better public policies and also nourishes democracy and the opening up of politics to groups that have had little success, at least recently, in shaping national policies. n23¶ Nevertheless, Congressional leaders have largely abandoned, with a few exceptions such as in welfare reform, the promises made in 1994 and 1995 to deliver a smaller federal government and devolve more power to states. n24 Instead, legislation to strengthen the federal role in taxing Internet commerce, property rights, electric industry deregulation, telecommunications, and a host of other areas demonstrate strong Congressional interest in maintaining and even expanding federal power. n25 Members of Congress appear to be much more interested in responding to the demands of business that they be given one set of federal standards to meet, rather than 50 different state requirements. The globalization of the economy and the emphasis on uniform standards provides strong pressure for increased federal policy making rather than policy devolution. n26 The exception of welfare policy seems to prove the rule: in areas where there is strong industry interest in uniform standards, including environmental policy making, there is little devolution; in areas [\*9] where industry has little interest, like welfare, Congress has responded to state demands for more flexibility and discretion.¶ III. RETHINKING ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT¶ An alternative approach to sorting out the debate over policy devolution and national regulatory programs is to consider what kinds of changes are needed in environmental laws and policies in order to encourage the transition from the current command and control approach to the idea of sustainable development. However, the next generation of environmental laws and regulatory programs, if they are to be more efficient and effective than their predecessors in preventing pollution, integrating economic and environmental values, and promoting sustainability, will still need to address the arguments made by proponents of devolution. The balance of this paper examines the definition of sustainable development, reviews the case for reshaping environmental regulation toward that goal, and explores the implications of the theory of sustainable development for policy devolution.

### Elections (Obama Good) DA

#### Obama will win now – Electoral College projections, national popular vote projections

Silver 10/4/12 (Nate, Founder @ Fivethirtyeight.com, "Oct. 3: Romney’s Electoral Challenge, and More on Debate Instant Polls," http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/04/oct-3-romneys-electoral-challenge-and-more-on-debate-instant-polls/)

It may be a bit fruitless to spend too much time worrying about the Wednesday afternoon FiveThirtyEight forecast when Wednesday night’s debate had the potential to change the election landscape. But for the sake of continuity, here goes. The FiveThirtyEight forecast had Mr. Obama gaining slightly on Wednesday, estimating that he had a 86.1 percent chance of winning the Electoral College on Nov. 6 — up from 84.7 percent in Tuesday’s forecast. This came despite the fact that it appeared there actually had been a modest shift back toward Mitt Romney in the polls even before the debate. In our “now-cast” — an estimate of what would happen if an election were held immediately — Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote had fallen by about one percentage point between Sunday and Wednesday. Our Nov. 6 forecast, however, had already anticipated some decline for Mr. Obama, and so has been less sensitive to the shift. In addition, there is a particular Electoral College outlook that is becoming problematic for Mr. Romney. As of Wednesday, our Nov. 6 forecast had Mr. Obama winning the popular vote by 4.1 percentage points. However, his advantage was larger than that — at least 4.9 percentage points, in 22 states (and the District of Columbia) — totaling 275 electoral votes: I highlight New Hampshire in yellow on this map because, although it is one of the states where Mr. Obama’s lead now exceeds 4.9 percentage points, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for him to win the Electoral College votes in this configuration. New Hampshire is not necessary because you could remove its 4 electoral votes from Mr. Obama’s column and he would still have 271, a winning total. It is not sufficient because if you removed any competitive state but New Hampshire from Mr. Obama’s column (for example, Nevada) he would at best achieve a 269-269 tie. Really, a great deal of this comes down to Ohio. Historically, Ohio is about two percentage points more Republican-leaning than the country as a whole. This year, however, it has polled as being Democratic-leaning by one percentage point or so. I ran an alternate version of our simulation on Wednesday in which Ohio was in fact polling two points more Republican than the country as a whole, as it has, on average, in the past, while leaving all other states unchanged. That change alone boosted Mr. Romney’s Electoral College winning chances to 19 percent from 14 percent.

#### But the next 10 days are key - new issues that “shake up the race” are key to Romney’s chances

Cook 10/1/12 (Charlie, Founder of Cook Political Report, "Shades of 1996," http://cookpolitical.com/story/4846)

Public attitudes toward candidates and elections often start off in a fluid state. Then they gradually begin to jell, first reaching a semisolid state before hardening to rock-solid. This year’s presidential race isn’t over, but Mitt Romney’s current trajectory in the polls will not cross President Obama’s by Nov. 6—or maybe even Nov. 6 of next year. If something doesn’t happen to shake up the race, Romney will lose. Romney’s negatives, particularly in swing states, have grown to the point that if allowed to solidify, his opportunity to recover will vanish. The GOP nominee still has a chance to change the trajectory of the campaign, but the longer he takes, the smaller the payoff. Very few undecided voters are left in swing states; campaign pollsters say that maybe 4 or 5 percent of likely voters fit in this category. And no one would be surprised if some of the remaining undecided voters, after being subjected to saturation advertising for months—in some cases since June—throw up their hands and opt to stay home on Election Day. If the presidential race stays on its current course for another week or 10 days, Romney faces the very real prospect that Republican donors, super PACs, and other parts of the GOP support structure will begin to shift resources away from helping him and toward a last-ditch effort to win a Senate majority—which once seemed very likely—and to protect the party’s House majority. A year and a half ago, it looked like Republicans had a 65 to 70 percent chance of capturing the Senate. The 23 Democratic seats up for grabs, compared with just 10 for Republicans, offered the GOP many opportunities for gains, particularly in states that Democrats had captured from Republicans in 2006. Jennifer Duffy, senior Senate editor of *The Cook Political Report*, now argues that the range of possible Senate outcomes goes from Republicans picking up two or three seats to actually losing a seat or two. For the most part, the deterioration of the Senate outlook is unrelated to Romney’s problems at the top of the ticket, and it comes despite a strong effort by the National Republican Senatorial Committee. But there’s no denying that things are not looking so good for the red team in the Senate. Arguably, Republicans now have a chance against only one of the four most vulnerable Democratic Senate incumbents, with GOP Rep. Denny Rehberg now running even with Jon Tester in Montana. Republican prospects to unseat Democrats Claire McCaskill in Missouri, Bill Nelson in Florida, andSherrod Brown in Ohio are remote, at best. Top-tier recruits in open seats in Hawaii and New Mexico have not caught on despite strong campaign efforts, further undercutting GOP chances of securing a Senate majority. Two moderate Democrats running for open Senate seats in very Republican states are doing unexpectedly well: Democratic former state Attorney General Heidi Heitkamp is locked in a tight race in North Dakota with GOP Rep. Rick Berg, while Democratic Rep. Joe Donnelly is in an equally close contest with Republican state Treasurer Richard Mourdock inIndiana. Republicans were heavily favored to win both seats early on; now both races are very tight. Duffy points to the last time this class of Senate seats was up, in 2006: Then, three Senate seats and control of the chamber were settled by 60,665 votes spread among three states, Missouri, Montana, and Virginia. Of the 10 Senate races that *The Cook Political Report* rates as toss-ups, six are now in Democratic hands and four are in GOP hands. The range of possible outcomes is very wide. In the House, we have not yet seen any signs of deterioration for the GOP majority. Even if Democrats were to win every seat currently rated solid Democratic, likely Democratic, or lean Democratic, as well as every toss-up, they would still come up short of a majority. The canaries in the coal mine are GOP seats currently rated as lean Republican or likely Republican. *Cook Political Report* House Editor David Wasserman points out that with Democrats likely to lose perhaps 10 of their own seats, they would have to gross 35 seats to hit the 25 net seats necessary to win a majority. That’s a very tall order. House Republican strategists have been preaching the “balance message” to their candidates: If the top of the ticket starts to go south on them, then Republicans need to argue that the party must keep the House in GOP hands to have a firm check in place to balance against a second-term President Obama. The next week or 10 days are thus critical for Romney and the GOP. If things don’t turn around, a stampede could ensue reminiscent of 1996, when Republicans realized that Bob Dole was not going to defeat President Clinton. History could repeat itself.

#### Plan massively unpopular – China bashing empirically effective

Yingzi 10. [Tan, reporter, "US likely to give nod to CNOOC deal, despite opposition" China Daily -- www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2010-10/14/content\_11409139.htm]

Several proposed Chinese investment projects in the US have encountered political obstacles this year. Some Congress members blamed China for the high US unemployment rate and regard the emerging economy's global expansion as a national security threat.¶ China has appeared as a "scapegoat" for the wobbly US economy in the fierce campaign for November's midterm elections. At least 29 candidates have aired advertisements blaming their opponents for being too sympathetic to China, the New York Times reported on Saturday.¶ Strong political opposition to the CNOOC deal is likely, given the recent congressional objections to Anshan Iron and Steel Group's investment in a small US steel company, said Scissors from the Heritage Foundation.

\*\*\*Note: CNOOC = China energy giant

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

Weir 12, 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. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### Electricity Prices DA

#### 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. 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.

#### Current wind capacity is manageable – new upgrades to capacity jacks prices

Bryce 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow @ Manhattan Institute, "The High Cost of Wind Energy as a Carbon-Dioxide Reduction Method," http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ib\_11.htm)

The Global Wind Energy Council (GWEC), an industry group, maintains that reducing the amount of carbon dioxide going into the atmosphere “is the most important environmental benefit from wind power generation.”[27] For its part, the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA), a national trade association, says “there is no need to wait for a new climate solution. Wind power is one of only a few near-term options to reduce emissions.”[28] In its 2008 report, the NREL claimed that if the United States were to derive 20 percent of its electricity from wind, it “could avoid approximately 825 million metric tons of carbon dioxide in the electric sector in 2030.”[29]¶ How does that 825 million tons of carbon dioxide compare with global emissions? In 2010, global carbon-dioxide emissions totaled 33.1 billion tons.[30] Thus, if the United States were somehow able to instantly increase its wind-generated electricity to 20 percent of total consumption, doing so might reduce global emissions by about 2.5 percent. But it is unlikely that global emissions will be the same in 2030 as they were in 2010. By 2030, the International Energy Agency (IEA) expects global emissions will total about 40.2 billion tons.[31] Thus, the 825 million tons that NREL claims might be reduced by achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will result in a global reduction of just 2 percent.[32]¶ Therefore, to justify a total investment of $850 billion in wind, U.S. policymakers would have to agree that reducing carbon dioxide in the year 2030 is worth spending $1,030 per ton. Of course, that amount would not be spent all at once. Instead it would be allocated over the coming 19 years and would be, in effect, a carbon tax set at $54 per ton.¶ However, the actual cost may be somewhat lower. In its 2008 report, NREL claimed that only 305,000 megawatts of wind capacity would be needed to meet the “20 by ‘30” goal. Recall that the United States has built about 40,000 megawatts of wind capacity at a cost of about $68 billion. Thus, building an additional 265,000 megawatts of wind capacity (again, at $2.43 million per megawatt) at a cost of $644 billion, would lead to a total cost of $712 billion, thereby implying that cutting one ton of carbon dioxide by 2030 would cost about $863. Spread over the next 19 years, the cost would be the equivalent of a carbon levy set at $45 per ton.¶ Achieving the “20 by ‘30” goal will have a significant impact on electricity rates. In 2007, Steven Hayward and Kenneth Green of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) estimated that a $15 carbon tax would likely increase the cost of coal-fired generation by about $0.0163 per kilowatt-hour. Therefore, we can assume that a carbon levy of $54-per-ton could increase electricity rates in coal-reliant regions by about $0.058 per kilowatt-hour. That’s a major increase given that the average price of electricity for residential consumers in the United States is currently $0.12 per kilowatt-hour.[33]¶ Put another way, if the United States were to achieve the “20 by ‘30” goal, U.S. residential electricity prices in coal-dependent regions could increase by about 48 percent over current levels. If we use the lower range of wind costs outlined by NREL in its 2008 report, and assume that reducing a ton of carbon by 2030 will cost $45 per year, the increase in electricity costs in coal-dependent areas will amount to about $0.049 per kilowatt-hour. That would result in an increase of 40 percent over current levels for residential customers in those regions.¶ These higher electricity costs will likely accelerate the pace of electric rate increases now underway around the country. Since 2004, the average cost of residential electricity has gone from $0.0895 per kilowatt-hour to $0.1218 per kilowatt-hour, an increase of 36 percent.[34]¶ Wind energy is not a cost-effective method of reducing carbon-dioxide emissions. Any effort—whether at the state level or the federal level—to dramatically increase the use of wind energy will result in a new tax on electricity consumers. If the United States were to achieve the “20 by ‘30” goal, the effective carbon tax of $45 to $54 per ton would far exceed any such tax regime currently in place. Further, if the stated goal were met by 2030, the likely reduction in carbon dioxide emissions would amount to just 2 percent of the expected global total.

#### Low electricity prices spurs manufacturing "reshoring"

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.

#### Manufacturing strength is key to 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-)](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf-%29)

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.

#### 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 – Economy

#### Lifting trade restrictions makes free trade and anti-protectionism impossible – China will game the system

Brinser 12 -- President, SolarWorld Industries America (Gordon, 5/28/12, "China, Free Trade and American Tariffs on Solar Panels," http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304707604577424153035240454.html)

Like the Journal, we support free trade. However, there is more to free trade than just cutting tariffs. For free trade to work, countries and businesses have to play by the rules set forth by the World Trade Organization. When foreign companies are thought to be breaking the rules, U.S. companies can use U.S. trade laws to force compliance. Indeed, the use of these laws is a WTO-permissible way to eliminate unfair trade practices, such as China's dumping and its subsidies in the solar sector. When China gained admission to the WTO, it committed to play by a set of rules. The solar case is about China failing to follow the rules of international trade. Since China was found guilty of violating those laws, it should be held accountable. Without enforcement of the rules, the promise of free trade is just a promise.

#### Tariff doesn’t cause trade war

Bradsher & Wald 12 -- staff writers @ NYT (Keith and Matthew, 3/20/12, "A Measured Rebuttal to China Over Solar Panels," http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/21/business/energy-environment/us-to-place-tariffs-on-chinese-solar-panels.html?pagewanted=all)

Whatever political spin proponents or critics might want to put on the tariff decision, there is no question that solar panels from China now control about half of the American market, while panels from the United States control less than a third. American imports of Chinese solar panels have soared to $2.65 billion last year from $21.3 million in 2005. While American manufacturers oppose the imports and filed the trade case against China, users of solar energy have benefited from low-cost Chinese solar panels. An American industry group composed of companies that sell and install solar panels said Tuesday that it was pleased with the relatively small size of the tariffs, having braced for higher ones. “This is a huge victory for the U.S. solar industry and our 100,000 employees,” said Jigar Shah, president of the Coalition for Affordable Solar Energy. “Given all our expectations, this is really good news.” Barry Cinnamon, chief executive of Westinghouse Solar, which imports panels from China and adds wiring, racking and other components, said he was relieved by the decision, which will raise the price of his 250-watt system to about $610 from $600. “If the tariffs were big, 20 percent or 50 percent or 100 percent, it would be really bad for U.S. jobs,” he said. “If it’s a small tariff, it does send a signal to encourage manufacturers to do more manufacturing in the U.S., but it’s not enough to have a huge impact on costs.” And it will not set off a trade war, he predicted.

#### They only solve one symptom of the trade war – currency manipulation, tire tariffs are all just as contentious – we even have other renewable tariffs on China AND solar tariff

DiBenedetto 12 -- president of Lampin Corp. of Uxbridge, an engineering and manufacturing firm; graduate of Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Bill, 8/2/12, "Tower Tariffs: The Winds of a Trade War with China?" http://www.triplepundit.com/2012/08/wind-tower-tarrifs/)

Renewable energy trade conflicts with China are heating up and blowing strong. The latest action by the Commerce Department has set tariffs that could go as high as high as 73 percent on imports of utility-scale wind towers from China and as much as 60 percent on towers from Vietnam, adding further restrictions on clean-energy imports from Asia. The agency’s International Trade Administration issued a “preliminary determination of anti-dumping duties” on July 27; the duties are expected to be finalized in December. In the 4-page fact sheet announcing the decision, ITA says producers in the two nations, which exported $301 million in wind towers to the U.S. in 2011, sold the utility-scale towers below production costs. The agency acted on a complaint by the Wind Tower Trade Coalition, a group of U.S. manufacturers that includes Broadwind Towers Inc., DMI Industries, Katana Summit LLC and Trinity Structural Towers Inc. Among culprits named in the finding were, in China, Chengxi Shipyard Co., Ltd. and Titan Wind Energy (Suzhou) Co., Ltd. and in Vietnam, CS Wind Corporation and CS Wind Vietnam Co. Ltd. It’s just about the towers, however; excluded from the scope of the ITA finding are nacelles and rotor blades whether or not they are attached to the tower. “China has ramped up the wind-tower production and done it in a way that is not reflective of market forces,” said Scott Paul, the executive director for the Washington-based Alliance for American Manufacturing, quoted by Bloomberg. “I’m hopeful these tariffs will give the American wind-energy manufacturers the breathing space to compete for more market space in the U.S.” The U.S. has imposed duties on numerous types of renewable energy products from China in recent months, including solar panels (see TP of January 12). This has escalated trade tensions between the two nations. The Commerce Department on May 30 set duties as high as 26 percent on wind-tower imports from China to compensate for Chinese government subsidies, again siding with U.S. manufacturers. On May 17 the department set anti-dumping tariffs of 31 percent to 250 percent on imports of Chinese solar-energy products, after a complaint by manufacturers including the U.S. unit of SolarWorld AG. The agency in March announced duties of as much as 4.73 percent to offset subsidies received from China’s government, and last month determined that the country’s producers benefited from additional state support. A final ruling on those duties is scheduled for October. Not to be outdone, in a complaint on May 24 to the Geneva-based World Trade Organization, China’s Ministry of Commerce said renewable-energy programs in California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio and Washington State violate global trade policies. China also says it filed a complaint at the WTO alleging that U.S. anti-subsidy duties undercut $7.3 billion in Chinese products, including solar panels. A trade war in the renewable energy sector is unfortunate but it also illustrates just how important renewables are becoming on the world trade stage.

**Trade disputes now – election politics**

**China Daily 12** (“Obama Steps Up Trade Fight with China Over Autos,” 9-18-12) http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2012-09/18/content\_15765633.htm

US President Barack Obama filed a complaint over Chinese automotive and auto-parts subsidies with the World Trade Organization on Monday, a move seen as a final push before the November elections. "These are subsidies that directly harm working men and women on the assembly lines in Ohio and Michigan and across the Midwest," Obama told supporters while campaigning in Ohio. "We are going to stop it. It is not right, it is against the rules and we will not let it stand," he said. It was the second time Obama disclosed an anti-China trade action in Ohio, which is a pivotal "swing" state for electoral votes and among the top manufacturers of vehicles and auto parts in the United States. The industries directly or indirectly employ 850,000 people in the state, according to the White House. On an early-July bus tour in Ohio, the president announced plans to ask a WTO panel to hear a separate case in which the US accused China of imposing unfair duties on more than $3 billion in exported US-made vehicles. Zhiqun Zhu, a professor of political science and international relations at Bucknell University in Pennsylvania, said the announcement's timing was intentional. He called the move "one of Obama's final pushes to maintain his lead over [Republican nominee Mitt] Romney" in the remaining weeks of the campaign.

**Other alt causes outweigh – solar, steel**

Tax News Online 12 (Mike Godfrey, Obama, Romney Seek To Out Tough Each Other On China,” 9-21-12)

The Office of the US Trade Representative has pointed out the long list of recent enforcement actions the US government has taken against China at the WTO – from China’s subsidies to wind power equipment manufacturers and the imposition of ADs on imports of solar cells from China, disputes regarding duties imposed by China on US automobiles, steel products and poultry products, and challenges to China’s export restraints on rare earths. On the other hand, following its own attack on alleged subsidies by the US within the renewable energy sector, the Chinese Ministry of Commerce (MOC) has reignited the on-going dispute over the application of both ADs and CVDs at the same time by the US over 24 of its products (almost USD7.2bn of its exports) which it is said to subsidize.

#### **No US-China war – economics**

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

#### No war – China abides by international law and keeps a low profile

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Keeping Low Profile China's strategy of keeping low profile constitutes the political foundation of the superficial friendship between the United States and China. After 1989, in the face of sanctions and blockades from the West, Deng Xiaoping told Chinese policy makers: ‘In short, my views about the international situation can be summed up in three sentences. First, we should observe the situation coolly. Second, we should hold our ground. Third, we should act camly. Don’t be impatient; it is no good to be impatient. We should be calm, calm and again calm, and quietly immerse ourselves in practical work to accomplish something – something for China.’48 Deng Xiaoping's counterstrategy was later summed up as ‘keeping a low profile’. It was in 1995 that then Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen first introduced this principle of Chinese policy to the world.49 In 1998, President Jiang Zemin summarized the policy as ‘observe calmly, cope with affairs calmly, never seek leadership, hide brightness and cherish obscurity, get some things done.’50 The white paper on China's Peaceful Development issued in 2011 notes that, ‘As a responsible member of the international community, China abides by international law and the generally recognized principles governing international relations, and eagerly fulfills its international responsibility. China has actively participated in reforming international systems, formulating international rules and addressing global issues. It supports the development of other developing countries, and works to safeguard world peace and stability.’51

#### Disputes are compartmentalized

**Weekend Australian 4** (2-21, Lexis)

Even as recently as last year, the Bush administration imposed sanctions on Chinese firms accused of selling weapons technology to other nations, including Pakistan. But it seems the US right now is content to take on faith that Beijing means what it says over non-proliferation. There are timely reasons for that. Next week comes another round of six-nation talks aimed at getting North Korea to abandon its nuclear program convenes in Beijing. The US is relying heavily on China's influence with its recalcitrant neighbour to help bring about the desired result. The US is also trying to persuade China to join the Proliferation Security Initiative, a plan that seeks to halt the international trade in weapons of mass destruction by, among other measures, stopping and searching ships at sea. That is why Bolton was in Beijing. At the same time, China is seeking US assistance to rein in the independence proclivities of Taiwanese President Chen Shui-bian, who faces an election on March 20. So it is in China's interests to play ball by, for example, applying appropriate gravitas to the nuclear secrets allegations coming out of Washington. As the week's events showed, the US and China have built sufficient ballast in their once fragile relationship to weather the occasional battering and to manage multiple and sometimes conflicting agendas, from trade and human rights to arms proliferation and Taiwan.

#### 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).

#### US-China transparency over energy issues increasing now - recent climate dialog proves

Moarif 6/14/12 (Sara, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, "TOWARD GREATER TRANSPARENCY BETWEEN U.S. AND CHINA," http://www.c2es.org/blog/moarifs/toward-greater-transparency-between-us-china)

Over the past five years, countries have been working through the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to strengthen the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions worldwide. Because these issues are especially important to the United States and China, C2ES has been partnering with Tsinghua University to convene informal discussions among MRV experts from both countries. In late 2010 with Tsinghua, we organized a workshop in Beijing on Reporting Practices Related to Climate Change and Other International Challenges. This initial gathering focused on MRV at the international level. Last week, we co-hosted a second workshop in Washington, D.C., on Domestic MRV of Climate Efforts. While the issues can quickly become highly technical, it’s important to remember why stronger measurement, reporting and verification are so important: MRV contributes to stronger greenhouse gas mitigation by building confidence among countries, helps them track national and international progress, and provides opportunities to learn from one another’s experiences. In his opening remarks, Professor Teng Fei of Tsinghua University characterized MRV at the domestic level and MRV of international action as two sides of the same coin. The workshop provided an excellent overview of MRV practices and challenges in both countries (we’ll be posting a more detailed summary soon). From the U.S. EPA, Kong Chiu provided an in-depth look at EPA’s new Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, while Jeremy Schreifels shared significant insights from MRV experience under non-GHG cap-and-trade programs. Clare Breidenich and Michael Gillenwater described MRV efforts under California’s renewable energy standard and GHG trading program. From the Chinese side, Teng Fei provided an excellent overview of energy data reporting and verification in China, important for monitoring the national energy intensity target; Renmin University’s Wu Jian gave a superb overview of pilot sulfur dioxide (SO2) control programs in China; Tsinghua’s Wu Jian provided an exceptionally useful overview of the status of China’s pilot GHG trading programs; and Wang Lan of the China Building Materials Academy gave valuable insight into how China’s cement sector is likely to be asked to measure and report emissions. A couple of simple but important lessons stood out from both the U.S. and Chinese experiences. The first was the importance of working across multiple, often overlapping, government programs. Georgetown’s Joanna Lewis and the World Bank’s Xueman Wang, in sharing their key takeaways from the workshop, pointed out the challenge of ensuring coherence among different MRV systems in China, given co-existing national targets (emissions intensity, energy intensity, and renewable energy) and the range of instruments needed at all levels of government to meet them. It was noted that California, with its various GHG-related policies, faces similar challenges. Lending a private sector perspective, Jeff Hopkins of Rio Tinto emphasized the importance of coherence across MRV systems to companies operating in various jurisdictions, each with different GHG-control policies. The second lesson was that measurement, reporting and verification systems continuously evolve and improve over time. As countries around the world are looking to implement significant climate policies, starting implementation sooner, even with a more modest MRV system, may trump having a “perfect” system in place. In both China and the U.S., experience and capacity have built up over time, with policy monitoring feeding back into stronger policy design and implementation– ultimately allowing for greater efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on environmental objectives. Apart from these concrete policy lessons, it was also clear that the international dialogue around MRV has become less political since our earlier workshop in Beijing, perhaps reflecting the progress made on MRV issues at the last two UNFCCC conferences in Cancún and Durban. Discussion at the workshop was frank, relaxed, open, and based on a genuine desire to learn. For us, it was an encouraging sign that measurement, reporting and verification can indeed be a source of stronger cooperation and climate action.

#### Energy transparency is impossible absent cooperation through the EITI

Crowshaw and Ye 12 (Heather and Wang, U.S.- China Partnership for Environmental Law, Vermont Law School & China University of Political Science & Law, "Bridging the Transparency Gap: Catalyzing Meaningful U.S.- China Participation in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative for Energy Security," [http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Croshaw\_WangYe\_JRP\_Final(0).pdf)](http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Documents/Croshaw_WangYe_JRP_Final%280%29.pdf%29) \*\* EITI = Extractuve Industries Transparency Initiative

The U.S. and China see each other as competitors in the global energy scramble, particularly in Africa and post-conflict countries. The rhetoric in the U.S. often paints a negative picture, whereas China views the U.S. as being greedy. As a result, the two countries have a slight mistrust of each other, especially when dealing with energy resources. Thus, EITI can help bridge the transparency gap between the involvements of the two countries in resource-rich states, as well as promote global energy security. First, for both U.S. and China, promoting EITI would improve data sharing for market for energy information to help lower transactions costs, and understand actions of other energy market players. 193 This platform would provide an opportunity to understand the global energy market so that corporations operating abroad will be able to better negotiate with host governments. Both countries want fair competition for energy supplies, so EITI can aid in level the playing field. Second, EITI will help both the U.S. and China avoid conflict both domestically and abroad due to their foreign relations policies. China wants to avoid social unrest, political protests, and “discontent over its foreign relations, including cooperation and conflict over energy supplies. …[the] Chinese do value multilateral cooperation on energy and environmental issues, but [are] also relatively uninformed about the exact nature of their foreign energy ties…” 194 With China, their SOE often operate as a surrogate foreign diplomat, even if they do have greater autonomy than in years past. They still have to abide by Beijing’s foreign policy, thus weighing down on their efficiency and competitiveness. Furthermore, China’s extractive companies are willing to work in very hostile and politically unstable areas, such as Sudan and South Sudan, where killings and kidnappings are not uncommon. 195 EITI would help with the political instability and improve the governance over the mineral resources where the public and companies can hold the managers responsible. Third, EITI can assist with diplomatic relations, especially over minerals that cross territorial lines. For instance, if China and Japan (or Vietnam, Philippines, etc.) had to resolve their dispute over territorial claims in the East China Sea, the two countries could form a joint venture to develop the natural gas and oil resources, and EITI would publish how much revenue each country receives for the natural resources. 196 That way, citizens and their respective national governments will know how much each country earns. The two governments and citizens can hold China and Japan accountable for any misappropriation of funds. Additionally, for the U.S., EITI could assist with the division over the Artic circle extractive resources between the Article circle nations and tribal groups through transparency of contracts, statistical information of transactions, publication of revenues, and other capacities to ensure smooth diplomatic relations. Finally, the U.S. and China can spearhead EITI to include minerals required for green technologies within their own EITI reports, and not just traditional carbon minerals. The U.S. and China can help other countries rich in these important low carbon minerals to include the revenues in their own EITI reports, or encourage non-EITI countries to join the initiative. Also, China could lead the way for the other BRIC countries— India, Brazil, and Russia— in declaring support for EITI as a way to improve global energy markets and secure access to current and future energy resources. Overall, as the two largest energy consumers in the world, both the U.S. and China have much work to do for bridging the transparency gap on EITI knowledge, changing misperceptions about the initiative, and supporting its implementation around the world. U.S.-China cooperation within EITI will help increase global energy security through improving access to market information, empowering the public, increasing community participation, promoting sustainable development, improving government accountability, reducing corruption, minimizing military involvement, and encouraging corporate best practices and due diligence both home and abroad. U.S. and China can work towards trust over energy issues through raising awareness and educating the public about EITI and how it can improve governance in the energy sector. EITI can improve energy relations between the two nations through transparency and accountability, where the public and corporations can have a voice in how their governments manage natural resources for the public good.

### 1NC – Relations

#### US-China relations are superficial – cooperation’s always fails, but war is impossible

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

Shortly after US President Obama and Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard sealed the bilateral defense deal in November 2011 under which 2500 US marines will be stationed in Australia came Obama's announcement on January 5 2012 of the new strategic defense guidance entitled Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for the 21st Century Defence. The document claims that China's rise might have impact on the US economy and security, and that countries such as China and Iran continue to pursue asymmetric means of countering US power projection capabilities.1 Both the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defense refuted these claims, arguing that not a shred of evidence exists to support such wild accusations.2 Many media reports nevertheless argue that competition between the United States and China amounts to a new Cold War.3 This article discusses characteristics and trends in Sino–US relations, and in this connection answers the specific question: How do the characteristics of Sino–US relations affect trends in their bilateral ties? How much longer can Sino–US relations continue to follow current trends? Where will strategic competition between China and the United States lead? Different Views of Trends in Sino–US Relations The conflict between China and the United States at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Talks gave rise to the mainstream view within US academic circles that Sino–US ties are worsening. Paul Pedrozo and Seth Cropsy argued that competition between China and the United States was a necessary outcome of China's naval modernization.4 Robert Kaplan, meanwhile, contended that China's growing military capacities and economic power made heightened tensions in Sino–US relations inevitable.5 Thomas Christensen holds that relations between the two countries will come under stress as China shifts towards a hard-line policy with respect to its sovereignty and territorial claims.6 While in 2010 US academics blamed China for the deterioration in Sino–US relations, Chinese scholars regarded the worsening of ties in 2011 as obviously a result of the Obama Administration's beefing-up of its pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region. Scholars are nonetheless split on whether the pivot constitutes a strategy adjustment or a tactical adjustment. Those arguing the former predict long-term competition between China and the United States; those who see it as a tactical adjustment regard the deterioration in Sino–US ties as temporary, that is to say, Obama's pivot strategy in the Asia Pacific region is part of his 2012 electoral strategy that he will drop after the elections and revert to his 2009 policy towards China. We identify three distinct views regarding the future of Sino–US relations. Pessimists argue that Sino–US relations are entering a new Cold War period. Henry C. K. Liu suggests that a new Cold War is brewing between China and the United States, but that it is more geopolitically framed than ideologically based, albeit couched in residual ideological polemic.7 William Jones goes as far as to expect conflict between China and the United States to culminate in a third world war.8 Yongnian Zheng also considers that East Asia is headed towards a new Cold War dynamic that has prompted developments on the Korean Peninsula.9 Mearsheimer holds that it is not possible for China to rise peacefully. He argues that ‘if China continues its impressive economic growth over the next few decades, the United States and China are likely to engage in an intense security competition with considerable potential for war. Most of China's neighbours, to include India, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Russia, and Vietnam, will join with the United States to contain China's power.’10 Lawrence S. Wittner even infers the possibility of nuclear war.11 Those more optimistic about the future of Sino–US relations are primarily Chinese scholars, who generally believe that it is possible for China and the United states to avoid a new Cold War. Wu Jianmin argues that China will not as a matter of national policy enact the role of a hegemon, but follow the historical trend of peace, development and cooperation and absolutely reject war, competition and conflict. Under no circumstances, therefore, will China enter into a new Cold War with the United States.12 Wang Jisi has long held that while China and the United States will not become allies, nor will a crisis in their ties arise of an extent amounting to Cold War.13 Wang argues that the structural contradictions that appeared between China and the United States in 2010 are attributable to the narrowing gap in their respective comparative capacities which, conversely, have driven them further apart in terms of mutual understanding. Major issues such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and the exchange rate have had escalating negative impact on Sino–US ties and created higher levels of strategic suspicion rather than mutual strategic trust.14 This implies that as long as the United States and China bolster strategic trust they can prevent their bilateral relationship from slipping into a Cold War scenario. As distinct from these pessimists and optimists, we, together with a number of colleagues, argue that United States’ pivot towards the Asia Pacific represents a strategy adjustment. Competition between China and the United States will consequently grow, but this does not meet the criteria for a Cold War.15 We characterize the United States and China as ‘superficial friends’, and argue that as such they have a highly volatile relationship, apparent in shifts between good and bad periods.16 As, at least for the meantime, China and the United States have no desire to abandon their strategy of superficial friendship, the conditions necessary for a Cold War are not present. For example, although Obama supports a new defense strategy whose focus is on containing China, he purposely avoided any mention of China at the time he announced this new policy at the Department of Defense.17 Moreover, four days after the announcement, Obama sent Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to China to seek Beijing's support of US sanctions against Iran.18 As China and the United States will not for the time being abandon their superficial friendship strategy, Sino–US relations will hence not teeter towards Cold War.

#### The plan is a drop in the bucket relative to overall disputes

**Stokes and Hatchigian, 12** [U.S.-China Relations in an Election Year Taking the Long View in a Season of Heated Rhetoric, Jacob, Research Assistant at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), where his research focuses on U.S. national security and defense policy. His writing has appeared in CNN.com, Politico, BusinessWeek, The Baltimore Sun, The Guardian and The American Prospect, among other publications, Senior Fellow at American Progress, http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/china/report/2012/03/13/11349/u-s-china-relations-in-an-election-year/)

This report examines the 10 most debated challenges in the U.S.-China relation-¶ ship in the 2012 presidential and congressional campaign season, exploring¶ differences between progressive and conservative approaches to China. We¶ detail these 10 issues in the pages that follow, but briefly, here is a summation of the top challenges and the different approaches advocated by conservatives and¶ taken by progressives.¶ • Ensuring fair trade. The Obama administration’s policy of vigorous enforce-¶ ment and results-oriented dialogue beats conservatives’ refusal to invest in¶ American competitiveness at home; empty, antagonistic rhetoric toward China;¶ and highly inconsistent positions on trade cases. The Obama administration has¶ announced a new trade-enforcement unit and has brought more major trade¶ cases against China than any of its predecessors.¶ • Progress on currency. The Obama administration’s efforts, on its own and with¶ other nations, to pressure China to deal with its undervalued currency have¶ resulted in progress, though more remains to be done. The administration is keeping the pressure on. The conservative answer is both needlessly antago-¶ nistic and ineffective.¶ • China owning U.S. debt. China owning just more than 8 percent of our federal¶ debt is not leverage China can use without unacceptably harming its own interests.¶ Conservative hysterics and fearmongering about this complex issue is misplaced.¶ • Chinese direct investment. Chinese investment in our country can be a major¶ source of capital and jobs going forward. We should allow proven national ¶ 4 Center for American Progress Action Fund | U.S.-China Relations in an Election Year¶ security processes to weed out threats to our nation and avoid excessive¶ paranoia around Chinese purchases, lest we miss investment-led growth¶ opportunities. Conservatives should take heed.¶ • Championing human rights. The Obama administration has consistently called¶ China out on human rights, speaking privately and publicly with Chinese¶ leaders, meeting with the Dalai Lama twice, and giving our diplomats new¶ forums to engage fully with their Chinese counterparts and the Chinese peo-¶ ple to improve human rights and religious freedoms in China. Conservatives’¶ only answer is even more forceful browbeating of Chinese leaders—emotion-¶ ally satisfying, but not an effective tactic to make real change.¶ • America the Pacific power. Under the Obama administration new trade part-¶ nerships, defense arrangements, and serious connections with regional orga-¶ nizations all support deeper U.S. engagement in Asia. Extremist conservative¶ rhetoric claiming the administration is not investing adequately in defense in¶ Asia is nonsense.¶ • Addressing China’s military. China’s military has grown rapidly in recent years,¶ albeit from a very low base. While some technologies are worrisome, the¶ United States retains a huge advantage over China. The Obama administration¶ is responding to China’s military buildup but is not exaggerating the threat, in¶ contrast to conservative efforts to use the “China threat” to justify unsustain-¶ able increases in military spending.¶ • Supporting regional allies. Asian nations continue to turn to America to ensure¶ peace and security. The United States is meeting that need by strengthening rela-¶ tions with our Pacific friends and allies. Relationships with Japan, South Korea,¶ and Australia are rock-solid, and the United States joined with regional players¶ to push back on Chinese belligerence. Conservatives ignore this track record in¶ desperate attempts to tag the Obama administration as abandoning our allies.¶ • A friend to Taiwan. The Obama administration has sold unprecedentedly large¶ packages of arms to Taiwan, including major fighter upgrades, while also upping¶ outreach to the island in ways that will not destabilize cross-Strait relations.¶ Conservatives are left complaining that the current administration, like the Bush¶ administration before it, did not sell Taiwan the most advanced jet fighters.¶ The Obama¶ administration¶ is responding to¶ China’s military¶ buildup but is¶ not exaggerating¶ the threat, in¶ contrast to¶ conservative efforts¶ to use the “China¶ threat” to justify¶ unsustainable¶ increases in military¶ spending.¶ 5 Center for American Progress Action Fund | U.S.-China Relations in an Election Year¶ • Tackling cybersecurity. From the start the Obama administration has identi-¶ fied cybersecurity as an issue of grave concern and mounted a comprehensive¶ response. Conservatives who condemn the administration’s response do not¶ understand its scope; they also offer little in the way of new ideas for combat-¶ ing the threat.¶ In the pages that follow, we will present in more detail these 10 challenges along-¶ side the response of the Obama administration and the misplaced criticisms and¶ hostile rhetoric of many conservatives.

#### Chinese protectionism non-uniques

**Wolf, 11** - President and Chief Executive Officer of Wolf Group Asia (WGA), and has been an advisor to companies in the telecommunications industry in China since 1993.(David, “Cross Post: In Defense of the CFIUS” 5/6, <http://siliconhutong.com/2011/05/06/cross-post-in-defense-of-the-cfius/>)

At its heart, though, the short book is a reasoned defense of what the authors clearly believe to be a fair process, if not quite a model for similar processes overseas. Their greatest concern is in the matter of transparency, and it is worth dwelling on that for a bit.¶ China is in the habit of rejecting foreign investments with greater frequency, an expression of an all-but-explicit national industrial policy that implicitly questions the value of foreign ownership of Chinese companies. That foreign firms – most recently YUM Brands – continue to pursue acquisitions of healthy Chinese corporations in blithe ignorance of this policy implies either willful ignorance on the part of executives, legal counsel, and investment banks, or that it is time for China to be more transparent in the criteria it uses to evaluate foreign investments.¶

#### Cooperation is ineffective – internal constraints block common action

**Xinbo, 12** [Wu Xinbo is Professor at the Center for American Studies, Fudan University, Forging Sino–US Partnership in the Twenty-First Century: opportunities and challenges, Journal of Contemporary China, p. UM libraries, preview available at http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10670564.2011.647429#preview]

Whether China and the US can forge a genuine partnership depends on their capability to overcome bilateral differences and expand their cooperation in areas of common interests, while the latter will be even more essential given the fact that the Sino–US relationship is still growing. However, common interests do notnecessarily guarantee common actions**.** In fact, efforts to forge a Sino–US partnership are confronted with a series of challenges arising from both sides.¶ On the US side, one problem lies in the lack of experience in working with a rising power like China. Since moving to the center of the world stage following World War II, the United States has accumulated experience in dealing with rising powers like the Soviet Union, Japan and Germany. While the containment strategy proved successful in coping with Soviet expansion during the Cold War, the alliance strategy worked well to secure Japanese and German acceptance of US leadership when both countries reemerged as major economic powers in the 1960s. China, however, is different from those rising countries. Unlike the Soviet Union, it is not pursuing an antagonistic relationship with the US, nor is it, like Japan and Germany, following US leadership in international affairs as a small brother. For Washington, Beijing is neither a complete enemy nor a sheer friend. Both competitive and cooperative dimensions exist in Sino–US relations. The competitive factors may not lead to strategic confrontation if well managed, yet confrontation may happen if not well managed. Meanwhile, the cooperative factors may not automatically lead to cooperation, as it requires such serious efforts as hard bargaining, skillful trade-offs and the demonstration of a spirit of respect and equality. Given its cultural and historical background, the United States lacks such sophistication to deal with a country like China. Although the US has learned a lot since the mid-1990s about how to deal with a rising China, it still has a long way to go to enrich experiences, improve skills and adjust mentality.¶ Another outstanding challenge originating on the US side is the constraint of its domestic politics. While US democracy may arguably provide a good example for internal good governance, its foreign policy lacks continuity and credibility due to political cycles coming out of election politics and the interplay of interest group politics.[28](http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10670564.2011.647429#FN0028) China policy in particular has fallen victim to internal politics from time to time. While Chinese leaders always emphasize the need to adopt strategic and long-term perspective on bilateral relations, US leaders, driven by political cycles, invariably pay more attention to tactical and short-term gains in interactions with China. It is true that China's domestic politics also increasingly works to affect its handling of relations with the US, but such impact is largely manageable and has caused much less volatility than US domestic politics does to bilateral ties. It is the volatility in US China policy that frustrates Chinese efforts and desires to secure a steady development of relations with the US. It also undermines endeavors to build mutual trust between the leaderships in both countries. ¶ On the Chinese side, a series of political, economic and security factors constrain its capability to extend the cooperation that the US expects. Politically, China appears more sympathetic with some authoritarian regimes that the US may find less tolerable, and Beijing may resist Washington's efforts to exert pressure on them through the United Nations. As a result, China is often accused of protecting those ‘rogue’ or ‘repressive’ regimes. Economically, although China now ranks as the second largest world economy, it is still a developing country in terms of per capital GDP and overall level of social–economic development, hence China refuses to shoulder international responsibilities that it views beyond its capacity, and the US may perceive China as unwilling to live up to its major power status. On the security front, given the differences in respective geopolitical interests between China and the US in the Asia–Pacific, Beijing's approach to some regional issues, such as the Korean peninsula issue, differs from that of the US. Such differences highlight bilateral competition rather than cooperation in the region.¶ Mutual trust holds the key to partnership-building. However, the lack of mutual trust is an outstanding feature of current Sino–US relations. This should be attributed not only to the real differences in respective national interests, but also to misperceptions that each possesses toward the other. A primary US misperception is that China aspires to undermine its position in the Asia–Pacific. China, on the other hand, always suspects that the US intends to contain it. Both sides are aware of the other's major concerns and try to assure each other. For instance, in both joint statements of 2009 and 2011, the United States reiterated that ‘it welcomes a strong, prosperous, and successful China that plays a greater role in world affairs’, while China suggested that it ‘welcomes the United States as an Asia–Pacific nation that contributes to peace, stability and prosperity in the region’. In spite of these assurances, however, those misperceptions remain strong, and both sides continue to try to find supporting evidence from the other's words and deeds.¶ Finally, some conceptual gaps between two countries also complicate their efforts to forge partnership in world affairs. What is China's international identity and responsibility? How to deal with the issue of sovereignty in the era of globalization and information? How strictly should the principle of non-interference in a sovereign country's internal affairs be abided by? How should foreign aid be best provided? What should a preferred international order looks like? And so on. Such differences will affect both the objectives the two countries seek to advance and the means they employ.

#### Assertive US stances don’t kill relations – clarity outweighs

**Cooke, 11** [ Clean Energy: U.S.-China Cooperation and Competition ¶ By Merritt T. (Terry) Cooke ¶ Terry Cooke is owner and principal of www.terrycooke.com, a corporate seminar/scenario firm and GC3 Strategy, an international advisory/consultancy business and is a Senior Fellow at FPRI. He is the author of the forthcoming monograph Sustaining U.S.-China Cooperation in Clean Energy. He also writes the U.S.-China Clean Energy blog at www.mterrycooke.wordpress.com, http://www.fpri.org/pubs/Obama-Hu.Summit2011.cooke.pdf]

The U.S.’s tougher tone in the traditional politics of bilateral relations and in the new politics of economic statecraft has not tripped up U.S.-China cooperation in clean energy or triggered a combative competitive response from China. If anything, it seems to have given China’s leaders a clearer sense of a more assertive and comprehensible American president. China now seems to see Obama as playing an established and recognizable “American tune” on the global stage. During his January state visit to Washington, Hu took pains to show the “smiling face” of Chinese “peaceful rise” diplomacy, replacing the “angry face” that had been on view after the Nobel Peace Prize award to Liu Xiaobo and a series of incidents in the South and East China Seas. Hu also skillfully brandished “China, Inc.’s” checkbook, presiding over more than US $45 billion of commercial deals during his visit with one-quarter of that amount going to clean energy deals with major U.S. firms.4 In negotiations during the state visit, China also appears to have ceded ground in the highly-charged dispute over China’s “indigenous innovation” policy in government technology procurement (which U.S. critics saw as disadvantaging U.S. providers or pressuring them to transfer intellectual property rights to Chinese firms).

This approach by China—a purring voice in response to twin U.S. growls— is understandable. The Chinese leadership, over many decades, has come to expect, and tends to respect, clear and principled postures of strength and clear assertions of legitimate interests from the United States. Chinese state-owned companies know that they cannot hope to become world-class if they do not acquire global market experience and global management skills. Access to U.S. markets provides an indispensable proving-ground. Chinese state-owned and private manufacturers depend on sales to U.S. markets in key areas, including, in the clean energy sector, photovoltaic solar products. They need U.S. markets to grow while they wait for a domestic market to be developed. Public attitudes in China are deeply confused by all the talk they hear of from U.S. sources about “Sputnik moments” and about the United States losing the innovation race to the Chinese. To their minds, innovation is in the U.S. market’s DNA and is the most notable feature missing from the Chinese market. The notion that Chinese innovation is an existential “Sputnik”-like threat to the United States, thus, does not describe for Chinese observers a recognizable reality. That may make it all the more alarming and effective as a rallying cry for U.S. action taking a tougher line against, and seeking to out compete, China in clean energy and other innovation-intensive sectors.

#### \*US/China relations strong now

Shambaugh 9 (David, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs and Director of the China Policy Program – George Washington University and Senior Fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program of the Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies – Brookings Institution, “Early Prospects of the Obama Administration’s Strategic Agenda with China”, Foreign Policy Research Institute, April, http://www.fpri.org/enotes/200904.shambaugh.obamastrategicagendachina.html)

The Obama administration has the good fortune to inherit a generally sound Sino-American relationship—and it has moved quickly to reach out to Beijing and push the relationship forward. Presidents Obama and Hu Jintao had their first face-to-face meeting on the sidelines of the G-20 Summit in London last week, Secretary of State Hilary Rodham Clinton has visited Beijing while her counterpart Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi has been to Washington, military-to-military exchanges have been put back on track, President Obama has accepted an invitation to pay an official visit to China in the second half of the year, and both sides are signaling their newfound “cooperative and comprehensive partnership.” The Inheritance The Sino-American relationship appears to be the best it has been in the twenty years since the traumatizing Tiananmen events of 1989. Those events shattered not only the bilateral relationship and the cooperation that had been built up in previous years, but also the bipartisan consensus that had been forged in the American body politic. While memories of 1989 still linger in American thinking about China, over the past decade a new, but unspoken, bipartisan consensus in favor of engagement has emerged in Congress and the policy community—while at a bilateral level, substantial cooperation has been achieved across a range of issues. The prior administration demonstrated sustained commitment to the relationship and worked hard to engage the Chinese over an array of bilateral, regional, and global issues.

#### Relations resilient

China Daily 3 (2-13, Lexis)

During President Jiang Zemin's visit to the United States last year, he and Bush stated that China and the United States had extensive and crucial common interests and should expand their exchanges and co-operation in various areas to develop a constructive and co-operative Sino-US relationship. Improving Sino-US relations thus became the inevitable option in Washington's China policy. Since the mid-1980s, economic and trade exchanges have been a vital factor in bilateral ties and remain the most resilient chain. Bearing in mind the huge economic interests arising from China's entry to the World Trade Organization (WTO), Bush emphasized the importance of Sino-US economic and trade relations, even when pursuing a hard-line China policy in the initial period of his tenure. History has proved that, despite some twists and turns, common interests have overweighed differences in Sino-US relations.

#### No spillover

IPS 3 (Inter-Press Service, 11-4, Lexis)

Indeed, it now appears that, despite rising tensions over the bilateral trade balance and the value of the yuan, the realists centered in the State Department have decisively taken control over U.S. China policy, thanks largely to Beijing's own behavior and rapidly growing influence. "The administration has come to the conclusion that strategic engagement is the only viable option on relations with China," says Garrett. That Washington's major problem today is over currency, he adds, illustrates the degree to which Sino-U.S. relations have stabilized. "This is the kind of problem we have with Japan," Garrett said. "We're at the point where we can have differences in one area without it threatening other aspects of the relationship."

#### Warming is irreversible

ANI 10 (“IPCC has underestimated climate-change impacts, say scientists”, 3-20, One India, http://news.oneindia.in/2010/03/20/ipcchas-underestimated-climate-change-impacts-sayscientis.html)

According to Charles H. Greene, Cornell professor of Earth and atmospheric science, "Even if all man-made greenhouse gas emissions were stopped tomorrow and carbon-dioxide levels stabilized at today's concentration, by the end of this century, the global average temperature would increase by about 4.3 degrees Fahrenheit, or about 2.4 degrees centigrade above pre-industrial levels, which is significantly above the level which scientists and policy makers agree is a threshold for dangerous climate change." "Of course, greenhouse gas emissions will not stop tomorrow, so the actual temperature increase will likely be significantly larger, resulting in potentially catastrophic impacts to society unless other steps are taken to reduce the Earth's temperature," he added. "Furthermore, while the oceans have slowed the amount of warming we would otherwise have seen for the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, the ocean's thermal inertia will also slow the cooling we experience once we finally reduce our greenhouse gas emissions," he said. This means that the temperature rise we see this century will be largely irreversible for the next thousand years. "Reducing greenhouse gas emissions alone is unlikely to mitigate the risks of dangerous climate change," said Green.

#### Global warming won’t cause species extinction – most evidence suggests warmer climates increase extinction resistence

Carter et al 11 [Dr. Robert M. Carter is a stratigrapher and marine geologist with degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England)., Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder and chairman of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Dr. S. Fred Singer is one of the most distinguished atmospheric physicists in the U.S. He established and served as the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, now part of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and earned a U.S. Department of Commerce Gold Medal Award for his technical leadership. “Climate Change Reconsidered – 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change” http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf, Chetan]

Results of other studies also suggest the model-based species extinction hypothesis is unlikely to occur. In a review paper published in Current Biology, for example, Erwin (2009) explored past epochs and the myriad nooks and crannies of contemporary Earth, all in a search for the primary trigger of speciation. His conclusion? Warmth is the fire that fuels the process by which species originate, whereas cold tends to destroy what warmth produced. Headquartered in the Department of Paleobiology at the National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC (USA), Erwin writes, ―some of the best evidence for a link between biodiversity and climate comes from latitudinal gradients in diversity, which provide an avenue to explore the more general relationship between climate and evolution.‖ In reviewing that evidence, he indicates ―among the wide range of biotic hypotheses, those with the greatest empirical support indicate that warmer climates [1] have provided the energetic foundation for increased biodiversity by fostering greater population size and thus increased extinction resistance, [2] have increased metabolic scope, [3] have allowed more species to exploit specialized niches as a result of greater available energy, and [4] have generated faster speciation and/or lower extinction rates.‖ He states ―in combination with geologic evidence for carbon dioxide levels and changing areas of tropical seas, these observations provide the basis for a simple, first-order model of the relationship between climate through the Phanerozoic and evolutionary patterns and diversity,‖ and he adds ―such a model suggests that we should expect greatest marine diversity during globally warm intervals,‖ as is typically also found to be the case for terrestrial diversity. Erwin notes ―the three best-studied mass extinction events are associated with sharp changes in climate and support the contention that rapid shifts in climate can reduce global diversity,‖ which sounds much like the mantra of the IPCC with respect to global warming. However, the climate shifts Erwin cites consist mostly of cooling, and it is not only the shift to cooling but stagnating in a cool state that bodes badly for Earth‘s biodiversity. As Erwin describes it, ―the long interval of stagnant evolution during the Permo-Carboniferous glaciation is consistent with studies of modern-day latitudinal diversity that [indicate] rates of evolutionary innovation and diversification are higher in highenergy climates than in low-energy climates.‖ In further explanation of this conceptual framework, Erwin notes ―contemporary studies suggest a positive relationship between high-energy climates and [1] increased diversification rates, [2] increased number of niches because of increased metabolic scope, and [3] more specialized niches, and possibly because of [4] niche construction.‖ Indeed, he states ―studies showing that the tropics are a cradle of diversity, pumping clade representatives into higher latitudes, as well as evidence of increased ordinal level originations in the tropics, and of the sudden appearance of several mammalian groups during the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum suggest an asymmetric pattern of innovations associated with high-energy climate regimes.‖ Erwin‘s parting comment in this regard is his statement, ―there is an intriguing possibility that diversity does not track climate, but rather builds up during warm intervals but without falling by proportional amounts when climates turn cooler,‖ with the result that ―warmer climates may serve as an evolutionary diversification pump with higher diversity persisting [throughout following cooler periods], at least for a time.‖ Whatever the details may be, two generalizations clearly can be made: warmth typically begets speciation, whereas cold tends to lead to species extinctions.

#### **No resource wars – prefer statistical evidence**

Pinker 11 (Steven, Harvard College Professor and Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology – Harvard University, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Google Books)

Once again it seems to me that the appropriate response is "maybe, but maybe not." Though climate change can cause plenty of misery and deserves to be mitigated for that reason alone, it will not necessarily lead to armed conflict. The political scientists who track war and peace, such as Halvard Buhaug, Idean Salehyan, Ole Theisen, and Nils Gleditsch, are skeptical of the popular idea that people fight wars over scarce resources. Hunger and resource shortages are tragically common in sub-Saharn countries such as Malawi, Zambia, and Tanzania, but wars involving them are not. Hurricanes, floods, droughts, and tsunamis (such as the disastrous one in the Indian Ocean in 2004) do not generally lead to armed conflict. The American dust bowl in the 1930s, to take another example, caused plenty of deprivation but no civil war. And while temperatures have been rising steadily in Africa during the past fifteen years, civil wars and war deaths have been falling. Pressures on access to land and water can certainly cause local skirmishes, but a genuine war requires that hostile forces be organized and armed, and that depends more on the influence of bad governments, closed economies, and militant ideologies than on the sheer availability of land and water. Certainly any connection to terrorism is in the imagination of the terror warriors: terrorists tend to be underemployed lower-middle-class men, not subsistence farmers. As for genocide, the Sudanese government finds it convenient to blame violence in Darfur on desertification, distracting the world from its own role in tolerating or encouraging the ethnic cleansing. In a regression analysis on armed conflicts from 1980 to 1992, Theisen found that conflict was more likely if a country was poor, populous, politically unstable, and abundant in oil, but not if it had suffered from droughts, water shortages, or mild land degradation. (Severe land degradation did have a small effect.) Reviewing analyses that examined a large number (N) of countries rather than cherry-picking one or two, he concluded, "those who foresee doom, because of the relationship between resource scarcity and violent internal conflict, have very little support in the large-N literature." Salehyan adds that relatively inexpensive advances in water use and agriculture practices in the developing world can yield massive increases in productivity with a constant or even shrinking amount of land, and that better governance can mitigate the human costs of environmental damage, as it does in developed democracies. Since the state of the environment is at most one ingredient in a mixture that depends far more on political and social organization, resource wars are far from inevitable, even in a climate-changed world.

#### No investment in renewables

**Seeking Alpha 12**

[“ Why Alternative Energy Will Never Achieve Widespread Use In Our Lifetime”, 8/13/12, http://seekingalpha.com/article/802141-why-alternative-energy-will-never-achieve-widespread-use-in-our-lifetime]

The biggest issue comes with adapting these new resources. Aside from the fact that it would be a major pain for companies to make the switch, cost is the real problem. Building fossil fuel plants and resources, as well as actually using them, is a cheaper option for most big businesses. Alternative energy costs more to install and maintain, and with natural gas prices sitting so low and the supply growing by the day, you would be hard pressed to convince corporate America (or anywhere else in the world for that matter) that switching to clean energy is better for their business. It may help the environment, but it often hurts bottom line returns. Our addiction to fossil fuels is worse than that of our addiction to quantitative easing. Weening off natural gas and oil will take decades if not longer. Another major issue is the need for government subsidies to keep these programs going, as we all saw what happens when those programs run dry a la Solyndra. That brings us to the investing side of the equation, as many have utilized alternative energy in long-term portfolios in hopes of racking up strong gains.

#### 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.

#### The next Ice Age is coming – it will cause extinction by 2030

Chapman 8 [Geophysicist and Astronautical Engineer, First Australian NASA Astronaut

[Phil, 4-23, The Australian, Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh (http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23583376-7583,00.html)]

Disconcerting as it may be to true believers in global warming, the average temperature on Earth has remained steady or slowly declined during the past decade, despite the continued increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, and now the global temperature is falling precipitously. All four agencies that track Earth's temperature (the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy group at the University of Alabama, and Remote Sensing Systems Inc in California) report that it cooled by about 0.7C in 2007. This is the fastest temperature change in the instrumental record and it puts us back where we were in 1930. If the temperature does not soon recover, we will have to conclude that global warming is over. There is also plenty of anecdotal evidence that 2007 was exceptionally cold. It snowed in Baghdad for the first time in centuries, the winter in China was simply terrible and the extent of Antarctic sea ice in the austral winter was the greatest on record since James Cook discovered the place in 1770. It is generally not possible to draw conclusions about climatic trends from events in a single year, so I would normally dismiss this cold snap as transient, pending what happens in the next few years. This is where SOHO comes in. The sunspot number follows a cycle of somewhat variable length, averaging 11 years. The most recent minimum was in March last year. The new cycle, No.24, was supposed to start soon after that, with a gradual build-up in sunspot numbers. It didn't happen. The first sunspot appeared in January this year and lasted only two days. A tiny spot appeared last Monday but vanished within 24 hours. Another little spot appeared this Monday. Pray that there will be many more, and soon. The reason this matters is that there is a close correlation between variations in the sunspot cycle and Earth's climate. The previous time a cycle was delayed like this was in the Dalton Minimum, an especially cold period that lasted several decades from 1790. Northern winters became ferocious: in particular, the rout of Napoleon's Grand Army during the retreat from Moscow in 1812 was at least partly due to the lack of sunspots. That the rapid temperature decline in 2007 coincided with the failure of cycle No.24 to begin on schedule is not proof of a causal connection but it is cause for concern. It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850. There is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time. If the ice age is coming, there is a small chance that we could prevent or at least delay the transition, if we are prepared to take action soon enough and on a large enough scale.

#### Increased fossil fuel use is key to stave off the Ice Age

Science Daily 07 Quotes Dr. Toby Tyrrell, a Reader in the University of Southampton’s School of Ocean and Earth Science [Next Ice Age Delayed By Rising Carbon Dioxide Levels (<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/08/070829193436.htm>)]

Future ice ages may be delayed by up to half a million years by our burning of fossil fuels. That is the implication of recent work by Dr Toby Tyrrell of the University of Southampton's School of Ocean and Earth Science at the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton. Arguably, this work demonstrates the most far-reaching disruption of long-term planetary processes yet suggested for human activity. Dr Tyrrell's team used a mathematical model to study what would happen to marine chemistry in a world with ever-increasing supplies of the greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide. The world's oceans are absorbing CO2 from the atmosphere but in doing so they are becoming more acidic. This in turn is dissolving the calcium carbonate in the shells produced by surface-dwelling marine organisms, adding even more carbon to the oceans. The outcome is elevated carbon dioxide for far longer than previously assumed. Computer modelling in 2004 by a then oceanography undergraduate student at the University, Stephanie Castle, first interested Dr Tyrrell and colleague Professor John Shepherd in the problem. They subsequently developed a theoretical analysis to validate the plausibility of the phenomenon. The work, which is part-funded by the Natural Environment Research Council, confirms earlier ideas of David Archer of the University of Chicago, who first estimated the impact rising CO2 levels would have on the timing of the next ice age. Dr Tyrrell said: 'Our research shows why atmospheric CO2 will not return to pre-industrial levels after we stop burning fossil fuels. It shows that it if we use up all known fossil fuels it doesn't matter at what rate we burn them. The result would be the same if we burned them at present rates or at more moderate rates; we would still get the same eventual ice-age-prevention result.' Ice ages occur around every 100,000 years as the pattern of Earth's orbit alters over time. Changes in the way the sun strikes the Earth allows for the growth of ice caps, plunging the Earth into an ice age. But it is not only variations in received sunlight that determine the descent into an ice age; levels of atmospheric CO2 are also important. Humanity has to date burnt about 300 Gt C of fossil fuels. This work suggests that even if only 1000 Gt C (gigatonnes of carbon) are eventually burnt (out of total reserves of about 4000 Gt C) then it is likely that the next ice age will be skipped. Burning all recoverable fossil fuels could lead to avoidance of the next five ice ages.

### 1NC – FDI

#### Can’t solve internal links –

####  It only changes the review for wind – it doesn’t change the CFIUS Review process for ANY OTHER issue or energy source

#### Means they can’t solve trade or FDI

#### This advantage is like…not a thing

## Round 8 2NC vs. Houston AR

### Econ Impact – 2NC

#### Impact outweighs and turns the case –

#### A. Magnitude – US collapse goes global and draws in every major country – treaties increase the probability of draw in and guarantees escalation.

#### B. Timeframe – decline causes lash out and outward pressure to secure economic gains – that’s Auslin.

### Econ Outweighs – Probability

#### Probability -- conflict now is highly likely given other economic stressors

Mootry 9 (Primus, B.A. Northern Illinois University “Americans likely to face more difficult times” - The Herald Bulletin, http://www.theheraldbulletin.com/columns/local\_story\_282184703.html?keyword=secondarystory)

These are difficult times. The direct and indirect costs associated with the war on Iraq have nearly wrecked our economy. The recent $700 billion bailout, bank failures, and the failure of many small and large businesses across the nation will take years — perhaps decades — to surmount. Along with these rampant business failures, we have seen unemployment rates skyrocket, record numbers of home foreclosures, an explosion of uninsured Americans, and other economic woes that together have politicians now openly willing to mention the "D" word: Depression. These are difficult days. We have seen our international reputation sink to all time lows. We have seen great natural disasters such as hurricanes Ike and Katrina leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens stripped of all they own or permanently dislocated. In all my years, I have never seen a time such as this. To make matters worse, we are witnessing a resurgence of animosities between the United States and Russia, as well as the rapid growth of India and China. As to the growth of these two huge countries, the problem for us is that they are demanding more and more oil — millions of barrels more each week — and there is not much we can say or do about it. In the meantime, if America does not get the oil it needs, our entire economy will grind to a halt. In short, the challenges we face are complex and enormous. Incidentally, one of the factors that makes this time unlike any other in history is the potential for worldwide nuclear conflict. **There has never been a time in** the long **history** of man **when**, through his own technologies — and his arrogance — he can destroy the planet. Given the tensions around the world, **a mere spark could lead to global conflagration.**[This evidence has been gender paraphrased].

### Turns Wind Power

#### Econ decline tanks wind power – demand destruction

Bolinger and Wise 11 (Mark and Ryan, Analysts @ Environmental Energy Tech Division-Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, "Understanding Trends in ¶ Wind Turbine Prices Over the Past Decade," http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-5119e.pdf)

3 For example, the sample includes just 10 transactions summing to 907 MW announced in 2010 and early 2011 – ¶ i.e., just 14% of the 6,280 MW of new turbine orders reported over this period by AWEA (2011). In addition to less ¶ transparency surrounding new orders, there have also been fewer orders overall in recent years, partly a function of ¶ reduced demand for wind turbines since the financial crisis of 2008/2009. Prior to the crisis, and heading into the ¶ peak of the wind turbine market (in terms of demand and pricing), many of the larger U.S. wind project developers ¶ entered into multi-year “frame agreements” with turbine manufacturers as a way to secure their anticipated turbine ¶ needs for the foreseeable future at a known price. In the wake of the financial crisis, demand for wind power in the ¶ U.S. diminished, leaving many developers

### Turns China

#### Growth prevents miscalculation and war with China

Glaser 5/2/12 (“China is Reacting to Our Weak Economy” Bonnie S. Glaser (senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.) 5/2/2012 http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/05/02/are-we-headed-for-a-cold-war-with-china/china-is-reacting-to-our-weak-economy)

To maintain peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and secure American interests, the United States must sustain its leadership and bolster regional confidence in its staying power. The key to those goals is reinvigorating the U.S. economy. Historically, the Chinese have taken advantage of perceived American weakness and shifts in the global balance of power. In 1974 China seized the Paracel Islands from Saigon just after the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam signed the Paris Peace Treaty, which signaled the U.S. withdrawal from the region. When the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met one of Deng Xiaoping’s “three obstacles” requirements for better ties and withdrew from Can Ranh Bay, Vietnam, in 1988, China snatched seven of the Spratly Islands from Hanoi. Two decades later, as the United States-Philippines base agreement was terminated, China grabbed Mischief Reef from Manila. Beijing must not be allowed to conclude that an economic downturn means our ability to guarantee regional stability has weakened. The Chinese assertive behaviors against its neighbors in recent years in the East China Sea, the South China Sea and the Yellow Sea were in part a consequence of China’s assessment that the global financial crisis signaled the beginning of U.S. decline and a shift in the balance of power in China’s favor. The Obama administration’s “rebalancing” or “pivot” to Asia will help prevent Chinese miscalculation and increase the confidence of U.S. partners in U.S. reliability as the ballast for peace and stability in the region. But failure to follow through with actions and resources would spark uncertainty and lead smaller countries to accommodate Chinese interests in the region. Most important, the United States must revive its economy. China will inevitably overtake the United States as the largest economy in the world in the coming decade or two. The United States must not let Beijing conclude that a relative decline in U.S. power means a weakened United States unable to guarantee regional peace and stability. The Chinese see the United States as mired in financial disorder, with an alarming budget deficit, high unemployment and slow economic growth — which, they predict, will lead to America's demise as the sole global superpower. To avoid Chinese miscalculation and greater United States-China strategic competition, the United States needs to restore financial solvency and growth through bipartisan action.

### Uniqueness Wall – 2NC

#### Group the uniqueness debate –

#### Electricity prices are on the decline and will remain low for the next years – the natural gas boom means that current supply is already meeting demand – that’s Burtraw. Prefer our evidence –

#### A. Predictive – it assumes rising demands for the next 20 years, their evidence is a snapshot and doesn’t occur for future changes.

#### B. More qualified – Burtraw is an expert is the electricity sector – their evidence is from a random news outlet.

#### Uniqueness determines the direction of the link – the only chance for consequence is a scenario where the plan increases prices. It means there’s no chance of their link turn being offense.

### Wind – 2NC

#### Group the link debate –

#### Wind drives up electricity prices –it’s not cost-efficient and raises prices by 48% – that’s Bryce. All of those costs get directly placed on ratepayers, not the company. Prefer our evidence – it’s from an economic fellow. All of their evidence is from the solar industry that are bias and have an incentive to lie.

#### Link outweighs the link turn – the costs of construction get put on taxpayers BEFORE the energy is generated.

#### Renewables are FIVE TIMES more expensive than conventionally produced energy

Zycher 1/17/12 (Benjamin, Visiting Scholar specializing in energy policy @ AEI, "Wind and solar power, part I: uncooperative reality," http://www.aei.org/outlook/energy-and-the-environment/alternative-energy/wind-and-solar-power-part-i-uncooperative-reality/)

The EIA estimates wind (onshore) and solar costs in 2016 at about $149 and $257–396 per mWh, respectively; if we add the rough estimate for backup costs, the total is about $517 for wind and $625–764 for solar generation.13 The EIA estimates for gas- or coal-fired generation are about $80–110 per mWh. Accordingly, the projected cost of renewable power in 2016, including the cost of backup capacity, is at least five times higher than that for conventional electricity. At the same time, outages of wind capacity because of weak wind conditions are much more likely to be correlated geographically than outages of conventional plants, and the same is true for solar electric generation because of the geographic concentrations of thermal solar sites and photovoltaic systems.

The higher cost of electricity generated with renewable energy sources is only one side of the competitiveness question; the other is the value of that generation, as not all electricity is created equal. In particular, power produced at periods of peak demand is more valuable than off-peak generation. In this context, wind generation, in particular, is problematic because, in general, winds tend to blow at night and in the winter, which corresponds inversely to peak energy demand during daylight hours and in the summer.

#### Renewable energy functionally puts a tax on carbon that gets transferred to consumers

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)

There is growing evidence that the costs may be too high—that the price tag for purchasing renewable energy, and for building new transmission lines to deliver it, may not only outweigh any environmental benefits but may also be detrimental to the economy, costing jobs rather than adding them.¶ The mandates amount to a "back-end way to put a price on carbon," says one former federal regulator. Put another way, the higher cost of electricity is essentially a de facto carbon-reduction tax, one that is putting a strain on a struggling economy and is falling most heavily, in the way that regressive taxes do, on the least well-off among residential users.¶ To be sure, the mandates aren't the only reason that electricity costs are rising—increased regulation of coal-fired power plants is also a major factor—and it is difficult to isolate the cost of the renewable mandates without rigorous cost-benefit analysis by the states.¶ That said, our analysis of available data has revealed a pattern of starkly higher rates in most states with RPS mandates compared with those without mandates. The gap is particularly striking in coal-dependent states—seven such states with RPS mandates saw their rates soar by an average of 54.2 percent between 2001 and 2010, more than twice the average increase experienced by seven other coal-dependent states without mandates.¶ Our study highlights another pattern as well, of a disconnect between the optimistic estimates by government policymakers of the impact that the mandates will have on rates and the harsh reality of the soaring rates that typically result. In some states, the implementation of mandate levels is proceeding so rapidly that residential and commercial users are being locked into exorbitant rates for many years to come. The experiences of Oregon, California, and Ontario (which is subject to a similar mandate plan) serve as case studies of how rates have spiraled.¶ A backlash may result that could even imperil the effort to protect the environment. Some of the renewable-energy projects being built in California are so expensive that "people are going to get rate shock," according to Joe Como, acting director of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, an independent consumer advocacy arm of the California Public Utility Commission. "In the long run," he said recently, the approval of overpriced renewable energy will harm "the states’ efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reductions."

#### Intermittency magnifies the link – producers will establish back-up capacity that jacks up prices

World Nuclear Association 12 ("Renewable Energy and Electricity," August, http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/inf10.html)

In a March 2004 report Eurelectric and the Federation of Industrial Energy Consumers in Europe pointed out that "Introducing renewable energy unavoidably leads to higher electricity prices. Not only are production costs substantially higher than for conventional energy, but in the case of intermittent energy sources like wind energy, grid extensions and additional balancing and back-up capacity to ensure security of supply imply costs which add considerably to the end price for the final consumer." "Reducing CO2 by promoting renewable energy can thus become extremely expensive for consumers," though both organisations fully support renewables in principle. The economic disadvantage referred to will also be reduced as carbon emission costs become factored in to fossil fuel generation.

### 2NC Conditionality Good

#### C/I The negative gets 1 conditional advocacies . The squo is always an option.

#### 2AC strategic thinking - forces the 2ac to tailor their straight turns to what the CP can’t solve - this increases analytic education.

#### No argument irresponsibility --- its no different than them choosing not to go for a link turn on politics.

#### Structural aff bias justifies – persuasive value of the 2AR outweighs the strategic benefit of the block – neg flex key to overwhelm their specificity bias

#### Real world – policymakers have to protect their plans from the right and left ideas

#### 2NR checks – collapsing the strategy allows the 2AR frame the debate

#### And – Dispo doesn’t solve

#### a. Still links to their offense - if one conditional advocacy is good, any disad to two or more is arbitrary.

#### b. Not a rational test of opportunity cost - if there are multiple costs to any policy you can’t just ignore some of them.

#### Reject the arg not the team

### 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

#### Turns resource wars because we’ll compete over food resources

#### 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

### Hoarding

#### Countries will hoard grain – causing grain wars, economic collapse, and disease

Kim 8 Former Vice President of JP Morgan, Former Senior Business Risk Officer at Citi Private Bank

[Ed, Risk Analysis Of Global Grain Shortage, Practical Risk Management, 4-11 (<http://riskyops.blogspot.com/2008/04/risk-analysis-of-global-grain-shortage.html>)]

We may not fully know how the competing theories weigh in as being the “main culprit” causing the current food crisis until a few years later. Rather than one main culprit, it appears to be a combination of cause and effect started by traders seeking alpha from weak crop reports. However, all of the analyses agree that this is a global crisis that threatens each sovereign’s national food security. So the focus of this assessment will be on “What are the risks faced by exporting countries, importing countries, and the overall global community?” Risk Assessment Of The Global Food Crisis For Net Exporters Of Grain, the biggest question that they face is to whether to add to their stockpile or sell into the rising prices. Russia and China, two major exporters of grain, have already placed restrictions on exports and are stockpiling. Thailand and India, two major exporters of rice, may announce some restrictions in the near future. The U.S. may decrease its exports of grain to meet internal demands, especially that of biofuel. If more grain exporting countries begin to limit exports, and/or more grain is diverted to biofuel production, then I think that the following risk events will increase in their probability of occurrence: 1. Grain prices will continue to reach new price highs due to limited world supply (traders will be able to skew the market prices even further with their speculative trading) 2. People will begin hoarding grain, leading to more shortage and still higher prices (self-fulfilling action) 3. More countries will begin to experience bread lines (less developed and developing countries) or place a limit on the quantity that one may purchase at one time (developed countries) 4. There will be sporadic shortages of grain based products, leading to localized panic, vandalism, and protests 5. There will be reports of grain carrying ships being hijacked (especially in the South China Sea) 6. Border tension and skirmishes between non-friendly nations will increase in frequency, scope, and duration 7. Companies will begin substituting other vegetables for grain in their products (potato flakes for breakfast anyone?) 8. Mass deforestation of vital rain forests and old growth forests to make room for more farmland (very bad move as it will cause more global climate imbalance) 9. Global stagflation brought on by rising food and fuel prices coupled with businesses failures, mass layoffs and devaluation of the local currency (Nations will print more money (fiat currency) to pay for imports, which will cause rampant price inflation) 10. Precious metal prices will set new highs 11. More catalytic converters will be stolen for their content of platinum, palladium, or rhodium 12. Global pollution levels will increase due to reduction in forest cover and production of more fertilizers 13. Carbon credits will rapidly rise in value as more nations realize that they will not meet their limits set in the Kyoto Treaty 14. Potential for a major outbreak of disease brought on by over farming, malnutrition, and increased pollution Please note that the above risk events are my opinions based on the facts presented. I developed these opinions by asking “What would be the likely outcomes of current events, should they continue linearly in their present vector?” Conclusion The World Bank’s April 2008 report Rising Food Prices: Policy Options and World Bank Response does not paint a rosy picture of the global food shortage and rapid rise in food prices. The World Bank report’s conclusion is that “Food crop prices are expected to remain high in 2008 and 2009 and then begin to decline, but they are likely to remain well above the 2004 levels through 2015 for most food crops.” While we in the developed countries bemoan the impact on our wallets, there are people around the world who bemoan the impact on their survival. As more families are forced to cut back on food, malnutrition will increase. This in turn will lead to increased incidents of major illnesses around the world. The overall effect of this will be series of grass root riots that will increasingly grow in size and turn more violent. With more frequent and violent protests, the probability is great that malevolent ideologists will use this opportunity to take control of some of the affected countries. After all, history shows that the oppressive economic condition – first hyper-inflation, then stagflation, and finally a major depression, all kick-started by the Treaty of Versailles – lead to public discontent in Germany, which made it possible for Hitler and the Nazi party to come into power. This theme reoccurs throughout modern history. John Foran, Professor of Sociology at the UC-Santa Barbara, notes in his research on approximately 36 revolutions in the 20th century that economic change combined with stagnation or deterioration in basic quality of life are two major components of revolutions. We’ve heard the adage that history repeats itself, albeit in a slightly different form. If we persist on staying the course on the current food shortage and its rapidly rising prices, then we are setting the stage for more revolutions to come. I hope that we do not come to that point. //

#### C/A Economic decline causes US-Sino-Russo nuclear war

#### Disease spread results in extinction

Steinbruner 98 Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution

[John D., Biological weapons: A plague upon all houses, Foreign Policy, 12-22]

It’ s a considerable comfort and undoubtedly a key to our survival that, so far, the main lines of defense against this threat have not depended on explicit policies or organized efforts. In the long course of evolution, the human body has developed physical barriers and a biochemical immune system whose sophistication and effectiveness exceed anything we could design or as yet even fully understand. But evolution is a sword that cuts both ways: New diseases emerge, while old diseases mutate and adapt. Throughout history, there have been epidemics during which human immunity has broken down on an epic scale. An infectious agent believed to have been the plague bacterium killed an estimated 20 million people over a four-year period in the fourteenth century, including nearly one-quarter of Western Europe's population at the time. Since its recognized appearance in 1981, some 20 variations of the mv virus have infected an estimated 29.4 million worldwide, with 1.5 million people currently dying of AIDS each year. Malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera--once thought to be under control--are now making a comeback. As we enter the twenty-first century, changing conditions have enhanced the potential for widespread contagion. The rapid growth rate of the total world population, the unprecedented freedom of movement across international borders, and scientific advances that expand the capability for the deliberate manipulation of pathogens are all cause for worry that the problem might be greater in the future than it has ever been in the past. The threat of infectious pathogens is not just an issue of public health, but a fundamental security problem for the species as a whole.

### Water Wars

#### CO­­2 increases water-use efficiency, preventing water wars

CSPP 6 (Center for Science and Public Policy, 1/12/2006, <<http://ff.org/centers/csspp/library/co2weekly/20060112/20060112_02.html>>.)

Wallace (2000) illustrates the source and magnitude of the problem by noting that the projected increase in the number of people who will join our ranks in the coming half-century (a median best-guess of 3.7 billion) is more sure of occurring than is any other environmental change currently underway or looming on the horizon; and these extra people will need a whopping amount of extra food that will take an equally whopping amount of extra water to produce, the problem being that there is no extra water. "Over the entire globe," therefore, says Wallace, "a staggering 67% of the future population of the world may experience some water stress," which translates into food insufficiency; and food insufficiency means malnutrition and, in the most extreme cases, starvation and war. So what's the solution? There's only one answer, according to Wallace. We must produce much more food per unit of available water, which leads to the most important question of all. How can it be done? Wallace suggests we must greatly augment water conservation measures wherever possible and implement every conceivable efficiency-enhancing procedure in irrigated and rain fed agriculture. Second, we must do everything we can, as he says, "to fix more carbon per unit of water transpired." That is, we must strive to dramatically increase plant water use efficiency. Human ingenuity will surely enable great strides to be made in all of these areas over the coming decades. But will the improvements be large enough? At the present time, no one can answer this question with any confidence. In fact, pessimism permeates most thinking on the subject; for as Wallace correctly reports, "the global scientific community is not currently giving this area sufficient attention." So where is our attention currently focused? Unfortunately, it is focused on reducing anthropogenic CO2 emissions to the atmosphere, which is truly lamentable; for the continuation of those emissions is, ironically, our only real hope for averting the near-certain future global food and water shortfalls that are destined to occur if the Kyoto Protocol Crowd gets its way with the world. But how would allowing anthropogenic CO2 emissions to take their natural course help to ameliorate future thirst as well as hunger? The answer resides in the fact that elevated levels of atmospheric CO2 tend to reduce plant transpiration while simultaneously enhancing plant photosynthesis, which two phenomena acting together enable earth's crops to produce more food per unit of water used in the process. Literally thousands of laboratory and field experiments - and that is no exaggeration - have verified this fact beyond any doubt whatsoever. Indeed, this atmospheric CO2-induced blessing is as sure as death and taxes, and as dependable as a mother's love. But what do climate-alarmist ideologues do about it? They spurn it. They deny it. They even try to make people believe the opposite (see our Editorial 13 Dec 2000). And they do it to the detriment of all mankind. Arial fertilization of C02 both reduces plant transpiration and increases photosynthesis, making plants more efficient and solving for water wars.

#### Water shortages spark global nuclear conflict

NASCA 6 (National Association for Scientific & Cultural Appreciation, 2006, “Water Shortages – Only A Matter Of Time,” <http://www.nasca.org.uk/Strange\_relics\_/water/water.html>.)

Water is one of the prime essentials for life as we know it. The plain fact is - no water, no life! This becomes all the more worrying when we realise that the worlds supply of drinkable water will soon diminish quite rapidly. In fact a recent report commissioned by the United Nations has emphasised that by the year 2025 at least 66% of the worlds population will be without an adequate water supply. As a disaster in the making water shortage ranks in the top category. Without water we are finished, and it is thus imperative that we protect the mechanism through which we derive our supply of this life giving fluid. Unfortunately the exact opposite is the case. We are doing incalculable damage to the planets capacity to generate water and this will have far ranging consequences for the not too distant future. The United Nations has warned that burning of fossil fuels is the prime cause of water shortage. While there may be other reasons such as increased solar activity it is clear that this is a situation over which we can exert a great deal of control. If not then the future will be very bleak indeed! Already the warning signs are there. The last year has seen devastating heatwaves in many parts of the world including the USA where the state of Texas experienced its worst drought on record. Elsewhere in the United States forest fires raged out of control, while other regions of the globe experienced drought conditions that were even more severe. Parts of Iran, Afgahnistan, China and other neighbouring countries experienced their worst droughts on record. These conditions also extended throughout many parts of Africa and it is clear that if circumstances remain unchanged we are facing a disaster of epic proportions. Moreover it will be one for which there is no easy answer. The spectre of a world water shortage evokes a truly frightening scenario. In fact the United Nations warns that disputes over water will become the prime source of conflict in the not too distant future. Where these shortages become ever more acute it could forseeably lead to the brink of nuclear conflict. On a lesser scale water, and the price of it, will acquire an importance somewhat like the current value placed on oil. The difference of course is that while oil is not vital for life, water most certainly is! It seems clear then that in future years countries rich in water will enjoy an importance that perhaps they do not have today. In these circumstances power shifts are inevitable, and this will undoubtedly create its own strife and tension. In the long term the implications do not look encouraging. It is a two edged sword. First the shortage of water, and then the increased stresses this will impose upon an already stressed world of politics. It means that answers need to be found immediately. Answers that will both ameliorate the damage to the environment, and also find new sources of water for future consumption. If not, and the problem is left unresolved there will eventually come the day when we shall find ourselves with a nightmare situation for which there will be no obvious answer.

#### Even one conflict unleashes 60,000 nukes

Weiner 90 (Johnathan Weiner, Professor at Princeton University, 1990, The Next 100 Years: Shaping the Fate of Our Living Earth, p. 214)

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

### 2NC Overview

#### The Ice Age outweighs – it’s coming now—the question is no longer global warming but rather global cooling—our Chapman evidence is the only one that cites current trends over speculation—the entire world got cooler in 07. Only continuous fossil fuel burning can heat up the earth enough to keep it from cooling – that’s Science Daily

#### This outweighs - the world would end in an Ice Age

Jaworowski 4 [Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Warsaw, Former Chair of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation [Dr. Zbigniew, 21ST CENTURY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, Winter]

It is difficult to predict the advent of a new Ice Age-the time when continental glaciers will start to cover Scandinavia, Central and Northern Europe, Asia, Canada, and the United States, Chile and Argentina with a layer of ice hundreds and thousands of meters thick; when mountain glaciers in the Himalayas, Andes and Alps, in Africa and Indonesia once again will descend into the valleys. Some climatologists claim that this will happen in 50 to 150 years. What fate awaits the Baltic Sea, the lakes, the forests, animals, cities, nations, and the whole infrastructure of modern civilization? They will be swept away by the advancing ice and then covered by moraine hills. This disaster will be incomparably more calamitous than all the doomsday prophecies of the proponents of the ~-made global warming hypothesis. The current sunspot cycle is weaker than the preceding cycles, and the next two cycles will be even weaker. Bashkirtsev and Mishnich expect that the minimum of the sec- ular cycle of solar activity will occur between 2021 and 2026, which will result in the minimum global temperature of the surface air. The shift from warm to cool climate might have already started. The average annual air temperature in Irkutsk, which correlates well with the average annual global temper- ature of the surface air, reached its maximum of +2.3°C in 1997, and then began to drop to +1.2°C in 1998, to +0.7°C in 1999, and to +0.4°C in 2000. This prediction is in agreement with major changes observed currently in biota of Pacific Ocean, associated with an oscillating climate cycle of about 50 years’ periodicity. The approaching new Ice Age poses a real challenge for [hu]mankind, much greater than all the other challenges in history. Before it comes-let's enjoy the warming, this benign gift from nature, and let's vigorously investigate the physics of clouds. F. Hoyle and C. Wickramasinghe stated recently that "without some artificial means of giving positive feedback to the climate ... an eventual drift into Ice Age conditions appears inevitable." These conditions "would render a large fraction ofthe world's major food growing areas inoperable, and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population." According to Hoyle and Wickramsinghe, "those who have engaged in uncritical scaremongering over an enhanced greenhouse effect raising the Earth's temperature by a degree or two should be seen as both misguided and dangerous," for the problem of the present "is of a drift back into an Ice Age, not away from an Ice Age." Will mankind be able to protect the biosphere against the next returning Ice Age? It depends on how much time we still have. I do not think that in the next 50 years we would acquire the knowledge and resources sufficient for governing climate on a global scale. Surely we shall not stop climate cooling by increasing industrial CO2 emissions. Even with the doubling of CO2 atmospheric levels, the increase in global surface air tem- perature would be trifling. However, it is unlikely that permanent doubling of the atmospheric CO2 , even using all our car- bon resources, is attainable by human activities. Also, it does not seem possible that we will ever gain influence over the Sun’s activity. However, I think that in the next centuries we shall learn to control sea currents and clouds, and this could be sufficient to govern the climate of our planet. The following "thought experiment" illustrates how valuable our civilization, and the very existence of man's intellect, for the terrestrial biosphere. Mikhail Budyko, the leading Russian climatologist (now deceased) predicted in 1982 a future drastic C02 deficit in the atmosphere, and claimed that one of the next Ice Age periods could result in a freezing of the entire surface of the Earth, including the oceans. The only niches of life, he said, would survive on the active volcano edges. Budyko's hypothesis is still controversial, but 10 years later it was discovered that 700 million years ago, the Earth already underwent such a disaster, changing into "snowball Earth," covered in white from Pole to Pole, with an average temperature of minus 40°C.

#### Even if can be prevented, nothing can prevent the climate transition to an Ice Age

### 2NC Trade War D

#### No chance of a trade war – its affect was relatively small compared to other tariffs. It only increased the price of solar panels from 600 to 610 – that’s Bradsher and Wald.

#### Read all their evidence with skepticism. They do not have a single piece of evidence that is not from the media or solar industry. You should reject their evidence – its super-charged rhetoric from people or have economic biases – that’s Ma and West. Prefer it because it makes a broader claim about the US-China’s relationship. It’s robust and not defined by one single issue which means no trade war.

### 2NC Trade War AC

#### Multiple other tariffs the US has China, including wind and on tires – that’s DiBenedetto. That empirically denies your argument – there is no functional difference between the plan’s tariff and the tariffs on wind and tires. China’s retaliation has remain limited and proves there would never be a full scale trade war.

### No War 2NC

#### There’s no war –

#### Prefer predictive evidence – the next 20 years will practice soft, not hard power

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full)

China and the United States are moving towards all-out competition, and in this respect their relationship is similar to US–Soviet relations. The form and scope of competition, however, is quite different. Competition between the United States and the Soviet Union was primarily in the military field, while that between the United States and China includes economics, science and technology, politics, military and other fields. US–Soviet competition involved using military means to maintain regimes in other states of a certain ideological orientation. Future strategic competition between China and the United States will involve expanding respective strategic influence through economic assistance, competition in science and technology, military protection, and competition for moral high ground. This strategic competition will be won by winning support and emulation from the majority of the world's states through the utilization of comprehensive national power. Under the context of globalization, Sino–US strategic competition might be likened to a team game, with winning allies embodying the necessary strategy for ultimate victory. As the classic Guanzi text says, ‘He who wins the support of majority states under the heavens is a King; he who wins support of only half is a hegemon.’58 If we compare competition between the United States and the Soviet Union to a boxing match, we might compare that between China and the United States to a game of football. The former was characterized predominately by violence, and whereas the latter will involve occasional conflicts, violence is not the primary means. The victor of Sino–US strategic competition will be the state that can increase its domestic power while at the same time maintaining an appropriate foreign policy strategy. Conversely, a major mistake in either of these areas will result in loss and a fate similar to that experienced by the Soviet Union or Japan.

#### Economics – Shor ev says that China is the largest holder of US economy – that mitigates any physical conflict

#### International Sphere – China is active in peacemaking – they’ve been keeping a low profile while recognizing international norms and rules – means they won’t risk instability or chaos

#### Disputes are compartmentalized – Weekend Australian cites Taiwan and Bush sanctions

### 2NC No Warming

#### Global warming won’t cause species extinction – Carter evidence has 2 reasons

#### Species extinction is unlikely to occur because it fosters greater population size

#### Warmer climates increase extinction resistance because it provides an energetic foundation for increased bioD

#### And Oliver Tickell literally knows nothing about global warming

Lomborg 8 – Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15,http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange, Chetan]
These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. **Oliver Tickell**, for instance, **writes that a global warming** causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

## Round 8 1NR vs. Houston AR

### Racism Addon Thing States CP

#### I’m not sure if this is an addon

#### They can’t overcome centuries of racism.

Howard **Winant 2k,** Department of Sociology @ Temple U, “The World is a Ghetto” p316

In this unresolved situation, it is unlikely that attempts to address worldwide dilemmas of race and racism by ignoring or transcending these themes, for example, by adopting so-called color-blind or differentialist policies, will have much effect. In the past the centrality of race deeply determined the economic, political, and cultural configuration of the modern world. Although recent decades have seen an efflorescence of movements for racial euality and justice, the legacies of centuries of racial oppression have not been overcome. Nor is a vision of racial justice fully worked out. Certainly the idea that such justice has already been largely achieved - as seen in the color-blind paradigm in the United States, the non-racialist rhetoric of the South African Freedom Charter, the Brazilian rhetoric of racial democracy, or the emerging racial differentialism of the European Union - remains problematic.

#### Alternate causality – Capitalism

Julius **Lester 2k,** U of Massachusetts Amherst, “Racism, Anti-Semitism and the Concept of Evil” http://www.umass.edu/judaic/anniversaryvolume/articles/08-B1-Lester.pdf

Racism became a cornerstone of modern Western civilization because by suppressing Africans, women and Jews, European man suppressed in himself the human attributes which most threatened that brave new world he was building, a world in which the economic mode changed from feudalism to capitalism. George Rawick observes that Capitalism required a new ethic to justify new forms of behavior and to repress the older ones. While part of this new ethic was the growth of democratic forms and processes, the other main ingredient was the separation of one human activity - work - from all others. Work was taken from its context as an organic part of life and subordinated to other social processes, becoming an abstract commodity....This kind of work required new personalities: men and women who could tolerate few periods of rest and relaxation, who could adjust to working steadily and at high speed without rest, who could repress the desire to quit and relax. It required the repression of man's nonrational desires and his subordination to rationalized work and more work, accumulation and more accumulation.

### 1NR Overview

#### Russia war outweighs the aff – Romney will collapse relations with Russia because of he won’t cooperate on BMD and Putin hates him – no impact defense means a 100% risk of our impact

#### It’s the only existential threat

**Bostrum 2**, 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.

#### 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

#### GOP victory leads to China bashing over multiple issues – causes sanctions

Gerstein 11 (Josh – Politico, “The GOP's China syndrome”, 11/22, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html>)

Mitt Romney says America is at war with China — a “trade war” over its undervalued currency. “They’re stealing our jobs. And we’re gonna stand up to China,” the former Massachusetts governor declared in a recent Republican presidential debate, arguing that the United States should threaten to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. When Romney steps on stage tonight for another debate, this one devoted to foreign policy, that kind of China-bashing is likely to be a favorite theme. With a moribund economy and relatively little traction for other international issues, the threat posed by cheap Chinese imports and Chinese purchases of U.S. debt is an irresistible target. The problem, China experts are quick to point out, is that those attacks often fly in the face of the business interests Republicans have traditionally represented, not to mention the record many of the candidates have either supporting trade with China — or actively soliciting it. Just last year, for example, Romney slammed President Barack Obama for growth-killing protectionism after he put a 35 percent tariff on Chinese tires because of a surge of cheap imports. And, Romney wrote in his book, “No Apology: The Case for American Greatness,” “Protectionism stifles productivity.” And though Texas Gov. Rick Perry predicted at a debate this month that “the Chinese government will end up on the ash heap of history if they do not change their virtues,” a picture posted on the Internet shows a smiling Perry on a trade mission to Shanghai and Beijing posing with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi after presenting him with a pair of cowboy boots. Nor has Perry been shy about encouraging Chinese investments in Texas: In October 2010, he appeared at the announcement of a new U.S. headquarters for Huawei Technologies to be located in Plano, Texas, despite lingering concerns among U.S. security officials that Huawei-made telecommunications equipment is designed to allow unauthorized access by the Chinese government. “There’s a certain pandering going on,” said Nicholas Lardy of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who adds that the GOP rhetoric is squarely at odds with the views of the U.S. establishment, which believes a showdown with China over the trade issue “will make things worse, not better.” Not all of the 2012 GOP presidential hopefuls have taken to publicly pummeling Beijing. The only bona fide China expert in the group, former Ambassador to China Jon Huntsman, has criticized Romney for being cavalier and simplistic in his talk of tariffs. “You can give applause lines, and you can kind of pander here and there. You start a trade war if you start slapping tariffs randomly on Chinese products based on currency manipulation,” Huntsman said at a recent debate. “That doesn’t work.” Former Sen. Rick Santorum also rejected the idea of slapping tariffs on Beijing if it won’t buckle on the currency issue. “That just taxes you. I don’t want to tax you,” Santorum said. Newt Gingrich says he wants to bring a world of hurt down on Beijing for alleged Chinese cyberattacks on the U.S. and theft of intellectual property, though he’s vague about how. “We’re going to have to find ways to dramatically raise the pain level for the Chinese cheating,” the former house speaker declares. And Herman Cain talks of a threat from China, but says the answer is to promote growth in the U.S. “China’s economic dominance would represent a national security threat to the USA, and possibly to the rest of the world,” Cain wrote in May in the Daily Caller. “We can outgrow China because the USA is not a loser nation. We just need a winner in the White House.” Romney’s rhetoric has been particularly harsh. “It’s predatory pricing, it’s killing jobs in America,” he declared at the CNBC debate earlier this month, promising to make a formal complaint to the World Trade Organization about China’s currency manipulation. “I would apply, if necessary, tariffs to make sure that they understand we are willing to play at a level playing field.” The Romney campaign insists those tariffs are entirely distinguishable from the tire duties Obama imposed in 2009. “The distinction between Obama’s tire action and what Gov. Romney is proposing is simple,” said a Romney aide who did not want to be named. “President Obama is not getting tough with China or pushing them unilaterally, he is handing out political favors to union allies. [Romney’s] policy focuses on fostering competition by keeping markets open and the playing field level.” Romney, who helped set up investment bank Bain Capital, has long been a favorite of Wall Street, so his stridency on the China trade issue has taken some traditional conservatives — for whom free trade is a fundamental tenet — by surprise. National Review said Romney’s move “risk[ed] a trade war with China” and was “a remarkably bad idea.” In fact, many business leaders give Obama good marks for his China policy. “What the Obama administration has done in not labeling China as a ‘currency manipulator’ is correct,” said one U.S. business lobbyist who closely follows U.S.-China trade issues and asked not to be named. “We’re very leery of a tit-for-tat situation,” he added, while acknowledging that the anti-China rhetoric is “good politics.”

### 1NR – AT: Environmentalists

#### No vote switching --- environmentalists won’t leave Obama.

**Bloomberg**, 8/31/**2011** (Green Vote Cools Toward Obama Risking a Replay of Gore-Nader, p. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-31/green-vote-cools-to-obama-over-pipeline-concerns.html)

Nader predicted in April that Obama will win re-election, in part because “the liberal base has nowhere to go to send a message” this time. Still, apathy among voters sympathetic to environmentalist goals may prove costly to Obama, according to Doug Schoen, who was a strategist for President Bill Clinton. “Obama won the election because the left, young people who are disproportionately environmentalists, came out in huge numbers,” Schoen said in an interview yesterday. “If he doesn’t have the kind of support he had from the left, from young people, from environmentalists, he is not going to be re- elected. It’s as simple as that.” NASA’s Hansen, Actor Hannah The sit-down protests outside the White House have drawn arrests of environmental figures from James Hansen, the head of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies, to actor Daryl Hannah, who starred in the 1984 mermaid movie “Splash.” The critics say TransCanada’s pipeline, which would carry crude extracted from Alberta’s oil sands to Gulf Coast refineries, would worsen global warming because the heavy Canadian crude produces more greenhouse gases than conventional oil. The State Department has said Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who has jurisdiction over the pipeline because it would cross an international border, will make a final decision by the end of the year. Under Obama, “there have been some huge disappointments, and some huge successes,” said Navin Nayak, senior vice president of the League of Conservation Voters, which spent $2 million supporting Democrats and $1 million opposing Republicans in the 2008 elections. “Those who were passionate about an Obama presidency want a reason to be passionate again.” Fuel Standards Among the successes cited by environmentalists are standards announced in July for cars and trucks that will double fuel efficiency to 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. Environmentalists also praise the 2009 stimulus bill for providing $90 billion in loan guarantees for energy efficiency and the development of renewable power sources such as batteries for electric vehicles. “President Obama has planted the seeds necessary to transition the nation to a clean-energy economy,” Ben LaBolt, a spokesman for the Obama campaign, said in an e-mail. He said that stands in contrast to Republicans who advocate “turning back the clock on our progress.” Environmental voters may vote for Obama less out of hope than fear of his Republican opponents who are attacking the administration’s environmental regulations, according to Erich Pica, president of Friends of the Earth in Washington.

### 1NR - AT: Jobs Key

#### Jobs aren’t key --- they are are not a sufficient condition for a win.

**Silver**, 2/3/**2012** (Nate – TIME’s Top 100 Most Influential People in 2009, Obama’s Magic Number May Be 150,000 Jobs Per Month, The New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/04/business/economy/obamas-magic-number-may-be-150000-jobs-per-month.html?\_r=1)

No economic indicator is a political holy grail. The American economy is a hard thing to measure, and initial estimates of economic performance are subject to significant revisions. Noneconomic matters — wars, candidates, scandals and so forth — matter, too. But if you want to focus on a single economic indicator, job growth during the presidential election year has a lot going for it. The job-growth numbers do at least as well as any other economic number in predicting elections, and slightly better than some other commonly used metrics, like the gross domestic product. So the news that the economy added 243,000 jobs last month was very good for President Obama. That pace is well above the minimum level — about 150,000 jobs — that he would seem to need to increase his chances of re-election. Beyond the history, there are a lot of common-sense reasons to focus on the jobs numbers. They measure something tangible and important. They receive much attention from economists, investors, political campaigns and the news media, and therefore inform the public discussion. They are released every month after only a minimal lag. They are not subject to as much revision as some other economic numbers. These qualitative factors are important because a sample size of 16 elections since World War II is insufficient for persuasive statistical evidence. But the statistical patterns are still striking. In the three election years where the economy was actually shedding jobs, the incumbent party lost — badly in 1980 and in 2008, and in a close election in 1960. George H. W. Bush lost in 1992 when the rate of job growth was under 1 percent, below the rate of population growth. On the flip side, in the election years when job growth was strongest — 1956, 1964, 1972, 1984, 1988 and 1996 — the incumbent party won the election fairly easily. And in the three years in which growth was positive but modest — 1948, 2000 and 2004 — the races were close. A bit of common sense can explain these outliers. (Be wary of statistical analysis that substitutes data dredging for common sense.) What about Mr. Obama? If Mitt Romney is the Republican nominee, the outcome does not seem likely to be an outlier. Mr. Romney is, by most measures, a fairly average challenger — neither a bridge-building moderate like Eisenhower, nor someone far outside of the political mainstream like George McGovern. Meanwhile, for now, Mr. Obama has no major scandals or foreign policy debacles. An analysis based solely on the historical patterns would suggest that Mr. Obama would be the favorite if the economy created at least 107,000 jobs a month until the election. Basically, this would represent job creation at about the rate of population growth. But Mr. Obama is not likely to get off quite so easily. Job creation was extremely poor during his first two years in office, and mediocre during the third year, which has weighed on his approval ratings. Slightly less than 50 percent of Americans approve of his performance, polls show. That isn’t terrible — it’s in the range where Mr. Obama might be able to eke out a victory in the Electoral College — but it’s somewhat below average. From 1948 through 2008, the average president had an approval rating of 52 percent on Feb. 1 of the election year, according to the Roper Center archives. If Mr. Obama has an approval rating of 52 percent by November, he will almost certainly win re-election. He will also be a favorite if he is at 50 percent, because some portions of voters do not express an opinion in such polls. The surest way for Mr. Obama to improve his approval rating will be to create jobs at a rate that exceeds the rate of population growth. Taking into account population size and his approval rating, an analysis by The Times’s FiveThirtyEight blog produces a break-even number of 151,000 jobs a month. If we knew nothing else about the election but how many jobs were created from January to October 2012, we would deem Mr. Obama to be a favorite if the economy created more than 151,000 jobs a month and an underdog otherwise. This is, in my view, a highly intuitive figure. When the payrolls number has come in below 150,000 jobs, economists tend to view it as bad news. A report above 150,000 jobs they regard as a hopeful sign, on balance. What’s more, current forecasts of job growth are close to that 150,000 jobs figure. I do not mean to suggest that the jobs numbers are the only thing that will matter. If job growth averages 175,000 a month, Mr. Obama will probably be a favorite, but not a prohibitive one. If it averages 125,000 a month, he will be a modest underdog.

### 1AR – Plan Doesn’t Link

#### Link to politics – all agencies are tied to Obama

**Nicholas and Hook 10** (Peter and Janet, Staff Writers – LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3)

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."

#### Obama gets the blame --- voters will hold him accountable for agency action.

**Wallison**, 1/1/**2003** (Peter J. – Resident Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, A Power Shift No One Noticed, American Enterprise Institute, p. http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15652/pub\_detail.asp)

Control over independent regulatory agencies has traditionally resided with Congress, which created all of them. The recent controversy over the Securities and Exchange Commission suggests, however, that now Congress, the White House, and the public all take for granted that the independent agencies are the president's responsibility. The political frenzy surrounding Enron's collapse and other corporate scandals may have produced--or at least exposed--a significant shift in the relationship between Congress and the White House. The efforts of congressional Democrats to pin some of the blame for the scandals on the president and the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission--and President Bush's willingness to act as though the SEC is his responsibility--may signal the end of more than a century of experimentation with independent regulatory agencies as a so-called "fourth branch" of government. History of Independent Agencies Independent agencies such as the SEC have always been regarded as "arms of Congress," outside the control of the executive branch. The president appointed the members and the chairman, but the terms for these officials overlapped presidential administrations, allowing--and encouraging--them to act without policy direction from the White House. The political fallout from the recent scandals has turned all this on its head. These independent agencies are creatures of Congress, not the Constitution. The first, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), was established in 1887 to control the powerful railroad industry. Later, especially during the Progressive and New Deal eras, a number of other agencies were created, several of which still exist--including the SEC, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission. Several others, such as the Federal Power Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, went out of business a quarter-century ago. The ICC closed its doors in 1995. There was no clear reason, or constitutional rationale, why the duties of these bodies could not have been performed by regular executive branch departments. Presidents have expressed their unhappiness with this diminution of their authority, and some have tried to influence agency policies through the appointments process, but they have not confronted Congress on the issue. And Congress--always jealous of its prerogatives in the face of the executive branch's growing power--has never conceded that the independent regulatory agencies could take policy direction from the president. Then, in 1971, the status quo was called into question. The President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization--known as the Ash Council after its chairman, Roy L. Ash of Litton Industries--recommended that almost all of the functions of these bodies be transferred to single administrators, appointed by the president and accountable to him. The Ash Council's rationale for this reform was simple: If the president's policy control did not extend to these independent agencies, then his responsibility for them could not be clearly fixed and voters could not hold him accountable. Moreover, the president's policies, even if adopted by Congress, could be frustrated through contrary actions by the independent agencies. The Ash Council's proposal, like many reform ideas, went nowhere. There was no support in Congress for enhancing the president's power, and the Nixon administration--beset first by economic problems and then by the Watergate scandal--had no stomach for challenging Congress. (The Ash Council's report did lead, however, to the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency, headed by an administrator who answers to the president.) During the Reagan administration, however, the executive branch became more assertive. The Justice Department took the Constitution's separation of powers seriously, which by implication challenged the very legitimacy of the independent regulatory agencies. Nevertheless, because of congressional sensitivities and the continuing sense that these bodies were quasi-judicial in nature, White House officials were warned that all contacts with the independent regulatory agencies had to be approved in advance--or actually carried out--by the White House counsel's office. The Reagan administration never seriously considered taking on Congress through a legislative proposal that would bring these independent agencies within the constitutionally established structure. The Presidential Role All this history appears to have been forgotten in the politics of 2002. The Democrats, hoping to make an election issue out of the SEC's "failure" to stop "corporate corruption," proceeded to blame a Republican president for events that were solely within the authority of the SEC. There was no indication that departments or agencies unquestionably controlled by the president had any role for policing either the securities industry or the companies under scrutiny. So if President Bush was somehow responsible for what happened at Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, and the rest, it had to be as a consequence of some presidential authority over the SEC. To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of all parties--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was fully accountable for an agency that has always been viewed as independent. The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can hardly be overstated. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become electorally responsible for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the die is now cast. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the attitude of Congress. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be difficult to convince them otherwise. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."

#### 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.”

#### The link only goes one way – 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.

### 1NR – AT: No Shift

#### No Romney traction – even if voters hate Obama’s energy policy they won’t shift to Romney

Lewis, 10/1/12 - senior contributor to The Daily Caller (Matt, The Daily Caller, “Mitt Romney’s struggle to win blue collar Ohio voters”

This sounds trivial, but it matters greatly — especially in places like Ohio.

The Atlantic’s Molly Ball is consistently a “must read,” and her latest column reinforces a point I’ve been making for a long time — that Mitt Romney is in danger of under-performing with working-class whites in key states like the Buckeye state. (Ball’s teaser says it all: “In Appalachian coal country, Romney is now viewed with nearly as much suspicion as Obama — and that may be the story of the 2012 election.”)

There is at least one substantive reason for these voters to be skeptical of Romney. While interviewing Ohio voters, Ball stumbled over an interesting blast from the past:

It turns out Romney, as governor of Massachusetts in 2003, held a press conference in front of a coal-fired power plant. “I will not create jobs or hold jobs that kill people,” he said, and then, gesturing at the facility behind him: “That plant, that plant kills people.” You can see the footage in an Obama campaign ad that’s been airing heavily here. It seems to have made an impression.

#### 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.”

#### Link debate below proves they’ll switch

### 1NR – Link Debate

#### Conceded that Obama will win, no Romney will lose cards so uniq controls direction of the link

#### China bashing is an election winner --- it appeals to voters and increases the chances of a Romney victory - Yingzi

#### Permitting Chinese foreign investment in domestic energy supplies sparks a HUGE public backlash – SNOOC controversy proves

Burke 11 (John, Analyst @ BakerHostetler, "The United States Welcomes Chinese Foreign Direct Investment - The Handful of Deals Blocked by CFIUS are Aberrant," http://www.chinaustradelawblog.com/2011/02/articles/investment/the-united-states-welcomes-chinese-foreign-direct-investment-the-handful-of-deals-blocked-by-cfius-are-aberrant/)

The President of the United States may order the divestment of a foreigner’s controlling interest in a U.S. business should he determine that such control threatens U.S. “national security.” The CFIUS review system works through voluntary filings by those parties to proposed transactions who seek to take advantage of the safe harbor that a CFIUS approval prior to an acquisition provides. The safe harbor prevents the President from undoing the deal pursuant to his authority under FINSA.¶ The CFIUS process is disciplined by the authority FINSA provides CFIUS to self-initiate a review as to whether any “covered transaction” threatens U.S. national security at any time. That authority is seldom used, but its existence means that foreign acquirers should give serious consideration to voluntary CFIUS filings before any national security questions may be asked.¶ For most companies, CFIUS review takes only thirty days. By seeking it voluntarily before the acquisition is consummated, the foreign acquirer can obtain assurance that its investment would not be destroyed by a CFIUS review, perhaps years after the acquisition. For a small number of companies, CFIUS review may become an additional forty-five day in-depth investigation. Even at this stage, however, most acquisitions are approved, although often with conditions.¶ A handful of Chinese acquisitions of existing U.S. businesses have been stopped either as a result of the CFIUS review process, or as a result of intense political opposition. However, in each of those cases, circumstances unique to the particular transaction, and not any hostility to Chinese investment in general, are what caused the transaction to fail. For example, when Northwest Non Ferrous International Investment Co., Ltd. dropped its plans to acquire a Nevada mining company, the reason for the unfavorable CFIUS review was the extremely sensitive nature of U.S. military installations that were adjacent to the mines to be acquired. (See The United States Remains Open To Chinese Investment). Had those mines been located elsewhere, the acquisition likely would have sailed through with little opposition. There was no objection to Chinese acquisition of gold mines. The objection was to the proximity to military installations.¶ Another deal effectively blocked by a CFIUS review was the proposed acquisition in 2007 by Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. (“Huawei”) of a significant ownership stake in 3Com Corporation. Two major concerns reportedly led CFIUS agencies to oppose the deal. The first was the inclusion in the deal of 3Com’s subsidiary Tipping Point, which sells network-based intrusion prevention equipment used by the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence agencies. The second was specific to Huawei. There were allegations in the press that Huawei had engaged in corporate espionage and intellectual property theft and was involved in high tech exports to Saddam Hussein’s regime and the Taliban. The combination of mission critical U.S. military technology and an acquirer with a particularly bad reputation from the perspective of U.S. national security interests caused that deal to fail, not any general opposition to Chinese companies acquiring specific U.S. businesses.¶ China National Offshore Oil Corporation’s (“CNOOC”) attempted acquisition in 2005 of Unocal, a U.S. energy company, was halted by congressional and public opposition before it could undergo a CFIUS review. That opposition arose because of concerns that critical energy supplies would pass out of US control. The fact that CNOOC is a Chinese state-owned enterprise did heighten those concerns. But it was the concern over access to critical energy supplies, and not anti-Chinese animus, that drove the opposition to that deal. Very few businesses that Chinese companies may seek to acquire will present these types of concerns. And, in hindsight, many observers think that, had CNOOC not pulled out, CFIUS would have approved. Unfortunately, CNOOC did not stay involved long enough to find out.

#### Labor

**A) Labor hates the plan ---- Obama will get the blame.**

**Bradsher**, 3/12/**2012** (Keith, Trade Issues With China Flare Anew, New York Times, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/13/business/global/trade-tensions-with-china-heating-up-again.html?pagewanted=all)

But China is seldom popular during election years in the United States, and this year is **no exception**. Mitt Romney and Congressional Democrats and labor unions have little in common politically — except that they have **all called for tough trade policies toward China**. It would be **politically difficult** for the White House to ignore the outcry. The European Union, for its part, has also been fairly quiet in the last month about Chinese trade policies, as it lobbied for a public commitment of Chinese money to ease the European debt crisis. But that sense of crisis has cooled somewhat, now that Greece has succeeded in reaching a debt reduction deal with its private creditors. And senior European Union officials have concluded that even if Beijing does decide to lend money toward a European bailout after two years of resistance, it would not be enough to make a significant difference, according to a person with a detailed knowledge of European deliberations on the issue who was not authorized to comment publicly. A World Trade Organization appeals panel ruled in late January that China must eliminate its export taxes on nine widely used industrial materials, not including rare earths or tungsten. The panel strongly criticized China’s export quota system, saying the policies favored Chinese domestic manufacturers over their global competitors that also need the same raw supplies. The panel did leave open the possibility that the separate system of quotas could be reformed instead of being scrapped entirely. Chinese trade officials are to join the W.T.O.’s monthly dispute-settlement meeting for all member nations in Geneva on March 23 to discuss the matter. Chinese commerce ministry officials have already told Chinese state-controlled media that they do not plan to change their rare earth policies in light of the W.T.O. appeals panel decision. In the United States and Europe, lawmakers, unions and businesses have been chafing at what has seemed to them like Western delay in addressing the rare earth issue.

**B) Key to the election.**

**Mead**, 8/24/**2012** (Walter Russell – avid fan of the television show the Price is Right and the movie Saving Private Ryan, Are Unions the Key to Obama’s Reelection?, Via Meadia, p. The American Interest, p. http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/08/24/are-unions-the-key-to-obamas-reelection/)

A massive push by organized labor is not the only thing that **could ensure Obama’s re-election**, but it is one of the few things that the president and his allies can have a great deal of influence over. After the past two years, organized labor has come to feel that a GOP sweep of Congress and the White House would create the worst political environment for labor since Andrew Mellon was Treasury secretary in the Coolidge administration. Faced with such a dire possibility, labor will **pull out all the stops** in this campaign. The larger question is how long labor can survive on this kind of emergency basis, where every election cycle presents the movement with massive challenges. Every dollar and every hour of staff and volunteer time that goes into life-or-death election campaigning is a resource that doesn’t go into staving off decades-long decline. It also diverts energy from the crucial task of re-imagining the American labor movement for the 21st century. Labor backing may help President Obama **extend his lease on the White House**. However, while defeat would be disastrous to labor, victory probably won’t reverse its decline.

**Ohio –**

**A) China bashing is key to winning Ohio.**

**Luce**, 3/11/**2012** (Edward, Welcome to the new China-bashing, Financial Times, p. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/25b78a5a-69e2-11e1-8996-00144feabdc0.html#axzz24sx7xBVS)

China-bashing was surely one reason why Mitt Romney was able to **scrape a cliffhanger victory in Ohio** last week and thus retain his frontrunner status. It is a line to which he will probably resort again and again. Just as deindustrialised Ohio will once more **prove a pivotal swing state** in the US election, so China will feature increasingly as a bone of contention in the build-up to November. “China steals our designs and our patents and our knowhow,” Mr Romney told Ohioans. “They have walked all over him [Barack Obama]. If I am president that is going to end.” Conventional wisdom tells us that China-bashing always occurs in even-numbered years and recedes during odd ones – US elections always being even. With an electorate that prematurely believes China is already the largest economy in the world, American politicians reflect that anguish on the hustings. When it comes to governing, however, they quickly grasp that it makes little sense to provoke trade war with the country’s largest creditor. “This year will be no different,” goes the refrain both from US pundits and foreign observers. “Elections are America’s way of **letting off steam**.” Such complacency is fortified by the mood on the stock market, which is more concerned about a potential Chinese slowdown and by the improving US labour market, which is now steadily adding more than 200,000 jobs a month. The optimists also point to manufacturing, where almost half a million US jobs have come back in the past 18 months. Meanwhile, China continues to allow the renminbi to appreciate – it has risen by roughly 20 per cent against the dollar in the past four years. Whatever voters tell pollsters about China, the underlying trends are good, they say. No need to take Mr Romney or Mr Obama at face value. There are three problems with this argument. First, it cannot see beyond its nose. Everything about a presidential election is geared towards the short-term mood of the voters. If the economy is going in the right direction, presidents get re-elected. Perhaps because of the minefield-strewn condition of the Republican party, the bien pensants are more euphoric about the economic data than is merited (partly because the trends improve Mr Obama’s re-election chances). Yet this remains a tepid recovery. At the current rate it will take another four years to return to 5 per cent unemployment. The recent upswing offers a methadone rush that has blinded people to the more fundamental trends the other way. One of these is the rapidly growing US trade deficit with China, which jumped by more than a tenth to nearly $300bn last year. So too are US median weekly earnings, which have fallen by 3 per cent since 2009. Almost 6m manufacturing jobs have been lost since 2001 – 2.3m since Mr Obama took office. Of the few that have trickled back, many pay at less than half the old rate. Last month General Electric advertised 400 new jobs in Kentucky at $13.50 an hour. It received 6,000 applications in 50 minutes before its server shut down. Second, in spite of all the chatter about reshoring, US competitiveness continues to slide. When Mr Obama came to office, the US had a $60bn deficit in advanced manufacturing goods, which is where the most valuable innovation takes place. Last year that rose to $99bn – an increase of almost two-thirds. Again, in contrast to the conventional patina, which notes China’s growing wage inflation and reassures itself that jobs will return to the US, wages in China represent only a fraction of the cost of investing there. Intel recently opened a plant in China. Jeff Immelt, GE’s chief executive who doubles up as chairman of Mr Obama’s jobs and competitiveness council, recently set up a joint venture between GE’s avionics division and a Chinese state company. China’s secret – and that of many other countries – is that it offers huge tax breaks to lure high value-added investors. The US is never likely to match China’s largesse, or even to try. Even the modest measures Mr Obama recently proposed have been criticised by friendly economists. Christina Romer, a former senior economic adviser to Mr Obama, said that consumers “value haircuts as much as hair dryers”. She did not add that hair dryers are imported, while haircuts remain unexportable. Finally, this time the politics feel different. Usually the Democrat bashes China on trade while the Republican holds back. But in 2012 it is the Republican who has taken the lead. Mr Obama will have to **parry** as the election gets under way. Mr Romney has promised to brand China a currency manipulator “on my first day in office”. He would not easily be able to wriggle out of this. Mr Obama will do well to avoid matching it.

**B) Ohio is a must-win for Romney.**

**Anderson**, 8/9/**2012** (Theo, Obama’s Trump Card: Ohio, In These Times, p. <http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/13609/obamas_ohio_trump_card/>)

Can Mitt Romney lose Ohio and win the election? **Not likely**. Assuming that President Obama takes Ohio and that Romney wins Florida, Romney would need to win 50 of the remaining swing state's 53 electoral college votes. If Romney loses both Ohio and Florida, where he now trails by about a point, he has essentially **no chance of winning**. (This analysis is based on the Real Clear Politics electoral map.) The **critical question**, then, is whether Romney can win Ohio. With the standard caveat that anything could happen between now and November, it looks increasingly doubtful.

#### China bashing swings the election for Romney --- that collapses relations and causes conflict with China.

**Jingya**, 8/24/**2012** (Mei, China bashing good for winning votes, but bad for Sino-US relations, Sina English, p. http://english.sina.com/china/2012/0824/499676.html)

Since China has been “demonized” all these years by American media, China bashing is an old trick that never fails to win the affection of voters. The US has a long tradition of challengers using China to attack incumbents during presidential elections. This year is no exception. Outlining his foreign policy toward China and East Asia, Romney said “In the face of China’s accelerated military build-up, the United States and our allies must maintain appropriate military capabilities to discourage any aggressive or coercive behavior by China against its neighbors." He also criticized China’s human rights record and stressed the need to “continue to strengthen alliances and relations with strategic partners like India and build stronger ties to influential countries like Indonesia”. During a campaign event in New Hampshire on Monday, Romney again claimed that he would crack down on "cheaters like China" and would work to open new market for US goods, according to a CNN report. Paul Ryan, Romney’s running mate and presumptive Republican vice-presidential nominee, accused China of stealing intellectual property, blocking access to its markets and manipulating the exchange rate during a campaign stop in Ohio last week. Peter Hays Gries, director of the Institute for U.S.-China Issues, wrote in an op-ed in the New York Times that China bashing may play well for the Romney-Ryan ticket, “but it will be bad for America’s relations with China and could undermine our national security.” “Popular pressure for more confrontational policies in both China and the United States will be more difficult to contain - and will increase the likelihood of conflict in Asia,” he concluded. Also, in a long run, it is nothing but American interest that is at stake, as China-bashing card may help Romney win some votes, but will finally lose the whole game if he insists on running counter to time and situation.

#### China-bashing campaigning triggers hostility between the U.S. and China.

**The Economist**, 7/14/**2012** (The China-bashing syndrome, p. http://www.economist.com/node/21558581)

Words have consequences, too In fact, the risks could be a lot greater than that. China, like America is in the middle of a transition of leadership; and being branded as a manipulator could easily risk a nasty response. For another thing, Mr Romney’s words set up a dynamic whereby candidates try to outdo one another with their China-bashing. Earlier this month, when the administration unveiled a complaint about Chinese car tariffs before the WTO, the president’s campaign proudly noted that he had initiated such proceedings twice as often as his predecessor. The Republican Party immediately retorted that Mr Obama was nonetheless a late convert to the cause, and should have been challenging China more often. Indeed, fewer and fewer Republicans are letting their supposed belief in free trade interfere with an easy shot at the president. Mr Romney is actually among the milder ones. Donald Trump, while flirting with a run for the Republican nomination last year, said, “China is raping this country.” Newt Gingrich, who did run, argued at a debate among candidates that it was important “to dramatically raise the pain level for the Chinese cheating”. Michele Bachmann, another candidate, quipped that China’s purchases of American Treasury bills brought a whole new meaning to the phrase “Hu’s your daddy?” The trouble with such talk is that it reinforces the feeling among China’s leaders that America is out to thwart their country’s “peaceful rise”. The fact that both parties are happy to portray China as the bogeyman of globalisation creates an impression of uniform hostility. That, in turn, undermines America’s message that China is unduly paranoid and defensive. It also disenfranchises those American voters who would like to express a more optimistic view of the consequences of commerce.

### 1NR - Uniqueness

#### Group the uniqueness debate – our Silver evidence indicates that Obama has an 86% chance of winning while winning a 4.1% lead in the popular vote

#### And 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.

#### Obama will win – jobs and swing states

Espo and Thomas October 5 (David and Ken, reporters at AP, <http://www.bradenton.com/2012/10/05/4227714/jobs-report-gives-obama-much-needed.html>, accessed: 5 October 2012, JT)

FAIRFAX, VA. — Mitt Romney was still celebrating his widely praised debate performance when the campaign lurched in a different direction.¶ Unemployment dropped last month to the lowest level since 2009, and suddenly it was President Barack Obama's turn to smile.¶ In a race dominated by the weak economy, Obama said Friday the creation of 114,000 jobs in September, coupled with a drop in unemployment to 7.8 percent, was "a reminder that this country has come too far to turn back now." Jabbing at his rival's plans, he declared, "We've made too much progress to return to the policies that caused this crisis in the first place."¶ But Romney saw little to like in the day's new government numbers.¶ "This is not what a real recovery looks like," the former Massachusetts governor and businessman said, an analysis echoed by other Republicans throughout the day. "We created fewer jobs in September than in August, and fewer jobs in August than in July, and we've lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs since President Obama took office," Romney added.¶ "If not for all the people who have simply dropped out of the labor force, the real unemployment rate would be closer to 11%," he said.¶ Incumbent and challenger alike campaigned in battleground states during the day, each man starting out in Virginia before the president headed for Ohio and Romney flew to Florida. Those three states, along with Colorado, Nevada, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, North Carolina and Iowa make up the nine battleground states where the race is likely to be decided. Among them, they account for 110 of the 270 electoral votes needed to win the White House.¶ Recent polls have shown Obama with leads in most if not all of them, although the impact of Wednesday night's debate and of the drop in unemployment could well change some public opinion.

#### Obama will win now but the race can quickly change – new political events can “rewrite” the election narrative to help Romney

**Sabato et al 9/27/12** (Larry, Prof of Poli Sci @ UVA and Founder of Sabato's Crystal Ball, "Election Tilts Toward Obama, Senate Democrats," http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/election-tilts-toward-obama-senate-democrats/)

Three weeks after the Democratic National Convention, we see little indication that the lead President Barack Obama took after it has faded. Obama is leading Mitt Romney by about four percentage points nationally, according to an average of national horserace surveys, and his edge has trickled down to the swing states.¶ So with 40 days to go, we’re moving several toss-up states in the president’s direction. Our changes push Obama over the magic 270 mark, but we are not calling the race. First, the debates are yet to come. There is at least the possibility that, if Romney fares particularly well or Obama does poorly, the drift of this contest could change. Second, other events — international (a crisis) or domestic (dramatically poor economic numbers) — could theoretically occur to re-write the narrative of the race. So caution is always in order with almost six weeks to go, yet President Obama clearly leads at the moment.¶ Chart 1: Crystal Ball ratings changes, presidential race¶ Map 1: Updated Crystal Ball electoral map¶ These rating changes move five of our eight toss-up states into Obama’s column, giving him 290 electoral votes to Mitt Romney’s 206, with Colorado, Florida and New Hampshire as toss-ups (42 votes). Obviously, Romney needs to turn some of the blue on this map to red, or this race will be over. And much of Obama’s territory is unavailable to him: the states won by both Al Gore in 2000 and John Kerry in 2004 add up to 242 electoral votes on this map. Other than Wisconsin, Romney appears to have little chance of winning any of the other Gore/Kerry states. And the Badger State, despite Paul Ryan’s presence on the ticket, appears to be moving away from him as well.¶ Provided Romney wins the three toss-ups, he will then need to pry another 22 electoral votes from Obama. And that will be difficult: Of all the states at least leaning toward Obama in our ratings, the president’s smallest polling lead, based on the RealClearPolitics average from mid-day on Wednesday, was four points in Iowa.¶ Chart 2: RealClearPolitics polling averages in competitive presidential states¶ Our rating changes are based on polling, reporting and our own judgments about the individual races. They are not set in stone, and we wouldn’t be surprised if we switched some states in October or early November. Please keep that in mind. Politics is a dynamic, not a static, business.¶ Of course, if the current polls showing a decisive Obama victory turn out to be correct — and we have our doubts — then Democrats will win a lot more than we’re projecting in the Electoral College, the Senate, and the House.

### 1NR – Energy 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."

#### Energy will be a key issue in the election --- Obama is vulnerable.

**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.”

#### Energy will be a key issue --- recent events push it to the forefront.

**Cousins**, 6/29/**2012** (Farron – executive editor of the Trial Lawyer magazine, How Energy Policy Will Impact Upcoming Elections, EcoWatch, p. http://ecowatch.org/2012/how-energy-policy/)

Environmental and energy issues became one of the central issues of the 2008 U.S. presidential election. While the economy itself took center stage, energy issues were right behind it, being pushed by the insufferable chant of “Drill baby drill.” In the four years that have followed, the U.S. has seen a boom in hydraulic fracturing (fracking), the worst oil spill in our history, skyrocketing (and then plummeting) gas prices, a disastrous oil pipeline plan that threatens the safety of our aquifers and a Republican-led assault on environmental safety standards. With all of these issues weighing heavily in the mind of the American public, there’s no doubt that both energy policy and environmental concerns will once again play an important role in the 2012 election cycle.

### 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.

#### --It’s real world – recent special sessions prove.

**Time**, 8/10/**2010** (Congressional Special Sessions, p. [http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,2009480,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0%2C8599%2C2009480%2C00.html))

Where do you think you're going, Congress? House members, scheduled for a recess that would have released them to head back home and stump for votes, will be in Washington on Tuesday, Aug. 9, to vote on a $26 billion state-aid bill as part of a special session. That privileged-sounding title is a bit misleading, though, given that it's the equivalent of getting dismissed for summer break, only to be marched back to class for a special geometry lesson. The power to call a special session is listed among presidential responsibilities in the Constitution, though Congressional leadership has on occasion authorized them. This summer recess was supposed to be the House's second longest since 1970, but the Senate's late passage of the bill forced the lower chamber to reconvene after their work was already presumed done. The last time the House was plucked out of summer recess was to pass an emergency spending bill in 2005, following Hurricane Katrina. And earlier that year, Republican leaders had called members back on Palm Sunday to deal with the case of Terri Schiavo, whose husband wanted to remove her feeding tube following Schiavo's 15 years in a vegetative state. (Republican leaders opposed the measure alongside Schiavo's parents, though they were eventually overruled by the courts.) But, according to the House historian's office, House members have only returned during summer breaks to do business two other times — once in 1980 and once in 1991 — in the past 30 years.